

**Creating a Culture of Peace and “Resistance”: Integrating Conflict Resolution
into the Social Studies Curriculum**

BY

Nancy Chislett

A Thesis/Practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of The University of

Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirement of the degree

Of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

Nancy Chislett ©2005

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

COPYRIGHT PERMISSION PAGE

**Creating a Culture of Peace and "Resistance":
Integrating Conflict Resolution into the Social Studies Curriculum**

BY

Nancy Chislett

**A Thesis/Practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of The University
of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree
of**

MASTER OF EDUCATION

NANCY CHISLETT ©2005

Permission has been granted to the Library of The University of Manitoba to lend or sell copies of this thesis/practicum, to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and to University Microfilm Inc. to publish an abstract of this thesis/practicum.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither this thesis/practicum nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

**Creating a Culture of Peace and “Resistance”: Integrating Conflict Resolution into the
Social Studies Curriculum**

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty of Education

Thesis Committee Members

Dr. Yatta Kanu (Chair)

Dr. Sheldon Rosenstock

Dr. Jessica Senehi (Sociology)

August 23rd, 2005

Submitted by:

Nancy Chislett

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction.....	6
Research Problems.....	7
Purpose of the Study.....	17
Research Questions.....	17
Conceptual Frameworks.....	18
Significance of the Study.....	28
Summary.....	29

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review.....	30
Social Studies and Citizenship Education.....	30
Configurations of Social Studies.....	32
The Pedagogy of Social Studies and the Hidden Curriculum.....	36
The Relevance of Global Education.....	41
Global Participatory Citizenship through Conflict Resolution Education.....	44
A Rationale for Peace and Peace Education.....	50
Approaches to Peace Education.....	55
Integrating Conflict Resolution.....	62
Curriculum Integration.....	67
Summary.....	71

CHAPTER THREE

Research Methodology.....	72
Research Context.....	74
Creating the Data Source.....	75
How Conflict Resolution Knowledge and Skills were Integrated.....	75
Data Collection Methods.....	82
Data Analysis Methods.....	84
Research Timeline.....	87
Summary.....	87

CHAPTER FOUR

Findings and Discussions.....	89
Theme One: Student Conceptions of "Peace".....	89
Theme Two: Notions of Conflict.....	98
Theme Three: Agency.....	104
Theme Four: Appreciating 'Difference'.....	111
Building a Culture of Peace: Integrating Conflict Resolution Education.....	118
Posttest Theme One: Practice of Critique.....	119
Posttest Theme Two: 'Perspectivity'.....	125
Posttest Theme Three: 'Difference'.....	127
Posttest Theme Four: Agency.....	128
Posttest Theme Five: Hope and Peace.....	130

Critical Elements of CRE that made a Difference to Student's	
Perceptions of Self-Efficacy.....	132
Summary.....	150

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusions and Implications.....	152
Watch for the Politics of Domination.....	152
Implementing Peacemaking Activities and Success Stories.....	158
Commitment to Social Action.....	159
Appreciating Difference.....	161
Concluding Remarks.....	162

APPENDICES

Appendix A.....	166
Appendix B.....	167
Appendix C.....	168

REFERENCES.....	169
-----------------	-----

ABSTRACT

This thesis investigated whether the integration of Conflict Resolution Education (CRE) into the Social Studies curriculum can enhance students' efficacy for developing a culture of peace. Specifically, it investigated students' perceptions of their political efficacy and what CRE-inspired classroom activities would best improve perceptions of political efficacy.

Over a period of twelve weeks, several C.R.E. activities were integrated into the planning and teaching of the Manitoba Grade 12 Social Studies curriculum units on the Middle East conflict and human rights in order to assess the potential of these activities for helping students perceive themselves as capable of contributing to peacemaking

Interviews interrogating the Grade 12 students' ideas about conflict, peace, and perceptions of themselves as peacemakers were conducted before and after the integration. Other sources of data included classroom observations of teaching processes and interactions and students' journals where they reflected on the classroom activities and the potential of these activities for enhancing students' political efficacy.

Analysis of the data from these multiple sources produced several themes that explicated some of the factors that inform/influence the development of students' political efficacy. These themes were: Appreciating difference, Practice of critique, Gaining perspectivity, Attitude towards agency and political efficacy, Vigilance for political dominance, and Hope for a future with peace.

Significantly, the study revealed that before the integration of CRE into the Social Studies curriculum, students held bleak beliefs about human nature (e.g., power hungry, greedy, intolerant) the likelihood of non-violent resolution to conflict, and the potential for peace in the world. After the integration of CRE activities students demonstrated an increased ability to critique ideas, understand and appreciate difference, see matters through the eyes of another, perceive themselves as peacemakers, and imagine a sophisticated vision of peace. Instructional activities that appeared to have helped generate these developments included role-plays, discussion of controversial issues, and the integration of success stories of non-violent approaches to conflict.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

This thesis is an attempt to understand how a culture of peace may be developed within the context of a grade 12 World Issues 40S course. Specifically, the thesis examined the effects of the integration of conflict resolution knowledge and skills on students' sense of political efficacy, hopefulness for the future, and confidence as active citizens and as agents of change, capable of building a more peaceful and socially just world. The study was framed by peace and conflict studies as well as Giroux's (1983) postmodernist theory of resistance which has elements characteristic of both postmodernism and critical theory and which provides a valuable resource for educators wishing to empower students to conceive a future different than the one predicted by some of the effects of phenomena such as globalization, colonization and a generally imbalanced world order. The specific site of the research was a World Issues classroom in a Winnipeg high school, where conflict resolution concepts and skills were integrated into the Human Rights unit of the grade 12 Social Studies curriculum.

The study was intended to achieve one of the current goals of Social Studies in Manitoba, namely, enhancing the students' potential for becoming active, democratic citizens with a globally-minded worldview. The hope was that students may develop an affinity for critique—that is, deconstructing ideas, particularly those that “legitimize” power asymmetries in society. I also wondered if students may develop political efficacy, or the belief that they can effect change. Achieving peace through addressing injustice is the overall rationale for the study, which may contribute to the scholarship on peace education through conflict resolution, and Social Studies as a site of peace education and political socialization.

Research Problem

Three interrelated issues that have triggered the need to conduct this study, for me as a Social Studies teacher, are colonialism and globalization and their implications for peaceful co-existence among people, and the need to politicize citizenship and citizenship education to empower student citizens to act in ways that develop a culture of peace. The goal is that through citizenship education that is active, critical and politically engaging, students will develop the knowledge, skills, attitudes and political efficacy to reduce some of the undesirable consequences of phenomena such as colonialism and globalization - for example, economic and social injustices that threaten peace within nations and internationally.

Colonialism

Essentially, colonialism is about dominance. "It is a structured relationship of domination and subordination, where the dominant and subordinate groups are defined along ethnic and/or racial lines, and where the relationship is established and maintained to serve the interests of all or part of the dominant group" (Barrera 1979, p. 193). To understand the many impacts colonialism has taken far more explanation than is possible here. However, the effects that heighten conflict will be briefly examined.

It is said that conflict often arises when one's basic needs are not met; this is otherwise known as the basic needs theory. Azur (1990) states that "under basic needs theory, individual or communal survival is contingent upon satisfaction of three fundamental sets of basic needs: acceptance needs (recognition of communal identity); access needs (effective participant in society); and security needs (physical security, housing, and nutrition), henceforth referred to as basic needs criteria. The denial of physical and acceptance needs, per se, does not directly induce

protracted social conflict. "Rather it is the denial of the means to attain these needs, that is, the access to social institutions, that prevents effective participation (political, social, and economic) in society" (p.68). Different groups fighting for their basic needs is not that surprising in places like Africa, for example, where even the independent governments are unable to meet the various and widespread social and economic needs of the people. The colonial governments, that preceded independence had little regard for human rights and were said to be very corrupt.

Because basic needs were not met, dangerous ethnic rivalries, rooted in colonial practices began to grow. Colonial governments often pitted one ethnic group against another by offering one group more privileges than another. Azur (1990) writes, "among the historical antecedents for protracted social conflict is a colonial divide-and-rule-legacy. As a result of the colonization process, or through inter-communal struggle, an adversarial relationship between communities develops, and one or more dominant communal groups emerge and effectively co-opt the state machinery. Hegemonic control is exercised by the dominant political parties and the state remains unresponsive to the needs of minority or subgroups, thereby impeding the nation-state building process" (p. 68). In Rwanda, for example, one must understand the divisive role of the Belgians in that country if one is to understand the genocide of not so long ago.

Under revolving hegemonic rule, ethnic rivalry, which has its origins in colonialism, will often reemerge in dangerous ways. As hegemony – a system of ideals represented and reinforced by a dominant group - denies the rights and participation of other groups, conflict is almost certain to emerge. As Azur (1990) has argued, "often it is the refusal of one community to accept and respect the identity of the other that lies at the core of basic needs deprivation and blockage of effective societal participation. Recognition of communal identity, therefore, can also be understood as a basic need. Denial of this need can foster group cohesion within victimized

communal groups and can work to promote collective violence if no other means of redress is available” (p. 68).

Colonial relations also exist where many minority groups around the world are subjugated by dominant ones. The obvious boundaries between colonizer and the colonized may be gone, but structural violence against minorities, women, the poor, and certain other groups still remain. According to Tejeda, Espinoza and Gutierrez (2003) “colonial domination and oppression materialize in the here and now of the processes and practices of our everyday lives – especially those related to securing the basic necessities of life” (p. 18). People embody the residual affects of negative and too simplistic notions of difference, originated during colonial times when European “scientists” were “content to view the human species as consisting of a few original “types” despite the accumulation of data on human diversity...” (Molnar 1998, p. 9).

As damaging stereotypes still exist and are reinforced on a societal level, there is a pressing need for a critical pedagogy that challenges prevalent notions of inferiority and “justified” oppression. Conflict resolution education can provide a new rationality and critical pedagogy that traces certain conflicts back to their colonial roots and excavates the many ways people continue to embody those colonial legacy today, in their attitudes, beliefs and behaviors.

Globalization and its Implications for Peace

Globalization is a complex phenomenon comprised of many factors that describe its meaning or behavior. Held (2000) for example, offers a few descriptors:

- It describes growing global interconnectedness.

- Globalization represents a significant shift in the spatial form of social relations so the interaction between apparently local and global processes becomes increasingly important.
- It involves the organization and exercise of power at a global scale.
- Globalization is a multi-dimensional process; it applies to the whole range of social relations – cultural, economic and political. Its effects can be seen in all aspects of social life from the food we eat and the TV we watch, to the sustainability of our environment.
- It can be seen positively as well as pessimistically. It may have benefits for society as well as risks. Local places and cultures can be seen as increasingly threatened by global flows or, alternatively, as reinvented through them in new and diverse ways (p. 15).

These characteristics of globalization also reflect the great debates about the effects of globalization. Simply put – is it negative or positive? Despite the scholarship of positive globalists, those who view globalization as a potential means to improve quality of life, globalization here will reflect the views of so called “pessimists” who perceive globalization to represent a new colonialism. For example, globalization has increased divisions between rich and poor, reduced quality of life for some people through increased corporate outsourcing, motivated ecological devastation, precipitated the disappearance of low-wage labor, expanded consumer debt, and forecasted a technologically-minded elite. This is not to say that people are helpless in the face of globalization.

However, it is the poor and the people of minority status that suffer the negative consequences of globalization the most. As McLaren (1997) writes, “we have been standing at the crossroads of a disintegrating culture for the last two decades where we have witnessed a steady increase in the disproportionate level of material wealth, economic dislocation, and intergenerational poverty suffered by African-Americans, Latinos, and other minorities” (p. 521). In short, globalization has rejuvenated inequity and injustice and is arguably another threat to peace.

Globalization has also brought in its wake a weakened significance of national borders and increased migration/immigration. For instance, Manitoba has recently received hundreds of

refugees from Sudan, Sierra Leone, and other places around the world. The consequences of such migration and the resultant "collisions" between peoples have included negative, stereotypical attitudes that people have towards those who are different from themselves, and resentment among some who regard immigrants and refugees as a threat to personal job security. This explains the use of negative metaphors such as "flood of immigrants" to describe this new wave of immigration. People, however, will need to transcend such biases, even if their only motivation for doing so is self-preservation. In the global economy, business requires new markets and in the interests of competition, people need to interact with diverse peoples from distant places. As Stephen and Stephen (2001) have noted, "with increased social and cultural diversity, combined with better communications... inter-group relations is the key to deriving the benefits and avoiding the perils (of globalization)" (pp.1-2).

Particularly within schools, inter-group conflict is a material consequence of this aspect of globalization as can be seen as early as adolescence where teenagers become accustomed to in-groups and out-groups, and the differing prejudice and discrimination they experience. Through education for peace, students can be better prepared to work and live in a pluralistic context, without the burden of discriminatory and oppressive attitudes towards others.

Scholars such as Phillip Brown and Hugh Lauder (1997) have argued that globalization carries with it benefits for the global community so long as education delivers the proper skills and training. Therefore, the picture is not absolutely negative. But because the effects of globalization as a sociopolitical phenomenon are varied, students will need the skills and abilities that will guide them through this new global terrain. Students should be exposed to globalization as a concept and as a world issue that is relevant to their experience. Diaz, Massialas and Xanthopoulos (1999) have added that "there needs to be a consciousness of the world as a whole,

a consciousness that the human species is inextricably bonded together and that each person is, in fact, a member of the world community" (p. 38). The processes of globalization necessitate the active social participation of students who begin to understand how their private life-world affects the quality of life of others, how power differentials spark conflict, and that they can reduce injustices through awareness and pro-social involvement. However, this may only happen if Social Studies educators transcend the current nationally-focused and passive conceptions and practices of citizenship education and develop notions of citizenship that are political, activist and globally oriented.

Politicizing citizenship and citizenship education

The subject of citizenship in the Social Studies curriculum has recently gained renewed currency in Manitoba. The provincial government, at the S.A.G. professional development meetings in fall 2004, announced the Social Studies K-8 curriculum and the framework of citizenship knowledge, values and skills that should be integrated within each grade level and within each unit of study. Although the senior years curriculum (grades 9-12) adaptations are currently stagnant, provincial and divisional consultants have provided some guidance for teachers about the framework for citizenship, particularly the citizenship-focused knowledge, skills and values to be taught. Citizenship knowledge consists, for example, of knowledge of place and identity, historical connections, interdependence and resources. The citizenship skills include active, democratic, global citizenship skills, managing ideas, critical and creative thinking, and effective communication (Manitoba Social Studies Curriculum Framework, 2003).

What is the reason for this new focus on "citizenship," and why now? Skeptics would argue that perhaps this rejuvenated mission for citizenship is the result of globalization and the

need for skilled workers who can help Canada compete in the global economy. Giroux (1997), for example, writes that this project of citizenship education has really been about a “vision of schools as crucibles in which to forge industrial soldiers fueled by the imperatives of excellence, competition, and down home character” (p. 95). In a time when national and international borders are blurred, global consumption and communication are technological phenomena that can be realized in seconds, and foreign cultures, political systems and economies seem closer than ever, the State will need a globally-minded populace that can both work and compete at the global level while being compliantly supportive of its governance at the national level. Fundamentally, the new curriculum represents a purposeful political socialization of youth, conceived and negotiated by a multi-ethnic group representative of the upper-middle class, meant to impact the social, political, and ultimately economic behavior of these youths later in life. We should however ask ourselves, is that the kind of citizenship education students should receive?

This is not to say that students, parents, educators or any other stakeholder in the educational process should not be concerned with economic competition or that they should try to ignore the “paradigmatic shift” (Gaudelli 2003, p. 11) resultant of globalization. Rather, the point here is to highlight the massive importance of citizenship education as a way to transform people. We must re-imagine what citizenship *should* look like, especially if people are to regard themselves as **subjects**, who are capable of achieving peace and justice, rather than **objects** of political or consumer manipulation.

The agenda for citizenship education includes the senior year's Social Studies curriculum in the province of Manitoba, in Canada, and I am suggesting that we pay special attention to the World Issues 40S course. The World Issues curriculum explains the social, political and economic contexts that surround many international tragedies and how these tragedies impact quality of life. Units in this course include human rights violations, terrorism, the Cold War, Global North and South and the media. After intense exposure to the inequity and injustice uncovered by information about these topics, it is reasonable to expect that the affect on students may be one of disquieting awareness. This is positive, for it could be argued that this awareness is critical, both as a source of knowledge, and as a prerequisite for student confidence and political efficacy, if they are to develop as active democratic and caring global citizens. This is particularly pertinent as the Manitoba provincial government looks to integrating concepts, skills and values of citizenship and democracy throughout social studies curricula, K-12. World Issues, like no other course, has a potential to create a consciousness or awakening about the world, beyond the scope of the student's personal communities, which can demand some sort of social or political stand to accompany moral outrage. This makes this curriculum an important vehicle for helping students develop pro-social worldviews.

Based on my experience teaching this course, typical student responses (at the beginning of the course) to curriculum content include comments such as, "How can people let this happen?" Behind such comments and outrage are personal beliefs about human rights, peace and the potential for peaceful resolution of conflict. Otherwise, such questions would not be asked. But eventually, these types of intellectually formulated and affectively-driven questions stop being asked, in the same class with the same curriculum that seemed to invite critical deliberation in the first place. What causes the change? Implicitly over time, students learn that

nothing will change. As Heath (1967) writes, "there is a deep skepticism among our most well educated youth about the assumption that man (sic) will not be able to adapt his social institutions to his technology by democratic, peaceful means – in time" (p. 32).

This notion has been echoed by other thinkers. Slattery (1995), for example, writes,

There is a pervasive distrust of the capacity of individuals to engage in dialogue in a democratic milieu for the purpose of achieving greater understanding. Therefore, schooling has reflected the societal preference of suppressing what seems to be either irrelevant or controversial in the curriculum. Curriculum development in the postmodern era is this modern notion of curriculum as racially, gender and culturally neutral... (p. 133).

It appears that as students learn about the quality of life of people all over the world, the "consciousness" students may be actually developing might be one of explanatory nihilism. Tragedy is explained (read: laid flat) by the social and political contexts in different geographical and temporal locations. Students begin to perceive that all people in similar circumstances would behave more or less the same, and that nothing will change so nothing can be done. Therein lies the beginning of student resignation and apathy, and the end of passionate deliberation and motivation to act.

Some would say that it is the focus of issues that debilitates kids – the content is depressing. And much of the world issues curriculum is depressing. But who would support the alternative? Of course students should not remain naïve about issues - that would be unthinkable. But through this curriculum, as students are losing their naivete, they are also losing hope - the same hope that motivates people to act in ways that better their communities, countries or the world. Without hope one cannot have or support others' political confidence and efficacy, insightful deliberation of issues, or feel true compassion for those who suffer the results of colonization and globalization, results such as conflict based in injustices. This is ironic, since

the course that seems to invite, guide and nurture social consciousness and action kills the hope that would otherwise make social action natural. This is not the kind of collective consciousness provincial or divisional consultants or critical or postmodernist theorists of curriculum would endorse. Hope degenerates as the curriculum is delivered because the curriculum is missing an intellectual and affective framework that balances the history of brutal violence, exploitation and other tragedies with an explanation of conflict, how some conflicts are managed and resolved, and the proof that people, including students and teachers, can act as agents for building a better world.

Without hope for the future, people can turn into malleable objects of the State. Political confidence and efficacy become empty of relevance, and active democratic citizenship becomes an empty enterprise, participation an empty gesture, and inclusive and equal membership an empty promise. What happens next? The politics of domination take over – warrior culture and the legitimization of dominance come to seem ‘normal,’ so much so that it comes to be reproduced in the schools. Instead, there should be a commitment to the implementation of a citizenship education curriculum that promotes political efficacy. Hahn (1998) asserts that “people who feel that citizens can influence political decision making are more likely to feel it is worthwhile to participate and be more inclined to do so than are people with a low sense of political efficacy” (p. 180).

One way of helping students to transcend feelings of hopelessness is by integrating conflict resolution knowledge and skills throughout the Social Studies curriculum. This would reduce the impact of all those “real life” examples where people simply cannot ‘get along.’ By implementing success stories, conflict analysis and inviting new rationalities through critique, students can be empowered to act because they realize that it is alright to care.

It is because World Issues focuses on issues that it can be an effective vehicle for peace education. As Harris and Morrison (2003) state, "peace education encompasses the root causes of war, the destruction of the environment, the national security state, international relations, human rights, and global cultures" (p. 66). Therefore, World Issues 40S is peace education. What is missing is the intellectual framework to make it a more effective course.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study, therefore, is to integrate conflict resolution knowledge and skills into the World Issues 40S curriculum, and, then assess the impact of such integration on students' perceptions of their own confidence and political efficacy to act as change agents capable of building a culture of peace.

Research Questions

The overarching question that this thesis investigated was: What is peace and how does one teach to enhance students' political efficacy for developing a culture of peace? Specific questions that guided the investigation of this question were:

1. Can the integration of conflict resolution knowledge and skills into the social studies curriculum contribute to the development of students' efficacy for developing a culture of peace among students?
2. If so, what specific conflict resolution knowledge and skills can we integrate?
3. What are the most effective ways of integrating such knowledge and skills into the social studies curriculum?

4. How does such integration impact on students' perceptions of their own political efficacy and confidence as agents of social change and peacemakers?
5. What are the critical elements of instruction that influence the development of such perceptions?

Conceptual Frameworks

Four theoretical constructs that provide conceptual frameworks for this study are *conflict resolution*, *postmodernism*, *critical theory*, and their derivative *resistance postmodernism* and I will briefly describe each construct as it relates to, and informs my study.

Conflict Resolution

The field of conflict resolution is complex. Since conflict occurs on so many levels, family conflict versus international conflict, for example, the field is open to discussion about how conflicts can be resolved for any number of people in various places. Furthermore, many aspects of the conflict must be taken into account. As Kriesberg (2003) states, "social conflicts vary in the issues in contention, characteristics of the adversaries, the relations between the adversaries, the social context of the conflict, and the modes used in the struggle" (p. 24). This complexity has produced a wide range of approaches to conflict resolution, namely, mediation, negotiation, conflict transformation, facilitation, peace-keeping, peace-making, peace-building, violence prevention and intervention.

The field of conflict resolution has many historical roots, including the antiwar movements of the past century. Continuing the commitment to both social justice and transformative social change exemplified by Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr., conflict

resolution scholars and practitioners promote “non-violent action” (Sharp 2005) to promote transformative social change and achieve peace. For example, one crucial distinction must be made between negative and positive peace. Negative peace focuses on directly eliminating violence. This means that although people may not be hitting or bombing one another, they may also be suffering from an unequal distribution of food, for example. Positive peace, however, focuses not only on the status of violence but also on social justice. This approach to peace acknowledges that without social justice, conflict resolution or peace may not be sustainable.

The analysis of conflicts addresses aspects of structural violence, such as race, gender, ethnicity and culture, for example. These are all socially constructed identities that can create social divisions however they are not the sole creators of social divisions. Conflict studies may also focus on psychocultural factors or structural factors within a society (e.g., Ross 1993). Social cubism argues to provide an in-depth analysis of protracted social conflicts, several dimensions need to be examined, including psychocultural, linguistic, historical, economic, political, and demographic factors. (Byrne, Carter and Senehi 2001, p. 730). The example of social cubism shows that intervention strategies aimed at reducing, managing, or resolving conflict must address the different aspects of each unique and sometimes multilayered conflict. Greater understanding of conflicts has helped scholars create greater visions of peace that do not simply advocate the elimination of violence. This is why conflict resolution, as a scholarly field, is often referred to as peace and conflict studies.

The field of peace and conflict studies has many significant themes that must be explicated in order to understand the range of key issues that it seeks to address. These central themes are; multiple levels of conflict, complexity of conflict, power, interdependence, identity, awareness, resistance, youth, theory and practice and the ethics of intervention.

Multiple levels of conflict and complexity of conflict are themes that describe how conflict occurs at many different levels of analysis, that conflict can be understood through many different “lenses,” and that intervention may occur in many ways and may serve different roles. For example, conflict can occur between family members, within an organization, within the community or at a global level. Intervention for any of these conflicts might involve mediators, for example, or educators. As Sandole (1999) writes, “any model of explanation that emphasizes dynamics and the interplay of variables at different levels over time is a distinct step forward” (12). The field of peace and conflict studies is complex because of the multiple sites and multiple roles for intervention.

Power and interdependence are other key issues within the field of peace and conflict studies, which seeks to create a climate of power-sharing rather than a climate where one party has power over another. This is what Boulding (1990) would characterize as an equal distribution of power. It is meant to counteract the reality that “the overall distribution of power in the world still seems extremely unequal” (p. 22). To address this issue of power there is a commitment to collaboration, empowerment, equality, social justice, and shared access to social institutions. As Lederach (1995) writes, “peacemaking... works for the empowerment of people to be active and full participants in the decisions and environment that affect their lives. It understands empowerment as emerging in independent relationships and contributing back to the growth of others in the community” (p. 21). The field of peace and conflict studies conveys a commitment to interdependence and balance of power where trust and communication can flourish and interdependence among people or groups can grow.

Identity is another key issue within peace and conflict studies because identity can be one of the central hallmarks of a conflict. Understanding that identity is socially constructed - that

who we are is often defined by external forces, for example, such as culture. Identities can also be somewhat defined by conflict. As Lederach (1997) states, "in situations of armed conflict (for example) people seek security by identifying with something close to their experience and over which they have some control. In today's settings that unit of identity may be clan, ethnicity, religion, or geographic/ regional affiliation, or a mix of these" (p. 13). In other instances, people who are oppressed can become defined by that oppression and can begin to lose a sense of who they are. It is also important that people do not endure forms of violence because of their identity. Therefore, peace and conflict studies also focuses on eliminating prejudice and discrimination and the effects of colonialism, for example, while it promotes mutual recognition and inter-cultural understanding, for example.

Awareness and resistance are key themes that address issues around consciousness-raising and conflict escalation for the purposes of challenging structural violence. Awareness is crucial; before people can become mobilized, they must be aware of their position: their possible oppression and their ability to transcend it. This shift in self-understanding is an important part of resistance. If people understand that there is a power imbalance and that they can do something about it, they may be less willing to live in secrecy and more willing to escalate conflict. Bartos and Wehr (2002) for example, would call this "strategic escalation" because parties who experience themselves as "injured" in some way may escalate conflict when they feel they "are in danger of becoming weaker" (p. 112). In other words, if conflict escalates, it can sometimes result in a sharing and acknowledgement of suffering with other parties.

Increasingly, there is recognition that youth must be involved in conflict resolution education and also as peacekeepers. Young people, through education for peace, learn that they can make a difference. As Barash and Webel (2002) write, "it cannot be stated too strongly that

individuals can make a difference, not only the larger-than-life figures such as Mother Teresa or Martin Luther King... For this process to continue, at least three things are needed: (1) belief in the possibility of peace, (2) belief in one's personal power and efficacy, and (3) motivation to proceed, whether individually or collectively" (p. 545). Young people may be more open to change. Through peace and conflict studies, young people can be encouraged to participate in building a better world.

Another core belief is the inextricable connection between theory and practice. Although theory is generated by scholars who, generally speaking, may concentrate on one object of inquiry at a time seeking to establish universal "Truths" and practitioners generally need to be acquainted with information from various sources and may apply these theories in many contexts, both theory and practice inform one another in a cyclical and mutually reflective manner for the purpose of conflict resolution. As Ross (1993) asserts, "believing that effective actions can be taken is, of course, not the same thing as knowing what specific steps to take in a particular situation, but in and of itself this attitude can contribute to a disputant's sense of efficacy and expectations and motivate a continuing search for constructive solutions" (p. 186).

Finally, the field of peace and conflict studies is concerned with the ethics of intervention. Intervention must be appropriate, sensitive and empowering to all parties involved. The idea is not that peace and conflict studies "experts" will provide "solutions." The idea is to empower the disputants in such a way that constructive solutions can be found and maintained by the people impacted by the conflict. "Therefore, intervention has moral as well as practical implications" (Deutsch and Coleman 2000, p. 423). One consideration for ethical intervention would be, for example, to value the knowledge of the disputing parties.

Peace and conflict studies relates to colonialism, globalization and citizenship because conflict resolution education can: help students to identify structural injustices in society that reveal the continuation of neo-colonialism; help students believe in their own agency and ability to be peace-makers; and support educational initiatives where students may participate in socially reconstructive activities that improve relationships among people in a globalised society. As Kimmel (2000) writes, "As our world becomes a global village, the need for better understanding and communication among people from different cultures increases" (p. 453).

Three theoretical constructs that provide conceptual frameworks for this study are *peace and conflict studies*, *postmodernism*, *critical theory*, and their derivative *resistance postmodernism* and I will briefly describe each construct as it relates to, and informs my study.

Postmodernism

Postmodernism, at first glimpse, is a theory developed in reaction against the knowledge or ideology characteristic of modernity. It is a philosophical orientation to the world that invites thought unregulated by modernist ideas of universal reason and "meta-narratives." Meta-narratives are those accounts that legitimize claims of "truth", and their significance and criticism are located in the exaltation of "universal" human reason which, according to the critical perspective of postmodernism, has been determined historically by the white, male, European elite (Slattery, 1995). In order to discover the biases imbedded in "universal reason," one must employ a process of deconstruction whereby one questions the origins of culturally "significant" attitudes and assumptions rationalized as legitimate, who benefits from them, and how such benefits reinforce or exacerbate injustices and, inevitably, conflict.

Postmodernism rejects meta-narratives because postmodernism values plurality, and historical accounts from many voices, particularly those that have been silenced because of their race, gender, class, and their opposition to white, patriarchal hegemony. Giroux (1997) argues, "against meta-narratives, which totalize historical experience by reducing its diversity to a one-dimensional, all-encompassing logic, postmodernism (Lyotard) posits a discourse of multiple horizons, the play of language games, and the terrain of micro-politics... it invokes a dialectics of indeterminacy, varied discourses of legitimation, and the politics based on the permanence of "difference" (p. 118). In this way, postmodernism is committed to social change because it exposes the asymmetry of society that legitimizes the subordination of certain groups referred to as those in the "margins", a metaphor used to acknowledge those people removed from the mainstream dynamics of power and privilege and who are relegated to marginal positions with little opportunity for political or social participation.

What postmodernism offers Social Studies educators and this study, in particular, is the possibility of social change through the inclusion of more voices in the construction of social reality.. By utilizing the processes of deconstruction entailed in postmodernism, Social Studies educators are better able to encourage and challenge students to explore methods of questioning meta-narratives that promote and legitimize societal injustices and acting to bring about a more peaceful and socially just world by giving voice to the marginalized. To do this, students will need to be able to reconceptualize ideas outside of the influence of modernist thought, especially thought revealed to suppress certain groups of people. In this way, students and educators undergo a type of emancipation that begins with the mind. "As historical agents, educators are positioned within the tension produced by modernist and postmodernist attempts to resolve the living contradiction of being both the subject and the object of meaning" (McLaren, 1997, p.

533). Students must be made aware of the arbitrary and provisional nature of the knowledges and assumptions embedded in meta-narratives such as globalization and that their experiences and efforts can provide a sense of hope for themselves and for others. The goal is to enable students to envision a future more culturally, politically, economically and socially judicial by explicitly addressing issues of power.

Critical Theory

Critical theory has also informed this study because of its focus on social injustice and the power of human agency to institute change. Not a unified theory, but rather a school of thought, "critical theory" was born in the 1920's from the "Frankfurt School", a convenient label for a tradition of thought and association of scholars, thinkers, and sometimes friends, who dared to critique exploitation and the violence brought upon them during the Nazi's rise to power. Inspired by, yet critical of Marxism and German philosophy, early proponents of critical theory, namely, Horkheimer, Adorno, Marcuse, and later Habermas, were repelled yet compelled to study the authoritarianism and inequitable power manifestations that reinforced Hitler's authority. According to Gibson (1986), "Such events... challenged their understanding of Marx (why hadn't his predictions come to pass?) and strengthened their acute feeling that oppression and injustice characterized the world" (p. 21). The Nazi's systematic violence came to represent all injustice and cruelty, and because of the Frankfurt School's critique of Nazi use and abuse of power, the men eventually had to flee to America.

Fascism became a central theme in the school's interrogation of power inequity and authoritarianism. But despite the horrors that were yet to come in Germany, the Frankfurt School surprisingly believed in people and how people could be agents of change. German philosopher,

Martin Buber, echoed this belief when he wrote: "There must exist cells, small community cells out of which alone, the great human community can be built" (quoted in Stringer 2004, p. 33).

Critical theory revolves around human agency that is catalyzed by knowledge that reveals a lack of freedom or conditioning or overt suppression manufactured and controlled by the ruling elite. Its central value is a commitment to penetrate (through critical analysis) the world of objective appearances to reveal the underlying assumptions and social relations they often conceal. It stresses critical thinking as the tenet of the struggle for self-emancipation and social change (Fay, 1980).

Praxis, or reflection and action (Freire, 1970), has become a pivotal notion in critical theoretical thinking. Critique, through reflection, is never critique alone. It is always about motivating change through the enlightenment of one's "situatedness" within the broader social and political context. Every experience, indeed every utterance, is molded by this context, and particularly for the marginalized, "this view constitutes an ideology critique which enables people to become aware of their historical and cultural conditioning and find ways to recreate their personal and social realities" (McNiff and Whitehead 2002, p. 33). This social and political consciousness, as some may call it, is a natural catalyst for change because it reveals change as a matter of personal and social interest – it is necessary for a better quality of life. In this sense, critical theory seeks to be an ideology for emancipation.

By being enabled to identify oppressive features and forces, people can learn to define themselves and imagine experience in different ways – a process of incredible importance in citizenship education. In order for students to participate in an active, democratic society as adults, they must be able to "see" things clearly, to deconstruct the functioning of society and the underlying assumptions that rationalize such functioning. This may be difficult when schools, to

a great extent, function as factories of cultural reproduction, where students are rendered passive and uncritical of the knowledge, rationalities, interpretations and activities that preoccupy nearly every moment of their school experience. In such situation, a critical theoretical approach to citizenship education is one of the most potent tools Social Studies teachers can utilize in the development of citizens who care sufficiently to build an alternate world through active political engagement. For this reason, critical theory has vastly contributed to the conceptualization of this study.

Resistance Postmodernism

Postmodernism and critical theory combine to formulate what Giroux (1983) refers to as “resistance” or “oppositional postmodernism,” the fourth theoretical construct that informs my study. Resistance postmodernism departs from “traditional” postmodernism in ways that make postmodern philosophy more accessible to educators and more relevant to peace education. Although it still rejects “meta-narratives,” resistance postmodernism does not reject all meta-narratives - only those meta-narratives that are an imposition. Based in the ideology critique entailed in critical theory, resistance is defined as the process of critique used to deconstruct assumptions of “universal” knowings that obstruct emancipation. Through critique, students resist the oppressive narratives that are characterized by binary dualisms, often creating reductive notions and simplicity of thought.

Resistance offers students the opportunity to feel empowered because there is an acknowledgement that schools, teaching practices and rules often dis-empower students. Therefore, this orientation provides for students a legitimate forum for deliberation and deconstruction of issues. This is important because social or political issues are paramount in a

resistance postmodernist approach to education, since resistance also has to do with resisting the oppressive nature of society and the power asymmetries that create structural violence toward “the Other” (usually marginalized groups with little power to participate in political or social life). Issues-based education, such as that present in the 40S Social Studies Curriculum, allows students to explicitly discuss issues, how they impinge on social justice and peace, and how students’ political efficacy can be developed to execute interventions.

The beauty of resistance postmodernism is that despite the fact that it evokes the same ideological eclecticism and inclusiveness that frustrates many critics of postmodernism, it is a theory that better complements the critical and transcendental characteristics of education for peace. It can help students to identify social and political sources and indications of injustice, in varying social, political and temporal contexts, while providing some guidance for educators who are outraged by structural inequities and keen on social reconstructionism and agentic action.

Postmodernism, critical theory, and resistance postmodernism have not only provided the theoretical frameworks for this study, they also significantly informed the analysis and interpretation of the study’s data.

Significance of the Study

This study may make significant contributions to the discourse of peace education because it illuminates how the theoretical contributions of critical theory, postmodernism, and resistance postmodernism can be explored to more fully understand peace building through conflict resolution. Practically, the study will provide Social Studies educators with insights into

how best to integrate conflict resolution knowledge and skills into the Social Studies curriculum in order to enhance students' sense of their own political efficacy to develop a culture of peace.

Summary

Chapter one has introduced the study by identifying the research problem, the purpose of the study, and the research questions. It has briefly discussed peace and conflict and the theoretical constructs of postmodernism, critical theory, and resistance postmodernism as conceptual frameworks for the study and established the significance of the study.

In the next chapter, I undertake a review of the literature pertinent to the study.

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

In this chapter I present a review of the literature that I consider as pertinent to the study. Specifically I have reviewed available literature on the following: social studies and citizenship education; configurations of social studies and notions of citizenship contained therein; the pedagogy of social studies and the hidden curriculum; the relevance of global education; global participatory citizenship through conflict resolution education; a rationale for peace education; approaches to peace education; methods for integrating conflict resolution education; and curriculum integration.

Social Studies and Citizenship Education

In many countries around the world, citizenship education is the rationale and the main purpose of the school subject Social Studies. According to Osborne, (1997) "to be a citizen is to be a member of a state, subject to its government and its laws, benefiting from its protection, enjoying what rights it confers, and fulfilling whatever duties it exacts" (p. 39). Superficial understanding of citizenship would emphasize the legal status of individuals as members of a state. In Canada, for example, social studies would strive to impart notions or values related to democratic citizenship, such as respect for democracy, civility, concern for the public good and Canadian identity. But narrowly understood legal conceptions obscure the deep, underlying values imbedded in "citizenship" and "citizenship education" that provide and provoke the inherent significance, importance and controversy of these concepts.

The reason citizenship is so contested is because it goes to the heart of what it means to be a good person and the "good life." We are motivated by what we cherish in life and naturally

we want our children to experience the best world we can create. As far back as Aristotle, people have thought about what it means to be a “good citizen.” Today, educators speak of several modes of citizenship, ranging from conservative notions of citizenship to cosmopolitan citizenship and consumer citizenship. But to whatever variety of citizenship one adheres, there is a mounting trend toward global awareness of “a less ethnocentric, less single-focused worldview” (Werner and Case, 1997, p. 176). To respond to this trend, social studies education is increasingly focusing on global issues and cultures, striving to cultivate an understanding of our new rights and duties as global citizens. However, this emphasis probably has more to do with the economy than it does with notions of multiculturalism, equality or peace in citizenship education.

The effects of globalization have had a significant impact on the reality and perception of citizenship. The preeminent global economy - a force that may be a “threat... to cultural differences in society, to traditional ways of life and to the scope for individual and collective agency,” (Held 2000, p. 13) - may be shaping current interpretations of citizenship. Ultimately, citizenship is interpreted through the lens of dominant culture and hegemonic influences; meaning that it will be based on the assumptions and values that dominate a given society. This may mean that citizenship and global education will be similarly affected. For example, citizenship curriculum initiatives that incorporate global issues and perspectives do not necessarily mean that those issues and perspectives will be taught parsimoniously. As Held (2000) points out, “global culture” is not something which draws in any even or uniform way on the vast diversity of cultures in the world, balancing or synthesizing these, but, rather, consists of the global dissemination of U.S. or Western culture – the complete opposite of diversity” (p. 41). This pattern can easily be translated into the classroom, as Noddings (2005) warns, that “some

think that there... should be – a global way of life, and it usually looks suspiciously like their own way” (p. 2).

Furthermore, scholars speculate that citizenship may eventually become extinct in a world driven by a global economy, since borders and belonging may oppose corporate interests. “In the emerging world of globalization and restructuring, in which capital is free to move where and as it chooses, regardless of national boundaries, and where economic imperatives call political structures into question, it could well be that citizenship is seen as obsolete” (Osborne, 1997, p. 62). This is not to say that in the world, society or in education, opposition to economic forces and reductive notions of citizenship is impossible. Osborne (1997) also states that “hegemony was and is a matter of resistance, negotiation, and contestation between dominant and subordinate groups” (p. 43). The possibility of change, if anything, makes dialogue and criticism about issues such as globalization, multiculturalism and citizenship a matter of high priority in social studies classrooms.

Configurations of Social Studies

The literature reveals several different configurations and practices of social studies. According to Ochoa and Engle (1988), social studies have been taught primarily in a “traditional” manner, characterized by content that is comprised of overly-simplified, de-contextualized “facts,” and by pedagogy that is oppressively expository. Ochoa and Engles (1988) have criticized this approach and pointed out that social sciences, from which social studies derives its content, are anything but a field comprised of unchallenged facts. In actuality, facts are precisely what the social sciences are not. They are only interpretations. Scholars within the social sciences continually contest historical events, the origins and the effects. Therefore,

teaching the social sciences as a set of agreed upon facts that are to be memorized for the purpose of passing a test is as dishonest as it is irresponsible. (Ochoa and Engle, 1988).

Traditionally, these “facts” are transmitted with little enlightenment about the social, economic or political contexts that might provide some value to said “facts.” Without a broader context, students are unable to understand the significance of history or social studies as a means of understanding the evolution of a country or the relevance of such events to current times. In reality, “groups and individuals bring diverse assumptions and values to events and issues, and these viewpoints often are related to particular times, places, purposes, and experiences” (Werner and Case 1997, p. 181). Without this context, students will be less likely to feel connected or responsible in any way as responsible citizens, never mind agents of change. Instead, when history, for instance, is taught as if it has nothing to do with students - as something obsolete and therefore insignificant, students become bored, resigned to the fact that they have to take the course, and they barely benefit from what social studies should offer students, that is, increased political efficacy, and the values, knowledge and skills relevant to globally responsible citizenship.

According to Engle and Ochoa (1988) there are seven configurations of social studies that describe a range of social studies pedagogies that speak to different notions of citizenship. Here, I will describe four: simple exposition, study of topics, critical study of social studies, and persistent social issues. These four of the seven configurations indicate the range of critical thinking and inquiry within social science curriculum and, in my view, best represent the main departures that distinguish between expository teaching and critical pedagogy. Beginning with social studies as “simple exposition,” teachers and pedagogy that exemplify this configuration treat social studies as a curriculum that students must memorize. This configuration of social

studies “justifies” teaching that leans on the authority of the teacher, further justifying expository teaching, and the authority of the text. Jakubowski (2001) describes this approach in this way:

Students learn to be dependent on teachers to tell them how to think, what to think and how to act in order to function effectively in society. Because these methods perpetuate unilateral relations of dependence between students and teacher (as authority figure), there is little room to question or raise opposing arguments. Empowering students with the ability to critically analyze and challenge controversial or contentious course content is simply not part of this traditional pedagogical process (p. 64).

The result of this configuration is the transmission of generalizations and unchallenged truth claims about events and the people involved. This is further problematic when there is an agenda for indoctrination that drives the selection of readings; when teachers mean to lead students to certain conclusions. According to Engles and Ochoa (1988) “the simplifying process actually works to distort the social sciences, making them say something that they did not actually say. The social sciences are not sciences if facts are withheld for whatever purpose. They are not sciences if other, possibly unpopular versions, are suppressed” (p. 93). This means that indoctrination is as profound as a result of what is taught as it is because of what is not taught.

Further problems with the “simple exposition” configuration consist of the misrepresentation of “truth” and the uncritical nature of students. It would be a rare, maybe impossible event, for social scientists to agree about a historical or current event. They may disagree about its origin, what or who escalated a particular conflict, or even when this event started. However, textbooks and simple expository teaching reinforces the illusion that history is a compilation of truth claims that are meant to be memorized. Not only is this educational experience boring for students, it reinforces student passivity by imagining their minds as nothing more than unquestioning banks of knowledge, that to some extent, absorb information

without the necessary examination of the foundational assumptions, or exploration of the fundamental issues that support and surround historical interpretation. Students who remain uncritical of assumptions or versions of “truth” are not educationally prepared to enter a future of national or global citizenship. “The weight of such teaching fosters conformity, in contrast to the questioning attitude of democratic citizens. It is healthy skepticism that keeps the democratic engine running” (Engle and Ochoa 1988, p. 94).

A slightly improved version of the simple expository configuration of social studies is a “study of topics.” This means that students are exposed to social problems. On the surface, this appears to introduce some controversy into the classroom that may engage students as well as the potential relevancy of the curriculum. However, this version is as misleading as the first, simply because the social problems under review are still treated as facts that are forever fixed. “For the most part materials are strictly topical, rather than problem oriented, being by and large narrative treatments of the topic” (Engle and Ochoa 1988, p. 98). The social, political or economic factors, as well as racial, gendered and class factors are usually removed from the context, rendering one, seemingly monumental view of selected events. However, events are usually resolved by compromises or trade-offs, meaning that educational opportunities for critical examination of decision-making or interrogation of factors and assumptions influencing events continues to go unexamined. Despite their inherent limitations, these first two configurations of social studies represent a vast amount of the social studies pedagogy currently practiced today.

A third configuration of social studies is the ‘critical study of social studies’ which means students and teachers begin to function more like social scientists, in that they begin to treat “facts” as interpretational. Investigation of history becomes hypothetical. This profound change means that students need to challenge and use “facts” rather than memorize them. The focus

becomes the reinterpretation of history, which invites the postmodern notion of competing versions of the "truth." Students become more critical and more empowered as their ability to challenge historical narratives increases.

However, critical thinking and empowerment really increase when social studies are configured as "persistent social issues," the fourth configuration of social studies. This configuration is comprised of relevant and protracted issues that use controversy and interpretation as vehicles for critical thought, creativity, problem solving, and ultimately, responsible and responsive citizenship. Since democracy presumes an educated populace, social studies that require these skills in the exploration of our world, instead of memorizing an insipid and biased world, will best prepare students for a new, more global citizenship and globalised terrain.

Despite the many benefits of these configurations of social studies, these last two configurations are difficult to find in social studies classrooms, unless the educator plans and implements their lessons with global citizenship in mind. Although global citizenship is not mentioned in Ochoa and Engle (1988) it is consistent with their final configuration of social studies because of the responsibility it places on students, as global citizens, inviting them to make connections between their reality and the reality of others, while reflecting on their role as a citizen of the world.

The Pedagogy of Social Studies and the Hidden Curriculum

Unfortunately, simplified pedagogy in the social sciences can have a negative impact on students that goes beyond incomplete knowledge. Critics of uncritical and disengaging pedagogy often speak of the hidden curriculum which this type of pedagogy teaches. The hidden

curriculum is a relevant topic to social studies curriculum because it enables the exploration of the various ways that education debunks the very ideas of citizenship, democracy, even peace. By studying aspects of the hidden curriculum, educators can understand how to counteract or eliminate the negative impact it has on students and society.

Distinguished critical and/or postmodern theorists such as Stanley Aronowitz, Henry Giroux and Peter McLaren have written about the implicit messages students receive as a result of their total educational experience. Contrary to the formal unit, lesson or topic of classroom exploration, hidden curriculum messages emerge in the rituals and behaviors demonstrated by teachers, administrators, curriculum guides and codes of conduct that contradict concepts of democracy. For instance, analyzing the educational experience of working-class students versus that of middle-class students reveals the differing expectations teachers have of students' creative ability, self-determination and academic promise. The asymmetry of access, expectation and empowerment reveals the important connection between school and society – according to Giroux (1997) “the question at the core of the radical problematic of the hidden curriculum is, how does the process of schooling function to reproduce and sustain the relationships of dominance, exploitation, and inequality between classes?” (p. 56). The alienation experienced by marginalized members of society reflects and reinforces the experience of many students.

The hidden curriculum is often blamed for what is perceived by many as an increase in student apathy, cynicism and deviance. It is believed that the mixed messages mentioned above create a climate where, more than ever, students are not finishing their homework, and they are ignoring the political world around them. What is this social and political apathy symptomatic of? “The greatest threat to children in modern liberal societies is not that they will believe in something too deeply, but that they will believe in nothing very deeply at all” (Vaughan 2001, p.

11). And if students do not believe in anything, there will be no motivation to actively participate in their academics, never mind political or social life.

The hidden curriculum that undermines much of what educators profess in social studies is also evident in, and reinforced through, curriculum documents. Social studies curriculum, like any curriculum, serves the functionalist purpose of following a reliable or stable form. This stability can be seen in the ongoing presentation of curriculum documents, where form and style are dictated by uniformity. Many teacher practitioners react to these documents with pedagogy characterized by a corresponding dictatorial need for compliance, even conformity. This conformity allows teachers to “cover” the curriculum so that students are not cheated by incomplete instruction of knowledge.

The weight of multiple curricular outcomes can crush an essential virtue of democracy – the time and opportunity to deliberate. Tragically, the hidden curriculum exemplified in curriculum documents alienates students in the power dynamics of classroom interaction, because curriculum documents invite a certain kind of teaching. The curriculum is largely content-lead and knowledge-based. This may be because, as Aronowitz and Giroux (1990) point out, “under the euphemism of “investing in our children,” major corporations are underwriting school curricula that link the teaching of basic skills with good work habits.” (p. 90). When basic skills are demanded by the marketplace, curriculum becomes an oppressively technical document in its form and managerial in its style. But because it promotes copious learning outcomes enabled by efficiency, it contradicts democratic processes.

This is the inherent problem when teachers teach, and schools operate in undemocratic ways. “Unfortunately, in many (perhaps most schools), there is a fundamental conflict between the formal or official curriculum taught through lectures, texts, and tests and the informal or

hidden curriculum taught through school norms, punishments, procedures, and norms” (Effrat 2003, p. 2). More often than not, students are passive, not active, they are pushed to conform, not participate, and schools are well known for being more like benevolent dictatorships than democracies. What then, are students really learning?

Regarding pedagogy, one significant threat to education for democracy is transmission teaching that renders students passive and compliant, which is ironic in social studies, where the formal curriculum often espouses the virtues of democratic citizenship. Massalias, Diaz, and Xanthopoulos (1996) have recognized the uniquely painful situation of hidden curriculum messages in social studies courses. They write, “social studies, more than any other subject, is full of hidden messages that are constantly conveyed to the students” (p. 391). One reason the hidden curriculum is so profound in social studies classrooms is that these classrooms, because of the curriculum content about conflicting people and ideologies, are sites of conflict, which has important implications for social studies pedagogy. Topics can provoke deep beliefs that may seem strange to others, and furthermore, students come to school with social and political beliefs of their own; beliefs that will vary depending on their culture, class, gender and ethnicity. This raises the potential for controversy. Unfortunately, this opportunity is usually missed or avoided.

Too often, teachers squash controversial deliberation out of a need for harmony or control, which means that information is laid on students, rendering them passive depositories of knowledge. According to Hahn (1998) “without attention to problematic issues, the effects of social studies instruction are limited to knowledge acquisition; influence on student attitudes and behavior is negligible... researchers have found that instruction can influence political attitudes and behaviors in a positive way when students are [encouraged] to explore and express differing views on controversial public issues” (p. 179). Controversy and deliberation are a must if

students are to develop critical thinking, an important capacity for building a culture of peace. The alternative is pedagogy that may be more supportive of compliance, subordination and war.

All curricula, and maybe every act of pedagogy, are inherently political. Freire (1970) said that teaching is always *for* something.... Teaching is either for “liberation or for domination” (p. 48). To teach social studies by evading controversy, conflict or critical thinking would require a (falsely) politically neutral stance that for education would mean stifling student perspectives and reinforcing the functional and oppressive operations of school and society. Giroux (1983) notes that “the notion that human beings produce history – including its restraints – is subsumed in a discourse that often portrays schools as prisons, factories, and administrative machines, functioning smoothly to produce the interests of domination and inequality. The result has often been modes of analysis that collapse into an arid functionalism or equally disabling pessimism” (p. 4). Unfortunately, functionalism “works.”

Some teachers consider transmission teaching more comfortable and manageable than dealing with students who are consistently critiquing and resisting ideas. This is because transmission creates a climate of compliance and the illusion of consensus. For example, the teacher might disseminate information about something, the students may write it down, and usually, it is easily swallowed and digested. Few argue, and very few challenge the information by discussing different contexts or by formulating different interpretations that may be interesting or relevant. Often, students only “regurgitate” information the teacher presents. This is not a democratic, meaningful approach to education. As Giroux (1983) asserts “rather than celebrating objectivity and consensus, teachers must place the notions of critique and conflict at the centre of the pedagogical models” (p. 63). The integration of conflict resolution, for example, would allow students to critique and deconstruct ideas while not necessarily creating an

atmosphere of conflict among other students, or between students and teachers. Rather, the infusion of conflict resolution into the social studies curriculum could create an atmosphere of democratic participation and deliberation, where student voices are validated.

The Relevance of Global Education

It is no accident that global education began in the 1950's, with a focus on content and themes such as world security, languages, world mindedness, and the study of international agreements and organizations. After the devastation of the second World War, educators found reason to teach knowledge, values and skills consistent with building peace. As Werner and Case (1997) point out, "despite an undercurrent of ethnocentrism, there was concern for a more holistic understanding of the earth" (p. 176). Eventually, global education expanded to include interrelationships, environmental education and the relationship between Northern and Southern hemispheres. But despite the importance and growth of global education, its character and application remains quite vague and inconsistent.

In its most general sense, global education embodies a state of mind. This frame of reference is characterized by ideas of interconnectedness, (national and international) multiple perspectives, diversity, caring, and the ability to generate alternatives and take action. In short, global education is education for liberation. The aim is to free students from the passive resignation that too often accompanies social studies, and to engender feelings of empowerment, while creating a broader, multifaceted and contextualized knowledge. "The impetus for broadening our worldview rests on a belief that the problems, structural relationships and emerging changes in the world ought to be represented from differing perspectives and with

greater complexity. The obligation to do so is a matter of honesty, moral responsibility, and enlightened self-interest" (Werner & Case 1997, p. 178).

Global education is meaningful when it emphasizes interconnections, meaning that historical or current events are explored by understanding the many ways these events impact and are impacted by other events. The result is often determined by the character of the relationship. For example, a teacher may want students to understand the growing gap between the rich and the poor. On a global level, this means that students need to understand how southern hemispheric countries are indebted and sometimes exploited by northern hemispheric countries. According to Werner and Case (1997) a real feature of our world is the gap between the "haves" and the "have nots" often exacerbated by exploitative dependencies that, historically, served some groups well and affected other adversely" (p. 179). Global education makes power disparities explicit. It would also encourage students to explore the ways that such a system of dominance is reinforced.

Another feature of global education is perspectivity, that is, "the individual's recognition or awareness that he or she has a view of the world that is not universally shared, that this view of the world has been and continues to be shaped by influences that often escape conscious detection, and that others have views of the world that are profoundly different from one's own" (Werner and Case 1997, p.181). The value of perspectivity can be seen in students' ability to compare perceptions of historical events in such a way that the assumptions the western countries take for granted are interrogated and critiqued. Interpretations are seen as viewpoints somewhat determined by place, experience and time, and that no one interpretation can be actually called the "truth." Seeing events through the eyes of other people or groups can

counteract the prevalence of Eurocentric views that can reinforce parochial and self serving interpretations of the past.

Looking at history or topics relevant to social studies from diverse perspectives can also highlight exploitation and discrimination evident around the world. This also brings the values and assumptions we bring to historical and current events to the fore and allows students to critique the foundational ideas that may produce biased and prejudicial attitudes and behaviors. This can be especially beneficial when teachers and students treat foreign countries or the "third world" as homogenous. "Aspects of a topic that are moderately novel, ambiguous, or conflicting often stimulate curiosity and a realization that things are more heterogeneous than any one image conveys" (Werner and Case 1997, p. 182). Treating the "third world," for example, as a heterogeneous area, where some are rich and many are poor, is not only more truthful, but it allows students to understand how it is that so many are poor, when they understand that some relationships are grounded in colonialism, dictatorship, and are still exploitative in terms of global trading systems. When students do not understand these relationships, "the way "otherness" is talked about may support a sense of our superiority or dominance, and encourage simplistic blame" (Werner and Case 1997, p. 183).

Global education also promotes action since action empowers students. This is particularly important when students study world issues that tend to focus on misery caused by any number of power asymmetries in society. As Werner and Case (1997) warns, "our failure to engage students in considering alternatives may induce a sense of hopelessness" (p. 188). When students are not offered an opportunity to act, they are left with resignation to a world that is determined by seemingly poor quality human beings who are bound to disappoint - through greed, power-hunger, and corruption. Pedagogy that incorporates some form of social

accomplishment or social action will strengthen student's perception of self- and collective efficacy, creating a small space for imagination and hope.

Global Participatory Citizenship through Conflict Resolution Education

It is my contention that social action, imagination and hope can be developed in the classroom through conflict resolution education. Because the "traditional" approach to the teaching of social studies generally doesn't promote the study of controversial topics of persistent social issues, the integration of conflict resolution into social studies curriculum can offer teachers a framework that not only complements and frames certain social studies content, but can also enable critical thinking, perspectivity, and action while enhancing student efficacy and confidence. Conflict resolution education involves a wide range of knowledges, skills and values that help students and teachers understand the complexity of events, as well as their origin, escalation and resolution, while enabling students to internalize values and skills consistent with peace. According to Smith and Fairman (2005) "high schools, therefore, can appropriately and effectively teach young people to understand, synthesize, and apply the behaviors and skills associated with tolerance, conflict management, and effective citizenship" (p. 41). These skills include: dialogue, negotiation skills for controversial topics, analysis of multiple causes of conflict, assessing interests and alternatives, inventing options, making trade offs, seeking objective criteria for decision-making, and critical thinking skills to assess the strategies that leaders and groups have used to deal with conflict.

Conflict Resolution Education, (C.R.E.) can ground social studies in social, political, economic, cultural and other dynamics that provide students the insight necessary to truly understand social issues. By situating students within historical events through an understanding

of conflict, students can see that history is a representation of a particular kind of truth; that group identities evolve, and that according to people and groups engaged in a conflict, violence sometimes *seems* to be a necessary and legitimate means to overcome oppressive structures within society. When students learn about violent events around the world in courses like World Issues, particularly when those events are treated as a series of facts, dates and names, students are unlikely to learn that violent outcomes can sometimes be avoided or that violence is never a condonable act even when there has been a violation of human rights.

Conflict Resolution Education (C.R.E.) can help remedy the problem of constantly reinforcing the same stereotypes and assumptions that are used to dominate certain groups, because C.R.E. can be used to “illustrate a general pattern of inter-group conflict escalation from the historical origins of stereotyping, prejudice, and racism, through socially discriminatory behavior and localized violence, to legalized exclusion, state-sanctioned violence, and ultimately genocide” (Smith and Fairman 2005, p. 43). High school social studies courses that focus on persistent social problems should therefore have conflict resolution knowledge and skills integrated into core curriculum.

However, integrating C.R.E. into Social Studies curriculum will mean that the paradigm of Conflict Resolution and the paradigm of Human Rights need to be clarified. Although Human Rights often focuses on needs such as equality and Conflict Resolution might focus on the needs of the people involved in a conflict, such as the need for equality, one important distinction from each paradigm does not integrate very well. The Human Rights paradigm is inherently judgmental. It focuses on who has been wronged and who is the wrongdoer. Therefore, this paradigm is legalistic in the sense that blame is assigned to one party and there is advocacy for one disputant and not the other(s). This means that “conflict professionals [would] stop focusing

on "resolution," because [they believe, that "conflict resolution"] often involves the continuation of injustice." (Burgess & Burgess 1997, <http://www.colorado.edu/conflict/transform/index.html>)

Conversely, Conflict Resolution theory approaches conflict with a paradigm characterized concepts such as "win-win," nonviolence and interdependence. Conflict Resolution theory ensures advocacy for all disputants so that the needs of everyone can be valued and communicated, regardless of who may be the "oppressor" and the "oppressed," thus enabling the discovery of a resolution to the conflict. As Muhamad (2004) writes, "Whether expressed by relatively free individuals or by victims of oppression, ignorance acts as a door jam against the welcome mat of peace" (<http://www.apeace maker.net/journey.html>). This means that educators wishing to integrate Conflict Resolution into Social Studies curriculum might encourage dialogue that recognizes the importance of Human Rights, but their main emphasis is not to exercise judgment and assign blame, but rather to demonstrate that protracted conflicts or persistent social problems are complex, multilayered and are invariably defined to some degree by the perceptions and needs of the people who, for the sake of peace, must have those perceptions and needs addressed. Therefore, Social Studies courses that are organized around persistent social issues will provide the best opportunity to integrate this new rationality.

World Issues 40S, a university-entrance course in Manitoba, is one example of a course that can be a vehicle for social improvement by developing pro-social attitudes among students (as long as the content and pedagogy continue to inspire students rather than communicating a depressing inevitability). The curriculum's potential is mainly due to its organization around issues. Since "issues are, by definition, about conflict and thus embody the central question of politics, they can usually be made relevant to contemporary affairs and to students' own

concerns; they embody controversy and argument and thus encourage a style of teaching which allows students to pursue their own opinions and arguments" (Osborne 1993, p. 127).

In the larger context, controversy through critical pedagogy helps students counteract dominant values and ideas that reinforce the status quo by allowing students to engage in activities that are counter hegemonic. Visano and Jakubowski (2002) assert, "if we see hegemony as a system that organizes consent, we have the choice of reorganizing or disorganizing that consensus" (p. 32). Providing students the opportunity to reframe old assumptions is like freeing a mind. As Marino (1997) stated, "re-framing occurs when problems or experiences are represented in ways that both retain the realities of existing political relationships and transcend them by opening up new (for those involved) and real opportunities for acting on the inequities of those relationships... [It] requires both teachers and students to co-construct new and useful frames on their experiences – ones that mobilize and empower them" (p. 108-109).

Empowerment may be reflected in students' enthusiasm for debate in the classroom. Students generally enjoy debating world issues, even if not all students speak, probably because deliberation becomes a natural outcome as students seek to express their social and political selves. Hence, learning and memory are improved because pedagogy supports "reflexive thinking and learning, [where] people learn as they think, and think best when confronted with problems that are real and relevant, and that pose meaningful questions" (Dewey 1916, pp. 3-16). Continual deliberation is critical for the pursuits of participation, equality, and membership, all of which are central to the notions of citizenship, democracy and peace. Therefore, social studies courses that are organized around issues may be the best site for a new rationality for peace,

because issues and controversy can offer an oppositional narrative to the traditional method of teaching and understanding history.

The World Issues 40S course for example, could create a global consciousness about inequities of power that often result in violence, raising the consciousness necessary for students to make better informed decisions as responsible citizens. As Visano and Jakobowski (2002) state, "through a constant unveiling of reality, education invites students to develop a critical awareness of their social worlds. It promotes both consciousness-raising and societal intervention" (p. 33). Conflict resolution and World Issues 40S make power asymmetries explicit; by illustrating the political systems that suppress various peoples, causing conflicts. The integration of these two subjects; is sometimes accidental, since one complements the other so consistently.

Research and theory about the hidden curriculum is also relevant to the integration of conflict resolution into social studies curriculum because conflict resolution knowledge and skills can help students counteract the mixed messages they receive about citizenship, participation and membership, thereby equipping them with the cognitive and affective tools necessary for dealing with conflict in their lives, including those that occur in school, while respecting the positions of "others." Teachers who use ideas and skills central to C.R.E. can help students "engage in social criticism of all forms of hegemony including the authority of the knowledge and value orientations taught in school" (Clark and Case 1997, p. 22). Therefore, students can understand international and inter-group conflicts as well as a better understanding of conflict and conflict management in their own lives.

Controversy in the classroom and critical pedagogy in general can help empower students so that they do not become passive and vulnerable objects of the state. The hidden curriculum

and the “traditional” styles of teaching both inhibit students and deliver the ultimate message that the system of governance is more valuable and more powerful than they will ever be. And this thinking is directly in line with corporate interests, especially in these times of globalization and speculation about global citizenship. “Within this orientation, the culture of corporate interests and collegial complicity have diverted attention away from authentic voices and action. The pedagogies associated with protected professionalism and lucrative consultation have ushered in a new “banking” system. The liberal talk of consent, common sense, citizenship and community also fails to liberate [students] from the disciplinary cadence of corporate capital” (Visano and Jakubowski 2002, p. 135). If curriculum developers and others who have influence on curriculum must make the global market its number one priority, then educators must engage students in critically challenging ways so that citizenship does involve intelligent, critically aware people, who have a sense of social justice and interdependency as well as a commitment to peace.

This will require a commitment to peacemaking, since peace is not merely a destination or end point; it is a process, one of on-going dialogue, conflict and negotiation. Students must become aware that they have the ability to make powerful differences in the lives of others, and are probably doing so without even knowing it. Reflecting on oneself as a peacemaker means that students take “some responsibility for – and making a contribution to – what the approaches to international conflict will be. It means adopting an activist stance and participating in foreign affairs, by thinking hard about what is wrong with the world as we see it, how it might look if it were better, and what specific steps we could take to improve what we see” (Fisher, Scheider, Borgwardt, and Ganson 1996, p. 17). Therefore, teachers who ask students to reflect on the various ways they think, behave and feel that are consistent with peacemaking will better enable

students to cross over from consciousness about conflict and inequity, to action geared toward resolving or at least diminishing or managing conflict.

A Rationale for Peace and Peace Education

Conflict is an evitable part of life; it permeates human activity from the individual level to conflict at the international level. No matter what the level of conflict may be - conflict is a permanent feature of the human condition, one that rationalizes an emphasis in education. Particularly in a multicultural country such as Canada, there is a greater need for tolerance or acceptance of "difference." This difference means that in a pluralistic society, people not only look differently, they see the world and express their opinions differently. This has implications for society and for schooling. As Banks (2002) writes, "everyone is likely to find some viewpoints distasteful. So what do we do when we find a perspective that is abhorrent to us?" (p. 116). In this context, schools are definitely a site for potentially increased conflict. So teachers and students must learn to appreciate difference. But without the benefit of conflict resolution knowledge and skills in education, people are left uncritical of their own worldviews, not accepting of others', and are therefore, more vulnerable to the war culture of Western society.

Western culture also provides a rationale for integrating conflict resolution into social studies. In Western cultures conflict is almost always associated with negative concepts, such as "war," "fight," "duel," "violence," "brawl," and so on. And violence is a common response. This is evident when we see children, for example, who learn from a very young age that violence is a feasible response through media, perhaps some family or peer group interactions, and/or a whole host of other situations in their lives. People learn that violence is not only a response to conflict, it is possibly the most effective and even most legitimate response to conflict. As Boulding

(2000) points out, “a statement by a former surgeon general, Dr. Jocelyn Elders, on children’s exposure to violence points out that, on average, children spend more time in front of the television screen than at school... [and that] exposure to television violence can contribute to aggressive attitudes and behaviors, to desensitization to real-world violence, and to increased fear in viewers” (p. 217). The media teaches children that violence is a legitimate response to conflict. Maybe violent behavior is the only response to conflict that children are being actively taught.

Some of the most powerful institutions in our culture (media and education) sustain supportive and reductive notions of violence, conflict and conflict resolution. The media sends repeated messages of violence and conflict and sells it as information and entertainment. For many young people, violence is exciting. But nearly all media representations of conflict and conflict resolution are fabrications because the “television conveys to the public an oversimplistic, over dramatized, shallow and often one sided image of occurrences in the political and social world around them” (Ichilov 1998, p. 7). When people are inundated with this “information,” there is little hope that individuals will face conflict in reality in a reasonable and just way.

Even education inadvertently reinforces this social construction of violence. In history classes in particular, textbooks and curriculum documents focus on our militaristic culture emphasizing wars and battles, winners and losers, the powerful and the marginalized, all as glorified and demonized characters in the story of human history. For example, Bretherton, Weston and Zbar (Curriculum Corporation, <http://www.curriculum.edu.au/projects/peace>) write that “militaristic attitudes, the build-up of weapons, the glorification of heroic conquests in history and the use of enemy images or de-humanizing stereotypes in text may provide fertile

ground for even greater conflict in the future” (p. 2). For these reasons, schools must develop a counter-narrative in the minds of children that challenges the assumptions and values that drive violent behavior, no matter what situation the child is in. But first, we must understand conflict.

According to Fisher et al, (2000) conflict can be defined as “a relationship between two or more parties (individuals or groups) who have, or think they have, incompatible goals” (p. 4). Many conflict resolution analysts and conflict theorists focus on this intrapersonal or interpersonal view of conflict, as well as how individuals experience conflict as in issues of guilt, for example, or how different individuals conflict with each other, whether because they possess differing values, dissenting world-views or seemingly incompatible and competitive needs for limited resources. This incompatibility may fuel an escalation of conflict that may have negative consequences for some or all disputants involved. This is especially true when society creates conflict because of the context of unjust and inequitable structural dimensions.

It is of paramount importance that one understands that conflict is part of human experience and that individuals live within social systems that breed conflict. The rationale for looking at conflict from an overarching societal view is to identify and appreciate the impact of injustice and inequity and try to imagine system that do not oppress. Duke (1996) states:

Conflict arises along different axes such as race, class, gender, and sexual orientation. Identity boundaries are established by group differences with the institutionalization of norms and values. Conflictual relationships derive from political, economic, and social divisions, which serve as the basis of power differentials. The ethics of caring and empathetic relationships are ignored in a competitive pursuit of interests. Institutions of modernity supported by capitalism, liberal democratic norms, industrialization, and scientific advances have contributed to the creation of homogeneous patterns of life, but have not reduced cultural and economic heterogeneity (p. 83).

Although structural dimensions in society can have a profound force, this is not to say that humans are bound by these social and political structures and that there is no opportunity for human agency. For instance, the imbalance of power and recognition in certain situations may help produce conflict among people, but it might also promote much needed evolution. "Conflict of any kind, whether interpersonal or international, often arises over the distribution or sharing of limited resources. This is true for siblings fighting over a toy and for nations fighting over oil fields or fishing rights" (Hargraves 1999, p. 111). This is precisely why conflict is sometimes warranted and desirable. For example, conflict is not always about people exercising their will - sometimes it is about people communicating their needs.

By integrating conflict resolution knowledge and skills into social studies curriculum, students will understand why structural inequalities often precede violence and revolution that are perceived (particularly by oppressed groups) to be the only way to transcend the oppressive elements of the status quo. In a Human Rights unit for instance, the student belief that "people have gone mad" or the question, "how can people let this happen?" can be better counteracted by understanding that unjust social, political and economic, when combined with other factors, can catalyze conflict of this magnitude. Therefore, students will know that not all harmful and deadly conflict is inevitable.

In cases of conflict where there is extreme need, students would learn that conflict can be positive in the sense that people may take the opportunity to communicate their need. Imagine Nelson Mandela from South Africa fighting against the apartheid and being sentenced to life in prison. Why would he and his followers risk their lives if they did not have an extreme need for freedom? Would he have taken the same path if political, social and economic structures of oppression were not so pervasive? This conflict in South Africa is an example of how conflict

may be necessary in illustrating the unmet needs of those people within a society. By integrating conflict resolution into social studies, students will understand the positions and interests disputing groups have that sometimes motivate their involvement in conflict.

If students know the role that need plays in conflict, then world issues in general will become something they can care about, because students will begin to feel that peace is possible. But first, students must possess the knowledge and skills necessary to personally negotiate and manage conflict in ways that are constructive rather than destructive. By integrating conflict resolution into social studies curriculum, students will be engaged by positive and empowering philosophical and practical information, (such as the significance of concepts such as identity, power, recognition and oppression) geared toward their emancipation (political efficacy) as critically-minded, responsible citizens. Hargraves (1999) argues that "in doing so, [CRE] counteracts the unintended curriculum which inadvertently accompanies much of the teaching and learning in schools that suggests it is enough to know about an issue and it is not necessary to do something about it..." She suggests that teachers can "help students begin to take steps toward active citizenship and to apply the knowledge and understandings gained through their academic study by engaging them in action-oriented activities" (p. 119). This is one of the main purposes of peace education.

The inevitability of conflict in life should make the management and resolution of conflict a priority in our educational institutions. Instead, students are usually left to deal with conflict on their own, sometimes in very destructive ways that harm others and themselves. Furthermore, as high school students begin to consider their lives as active, democratic citizens, they should have some idea about injustice in the world, and how they can participate socially and politically without marginalizing certain groups. This is why the "substantive dimension

within peace education focuses mainly on knowledge about the root causes and elimination of violence in its various forms” (Hargraves 1999, p. 111). The contribution of conflict theory to my study is that it illustrates the need for understanding conflict theory and the ways people are socially vulnerable, hence, creating a consciousness that supports hope and agency. As Bretherton, Weston and Zbar (Curriculum Corporation, <http://www.curriculum.edu.au/projects/peace>) point out;

More recent initiatives by the UN have stressed the idea of a culture of peace. The idea of culture introduces the notion of shared meanings and values, and diversity between different peoples of the world. It also creates a space for thinking of peace not just as the province of politicians and soldiers by also of ordinary people.... The ideas of a culture of peace moves beyond the dualism of inner and outer peace by stressing the inner meaning that is inherent in the experience of and active agency upon outer events (p. 2).

Approaches to Peace Education

In order to cultivate peace through the integration of conflict resolution into social studies curriculum, one must first understand what the abstraction “peace” means and how peace education has been approached. Peace is a concept that is extremely difficult to define for many reasons. First, most educated people agree that it is more than just the absence of war, because conflict can exist without the use of physical or verbal violence. Furthermore, conflict sometimes arises because of the perception of injustice. Scholars have argued that peace is in the creation of a more just world, since the social pressures of structural violence create a climate of psychological, and possibly, overt conflict (Hargraves 1999, p. 111). In addition, assuming one wants to resolve this conflict, “if the processes or outcomes of a conflict are perceived to be unjust, the resolution of a conflict is likely to be unstable and give rise to further conflict” (Deutsche & Coleman 2000, p. 52). In addition, who is to say what is “just?” There are no easy

answers. Finally, different people from different cultures have different concepts of peace, conflict and justice, so defining what it is that needs to change, assuming one could change it, would be a matter of conflicting cultural interpretations.

But for now, “peace” as defined by Joel Kovel, is “a state of existence where neither the overt violence of war nor the covert violence of unjust systems is used as an instrument for extending the interests of a particular nation or group. It is a world where basic human needs are met, and in which justice can be obtained and conflict resolved through nonviolent processes and human and material resources are shared for the benefit of all people” in (Harris and Morrison 2003, p. 121). This definition is valuable because it is a reflection of what is called positive peace, which also addresses elements of structural violence as an opportunity to make positive changes in society by creating social justice. The idea of structural violence comes from Galtung, and is significant because “positive peace would entail the absence of militarism and also the absence of... the inequalities and exclusions buried in social institutions” (Bretherton, Weston & Zbar Curriculum Corporation <http://www.curriculum.edu.au/projects/peace>, p. 2) This push for transformation means that conflict is not only inevitable, it is desirable as means for social reconstruction.

Historically, curriculum innovators such as George Counts have linked peace and social reconstruction, particularly since 1945. Counts believed that education played a role in educating young people for the purposes of social change, by showing students that they could be agents of change. In his book, Dare the School Build a New Social Order? (1932) Counts asserted that “[education] must face squarely and courageously every social issue, come to grips with life in all of its stark reality, establish an organic relation with the community, develop a realistic and comprehensive theory of welfare, fashion a compelling and challenging vision of human

destiny" (p. 189). Counts believed that education must help young people envision a world of peace and justice, even when there are clearly many threats to peace and justice. Hence, social reconstructionism provides a foundation for the integration of conflict resolution into the social studies curriculum. This purpose and goal for education was also echoed by UNESCO, founded after World War II, in the hopes that war, and war culture as a state of mind, could be unlearned or at least challenged by an education for peace.

"Peace education" is used as a generic term to encompass the various educational approaches to peace because peace education is conceived of, and practiced differently around the world, under many titles. Conceptions of peace education include broad and narrow definitions as well as different components such as human rights education, environmental education and conflict resolution education. This diverse understanding of peace education is positive because as postmodernists have argued, there is no single, universal concept of peace. The way a specific injustice should be rectified will be perceived differently by different people. And each of their perspectives is as valid as their specific experience of oppression is real. It might seem that a postmodern resolution to conflict is impossible. But the commonality throughout the spectrum of voices is their "cries for justice [that] challenge the authority and legitimacy of governing elites" (Harris and Morrison 1997, p. 20). Postmodern justice is practiced outside of traditional politics and "justice," because, usually, that "justice" is used to maintain the status quo for the privileged and the few.

As each focus and component of peace education emphasizes different sets of ideas, values, and skills, it is necessary to explore a variety of peace education approaches in order to understand the unique character of conflict resolution as a means for peace. Hargraves (1999) writes that when different components of peace education, such as human rights education or

environmental education, are taught as if they are distinct areas of study, separable and isolated from other components, peace education has a narrow focus. "At the narrow focus, peace education is concentrated on themes such as conflict resolution, community building and violence prevention" (p. 111). However, it is my belief that if various components of peace education can be blended, peace education becomes more consistent with the aims of social studies education and applicable to all kinds of educational objectives, goals and evaluative strategies.

Conflict resolution, on the contrary, is often misconceived as more of a harmonizing technique – neither disputant wins or loses too much but each does their share of both. This may be because of a particular interpretation of conflict as a contest. Thus, if the relationship between disputants is transformed at all, it becomes one of tolerance, or perhaps mutual compromise. This narrow approach to C.R.E. is safer and has therefore garnered more support for its implementation. However, in reality, conflict resolution can be controversial as well, since it actually seeks to meet the needs of all people involved in a dispute by advocating for everyone, and thereby bringing about a "win-win" situation where all disputants have their needs met and are satisfied with the outcome and are willing to take the necessary steps to sustain it. "It's not necessarily our first choice, but it's one we can all live with. It makes us feel like all parties are winners" (Lantieri and Janet 1996, p. 65). Sometimes, neutral third parties, mediators, will step out of their neutrality and advocate for one particular group that is particularly oppressed. This happens when one group does not, for one reason or another, have a balance of power with the other group, and will likely be unable to negotiate their needs, a priority in the negotiation of a sustainable peace.

Approaches to peace education have also included human rights education, environmental education and C.R.E. Human rights education diverges from peace education in its dominant emphasis on human rights. This may seem obvious, but what it really means is that the experiences of the exploited and marginalized are the focus. Often injustices that are explored are created through the deliberate violation of citizen rights. Human rights educators believe that citizens of the world, whether or not their governments acknowledge it or not, should at least live with a minimal standard of living, meaning that basic sustenance, safety and opportunity should be available to them regardless of any conflict situation. If people's minimal requirements are not met, conflict ensues. For example, the "abuse of rights, and the struggle to eliminate that abuse, lies at the heart of many violent conflicts" (Harris and Morrison 2003, p. 67). Although human rights education is understood and practiced in different ways as well, the basic purpose of human rights education is to preserve human dignity by challenging notions of the "enemy."

Environmental education, on the other hand, focuses on the preservation of the earth which supplies us with much valued resources that may not be sustainable as long as people continue to destroy, neglect and mismanage these resources. The survival of the human race is dependent on this earth, so environmental educators focus on the interdependence of living things and the paramount importance of "an ecological world outlook that contains basic ecological knowledge, develops strong personal convictions about protecting natural resources, and provides dynamic experiences conserving natural resources" (Harris and Morrison 2003, p. 69). Because resources are not infinite, and are therefore the frequent origin of conflicts, the challenge of this kind of peace education is to help the young learn to proceed in a world of non-

stop technological advances in ways promoting sustainable development, thereby safeguarding their individual and collective future(s).

Peace education has also been perceived as controversial, particularly in the United States, largely because of the transformative element demanding that structural violence and injustice be eliminated. One component of peace education, for example, could be feminist pedagogy. As Briskin (1994) explains;

Feminist pedagogy names the personal as political: the individual experience as a social and political reality. By definition, it challenges the ideology of individualism which suggests that we are each able to shape our lives through individual will and determination, and that any failure is due to personal inadequacy or laziness. In contrast, the feminist identification of the social and political character of gender underscores the structural and ideological barriers that face women, and helps turn them from guilt – an inward and individualistic focus – to anger – an outward and societal focus – and from the standpoint of victim to that of agent (p. 33).

However, any form of critical pedagogy would be threatening to the elite, and those who may benefit in some ways from the oppression of certain groups, and who may not want marginalized groups to become more empowered and active. Betty Reardon, for instance, believes that “peace education also seeks to transform the present human condition by...changing social structures and patterns of thought that have created it” (Harris and Morrison 2003, p. 9).

Among all these approaches to peace education, I chose C.R.E. as an approach to peace education for my study because conflict resolution practiced as positive peace helps students identify the root causes of conflict and to encourage peaceful methods and conduct in conflict situations. In this way, conflict resolution approaches peace in practical and philosophical terms. The purpose of conflict resolution as a method of peace education is to help students negotiate

personal conflicts in a nonviolent or just manner, while encouraging students to be peacemakers; it is also to connect with “others,” as portrayed in the multicultural aspects of conflict resolution methods and content. C.R.E. also requires a cooperative classroom climate where students learn communication skills, conflict management and resolution strategies, emotional awareness and control, as well as problem solving skills. The aim should be to transform conflict situations, otherwise, students will not believe it is anything other than another means to control them. Conflict resolution as peace education that does not focus student’s attention to structural inequality would reduce peace education to the study of an idealistic [read: unattainable] abstraction.

Since students learn to manage conflict and create peace, conflict resolution may come to be termed “conflict transformation” because of the potential for students and teachers to change conflict situations simply through awareness and more informed action, making conflict a matter of restorative justice. “The goal is not to eliminate conflict, but to understand its potential for growth and transformation, both for individuals and also for communities” (Harris and Morrison 2003, p. 74). Interrogating the societal forces that breed conflict also enables students to make more informed decisions as they exercise their democratic citizenry. Even the skills most often associated with conflict resolution, such as effective listening and communication, critical thinking, asserting feelings and many more, help students to live more peacefully in their homes, at work, in their community and in the world. This is of course, consistent with more sophisticated configurations and issue-based forms of social studies pedagogy.

By juxtaposing different approaches to peace education, it becomes evident that conflict resolution as a means to peace has the potential to be more effective because it includes perspectives of human rights education, environmental education, and critical pedagogy.

Furthermore, conflict resolution can be transformational as students learn how to competently manage conflict at this stage of their life while understanding conflicts on the national and international stage.

Integrating Conflict Resolution

For the purposes of this literature review and my study, the integration of conflict resolution in education will mean “teaching encounters that draw out from people their desires for peace and provide them with nonviolent alternatives for managing conflicts, as well as the skills for critical analysis of the structural arrangements that legitimize and produce injustice and inequality” (Harris and Morrison 2003, p.78). Harris combines intellectual capacity, critical thinking, with conflict resolution skills, enabling teachers and students to consider both the dominating structural elements in society and the individual’s power to choose non-violence and build peace. Here, conflict resolution is peace education, because, among other things, it is an effort to envision and work toward a sustainable future.

Many advocates for integrating conflict resolution into school curriculum or programming often look to early year’s education as the ideal context. Since violence is a learned response, educators see reason to counteract the violent influence society has on students as a form of early intervention. For example, “Second Step,” a narrowly-focused violence prevention program implemented in Jefferson County Public Schools, consists of a two week, 30-lesson curriculum in non-violence and pro-social behaviors. Students were taught about impulse control, anger management, empathy and problem solving strategies to name a few. After this instruction, students were “rated by behavioral observers to be less physically aggressive and to

engage in more neutral/positive behaviors on the playgrounds and in the lunchroom (but not in the classroom) than students in the control group” (Munoz 2002, p 12).

It would be impossible to state emphatically why children’s behavior did not improve within the context of the classroom. But one could make an educated guess. Students act out in the classroom for a variety of reasons, one being that the attention they receive due to “bad” behavior is a kind of reward; condemnations, punishments, cautionary remarks – they all pay infamous tribute to misbehaving students. “Merely focusing on reducing these negative behaviors puts a lot of emphasis on a small group of youth, perhaps differentially reinforcing their negative behavior, and ignores the large majority of students who are doing well” (Munoz 2002, p. 20). So the question becomes, how do peace educators teach in a manner that rewards and motivates students exhibiting peaceful behavior? Conflict resolution studies that are closely connected to peace education stress the importance of a cooperative classroom where the teacher is not the all-knowing expert in the class. Peace education makes the power differentials between teachers and students explicitly political, thereby explaining some of the misbehavior evident in class, and the necessity for a student-centered and liberating pedagogy.

Another approach to conflict resolution education has been made in many middle schools in the southeast United States where educators have integrated conflict resolution programs as a response to growing violence amongst teenagers. Researchers Daunic, Smith, Robinson, Miller and Landry, (2000) have examined the impact of this integration over a three year period, which consisted of a conflict resolution curriculum and a group of trained student mediators who led disputants in discussion, and facilitated a process where by disputants eventually signed agreement forms identifying the mode of resolution they agreed upon. On the surface, this approach was “successful” since “a resolution acceptable to the disputing parties was reached

more than 95% of the time, with students most frequently resolving to avoid each other, to stop the offending behavior, or to “agree to get along” (p. 96).

The issues evident in these kinds of claims can be seen by examining the theoretical orientation used to support these efforts and the kind of disputes that are referred to mediation. First, the theoretical orientation used as the foundation of Daunic et al’s study is rooted in “developmental and social psychological theory” (Daunic et al 2000, p. 95). Since these programs are implemented in middle schools, it seems fitting to apply a theory that represents the unique developmental period of their life. But, developmental theories do not address the larger social forces that nurture conflict, such as racism, sexism and poverty. In my opinion, without the foundation of critical theory, conflicts will continue. Second, larger conflicts among students, such as bullying and fighting, are not reported for mediation. This is why the success rate for this program is so high, only disputes of minimal magnitude, thus optimal potential for resolution, are reported. This is not real conflict resolution, only another administrative arm for minor behavioral control.

There have also been efforts to integrate conflict resolution and peace and education in high schools as well. In a final evaluative report, Powers and Price-Johnson (2002), described a curriculum innovation “Teens in Action: In Pursuit of Peace Curriculum,” that was implemented in Arizona in Chandler High School, among other sites, such as a summer camp. 94 students in total, grades 6-12 were interviewed and surveyed about their experience in the delinquency prevention program. The “results showed that after participating in the program the youth expressed themselves with more concrete and realistic terms when they described ways to resolve conflict between two people [and] they were able to generate more ideas for promoting peace and peaceful attitudes” (p. 3).

However, the post-survey findings concerning student responses to concepts of fighting, violence and peace are reflective of some of the crucial controversies in peace education. The feedback from students was, for example, "peace is good," "violence is wrong," and "get along with everyone." The problem lies in the lack of insight in these responses, and that these responses seem to satisfy the writers so much so that they recommend the program. To the layperson, the student feedback may not be revolutionary, but it does fall within society's set of pre-scripted behaviors and attitudes. But that might be a problem. In my opinion, because peace education is often criticized for countering war culture indoctrination with another kind of indoctrination people often discourage its implementation. Since the high school student responses to questions about violence and conflict are so elementary, this conflict resolution or delinquency prevention program appears to have taken the critical and personal thought out of the experience of conflict resolution. It will become increasingly difficult to rationalize conflict resolution or peace education if implementation is planned and research continues to be conducted in this manner.

Nonetheless, conflict resolution studies in education can be implemented effectively when the implementation or integration is supported by theory and research. "Despite the abundance of school-based conflict training programs, most are not linked to conflict resolution theory and research" (Stevahn et al 2002, p. 306). Stand alone programs are simply not as effective as integrated efforts because stand alone programs are perceived to interfere with core curriculum and are not taken as seriously by students. Therefore, if conflict resolution is to be taught in schools, it will need to be integrated. This way, conflict resolution acts like a conceptual framework for the "conflicts inherent in social studies, [therefore] students essentially climb into the hearts and minds of historical (or modern) figures by examining their underlying

interests, identifying their emotions, reversing perspectives, better understand alternative viewpoints, and thinking both divergently and convergently to invent and agree on solutions that maximize joint outcomes” (Stevahn et al 2002, p. 327). This means that not only do students learn about conflict resolution, or that conflict resolution can aid in the learning and memory of core social studies curriculum, it can also emancipate students by enabling them to imagine different outcomes (political efficacy) and envisioning a different future (peace).

One example that exemplifies a thoughtful integration of conflict resolution into social studies curriculum is from the Consensus Building Institute, (C.B.I.) in Massachusetts. Scholars from different fields, such as political science and philosophy, as well as education, have planned a ‘workable peace framework’ (<http://www.workablepeace.org>) that utilizes their expertise for the purpose of increasing student ability to analyze conflict in a way that makes students active as well as knowledgeable. This is particularly evident in the role play activities provided.

The emphasis on role play activities comes from the belief that role play activities have a unique way of making course content more “real” to students. These activities require students to take on the perspective and role of people involved in conflict, to better understand the perceptions of dissenting groups and to reflect on a particular conflict’s escalation and how it may have been stopped. “Role-play is a type of learning by doing that allows participants an opportunity to develop direct experience with the content and skills being taught by taking on the personality and background of an individual or group and interacting with others in the context of a specific situation. Role play provides an opportunity for learners to internalize concepts, principles, and ideas through lived experience and reflection, leading to changes in behaviors and actions” (Smith and Fairman 2005, p. 47). These role play activities enable students to engage in conflict analysis, internalize multiple perspectives, and practice conflict resolution and civic

skills, making the goals of such C.R.E. consistent with social studies curriculum and citizenship and peace education.

Curriculum Integration

There are different ways of integrating content issues and skills into curriculum. Banks (1994) identifies four approaches to how teachers have perceived and implemented curriculum integration. These are the additive approach the contributions approach, the transformative approach, and the social action approach.

The additive approach has characterized many attempts at C.R.E. where conflict resolution skills have been integrated with content, for example, through the use of cooperative learning strategies, active listening and negotiation skills (skills relevant to C.R.E.) as a way of implementing social studies curriculum. The skills of conflict resolution are literally added to social studies curriculum without renewing the structural logic of the curriculum.

A transformation approach would be more preferable, as it “changes the canon, paradigms, and basic assumptions of the curriculum and enables students to view concepts, issues, themes, and problems from different perspectives and points of view” (Banks 1994, p. 26). This integrated approach involves lessons, activities, evaluation and instruction that would reinforce the general purpose of conflict resolution and peace. In this way, students receive fewer mixed or hidden messages, and it can “teach students to think critically and to develop the skills to formulate, document, and justify their conclusions and generalizations... [and] to know, to care, and to act in ways that will develop and foster a democratic and just society in which all groups experience cultural democracy and cultural empowerment” (Banks 1994, p. 26-27).

The social action approach to integration extends the breadth of the transformation approach by incorporating action oriented activities that allow students “to take personal, social, and civic actions related to the concepts, problems, and issues they have studied” (Banks 1994, p. 27). This approach creates more opportunities for students to learn, especially since it requires more research, more collaboration, more dialogue and more reflection. Again, the workable peace framework from the C.B.I. would fit this description. However, teacher preparation will also impact the quality of integrating C.R.E.

In order for the integration of conflict resolution into social studies curriculum to be effective, integration will “rest on the ability of teachers to integrate [it] into academic units in ways that increase academic achievement” (Stevahn et al 2002, p, 309). For social studies teachers, particularly World Issues teachers, this will not be too difficult a task; if curriculum provides guidelines for the key conflict resolution concepts and skills. Since teachers of World Issues 40S are (usually) familiar with the topics listed below, integration of conflict resolution knowledge and skills as peace education will be seen as a natural expansion of core curricular content, learning outcomes and assessment opportunities. Regarding content, Betty Reardon (2000), recommends an integrated plan as follows;

Peace (Concepts, Models, Processes)
 Conflict, Conflict Management, Conflict Resolution, War, Weapons
 Cooperation and Interdependence
 Nonviolence (Concepts, Practices, Cases)
 Global Community, Multicultural Understanding, Comparative Systems
 World Order, Global Institutions, Peacekeeping (Methods, Models, and Cases),
 Alternative Security Systems
 Human Rights, Social Justice, Economic Justice, Political Freedom
 Social Responsibility, Citizenship, Stewardship, Social and Political Movements
 Ecological Balance, Global Environment, World Resources (p. 3)

Conflict resolution as peace education emphasizes both the cognitive and affective domains, because there is a substantial attitude shift when students begin to see themselves as

globally responsible citizens, capable of managing conflict and making socially and politically judicial decisions. "The attitudes sought are those frequently cited and widely accepted as educational goals, expressed in such language as competence, empowerment, efficacy, fairness, nonjudgmentalism, inquiry, open-mindedness, responsibility – in short, the attitudes of a committed and competent learner and a responsible citizen" (Reardon 2000, p. 81). Hence, students would be assessed on their ability to learn the cognitive dimensions of interdependence, for example, as well as their ability to appreciate the value of that point of view. For example, when students are studying situations where conflict involves civil war, violence, death and human rights violations, students will realize that multicultural understanding is very important in eliminating or reducing conflict. Students with "cross cultural capacity... seek to transcend cultural prejudice and stereotypes" (Reardon 2000, p. 82). Although attitude change is not enough change to establish a more peaceful world, it is one of the first steps toward social change. This, again, is why students in social studies courses must learn about the structural elements in society that oppress.

Because conflict resolution involves knowledge and skills, for both the cognitive and affective domains, an alternative assessment strategy can be employed in addition to traditional pen-and-paper tests, classroom observations and assignments. Anecdotal records "reduce the incidence of distorted or unreliable assessment through observations [and they] contain essential information about the students and, if needed, a recommendation by the teacher for improvement" (Reardon 2000, p. 198). These records assist the teacher's overall assessment of peace education initiatives such as conflict resolution because the records allow for cognitive and affective observations of students, thus enabling teachers in their instructional planning and

strategy. Social studies pedagogy will be further discussed within the context of postmodern and critical theories.

The review of conflict resolution studies in early, middle and senior years in schools in the United States illustrates the need for theory and research to support integration of conflict resolution into social studies curriculum. Conflict resolution is more successful when it is infused with core curriculum in a way that emphasizes connections and relationships in previously separated knowledge. Technically, this is achieved by integrating conflict resolution at various levels of social studies curriculum, for example, outcomes and assessment.

The specific method of integration I used in this study is called infusion, meaning that “teachers and students are introduced to a set of fundamental concepts that are highlighted and exploited by raising relevant questions within the context of existing curricula” (Reardon 2000, p. 4). Infusion is based largely on the idea that all knowledge is interconnected, therefore unified. Although curriculum can plan to infuse concepts such as conflict resolution and social studies, integration is really what happens in the student’s mind, as a result of perceived relationships within different information and an increased capacity for transference of knowledge. Therefore, I used the method of infusion to integration CRE materials and activities into the existing unit on the Middle East conflict.

I chose this method of integration because this kind of integration has received more support in postmodern times since it acknowledges the life-worlds of individuals. Ornstein and Hunkins (1998) assert that postmodernism “[advances] the idea that knowledge is not separated from its reality, that people cannot really disconnect themselves from their inquiry, and that the curriculum really cannot exist as separate bits” (p. 241). In theory, knowledge cannot be disintegrated, but in reality, curriculum developers can attempt to integrate mutually inclusive or

complementary curricula. High school social studies courses would support a broader and more multi-disciplinary approach to C.R.E.

Summary

Chapter two has reviewed representative literature that may be considered relevant to this study. This includes literature on social studies and citizenship education, the pedagogy of social studies, and the hidden curriculum, global education, C.R.E. as a way of increasing participatory citizenship, peace education, approaches to peace education, and methods for integrating C.R.E.

In Chapter 3, I discuss my research methods and research context, the creation of the data sources and data collection and analysis methods.

CHAPTER THREE

Research Methodology

As conveyed in chapter one, the purpose of this study was to explore the potential of integrating conflict resolution concepts and skills into the World Issues 40S curriculum for increasing student's political efficacy and confidence to build a culture of peace. In this chapter, I discuss the research methodology, research context and techniques used for data gathering and analysis.

This was a qualitative study in which the ethnographic method, more precisely critical ethnography, was utilized. Ethnography allowed me to observe the research participants in their own context and to understand their views and perceptions of their own political efficacy to develop a culture of peace through conflict resolution education. Traditional ethnography has undergone a shift in postmodern times, which illustrates the resiliency of ethnography as a research method, but also as a research method that bridges the gap between theory and practice. Mainly because of the influence of critical theory, or more precisely praxis, traditional ethnography has metamorphosed into critical ethnography which, according to Stephen Brown and Sidney Dobrin (2004), "is discovering new sties for praxis, occupying new theoretical topoi, developing new signifying practices, articulating a new ethnographic subject, redefining its goals, reinventing its methodologies, and revising its assumptions in what constitutes a radical ontological and epistemological transformation" (p.1-2). Praxis, as a process of action and reflection, has been more sharply focused on the social, political and class factors that impact participation perceptions of "reality," while politicizing the goals of this kind of research. Critical ethnography, unlike more traditional ethnographic approaches, seeks to transform knowledge and society.

Traditional ethnography is not necessarily political; it's only a phenomenological approach to research that focuses on how people perceive their world and/or how they understand people's behavior. In other words, perception is reality. Handwerker (2001) writes, "ethnography, as I use the word, consists of the process and products of research that document what people know, feel, and do in a way that situates those phenomena at specific times in the history of individuals lives, including pertinent global events and processes" (p. 7). The idea of situation, or what some critical theorists in general may call "situatedness" relates well with critical theory, particularly postmodernism. People's behavior is, to a certain extent, determined by their social, political, gender, national, and class situation, or what postmodernists would call "positionality". Brown and Dorbin take the traditional ethnographic notions of context and situation and politicize them by making explicit the transformational possibilities of ethnographic research.

Traditional ethnography sees reality as a social construction that is created and sustained in a given culture. It can be said that what is real is what groups of people think is real. Our collective interpretations and understandings mold our ability to make meaning of events and engage in action. Therefore, ethnographic research contextualizes, interprets and understands reality through the eyes of participants. But critical ethnographers would say that this is not enough, particularly in cases where injustice is apparent. Denzin (2003) reiterates this commitment when he asserts that ethnographers should "contribute to radical social change, [and] economic justice" (p. 3). Here the shift away from mere understanding of a reality moves toward social transformation. So not only is the naturalistic foundation and purpose of the research politicized, so is the role of the researcher. And this is the attraction of critical ethnography for my study.

Critical ethnography also suits my study because a more socially- and politically-minded ethnography will better allow me to “see myself not as an intruder, but as a historically located social subject with specific interests and desires politically and personally engaging in a dialogue about our struggles” (Chapman, 2003 p. 147). Because the topic is “Creating a Culture of Peace,” I consider myself to be a factor in the study, not just as an interpreter, but as a kind of social force.

The specific data collection methods I used within the critical ethnographic approach were classroom observations, interviews and journals. Before discussing these methods, however, I will describe the research context and how the data source was created.

Research Context

As stated earlier, the context of this study was a Social Studies World Issues classroom at a large senior years school with a diverse student population in Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada. Winnipeg has a metropolitan population of about 800,000 people, and is the capital city of the province.

Within the World Issues 40S curriculum, there is a unit on Human Rights, where I integrated conflict resolution concepts/skills and assessed the impact of this integration on students’ perceptions of their own efficacy to contribute to peace building through conflict resolution. Specifically, I documented the changes, if any, in student perceptions’ of themselves – their hope, confidence, their social participation as peacemakers.

The teacher and I met and discussed how I would interact and observe the students in class as well as the integration of conflict resolution in his human rights unit, focusing on conflicts in the Middle East and Africa. This unit lasted a minimum of 20 classes. I started

attending the class from the beginning of the semester in February. I identified myself as a researcher, briefly explained what I was trying to do and as time progressed I helped students relax any feelings of intimidation and to “reduce my visibility.” As an ethnographer, I wanted to become a part of the environment and extended contact time best allowed for that.

Creating the Data Source

Prior to the teaching of the human rights unit, I collaborated with the teacher to plan and create assignments, activities, and projects that integrated ideas of conflict and conflict resolution into the unit. The teacher was primarily teaching students about conflicts in the Middle East. Thus, I recommended certain well established and well practiced conflict resolution ideas and skills that can complement any world issues where conflict is the central theme. The following is a list of examples of the specific knowledge and skills integrated:

Knowledge

What is conflict?

Types of Conflict

Sources of Conflict

Sources of inter-group or inter-ethnic conflict

Types of conflict resolution

What is peace, justice and peacemaking?

Skills

Managing personal conflicts

Critical and creative thinking

Mapping conflicts

Communication

Appropriate assertiveness

Peacemaking

How Conflict Resolution Knowledge and Skills were Integrated

Drawing on Kanu's (2005) work on the integration of Aboriginal perspectives into high school curriculum, the integration of conflict resolution was planned and implemented on five

levels: student learning outcomes, learning resources, teaching methods/strategies, assessment of student learning, and as a philosophical underpinning of the curriculum unit (that is, the teacher's belief in the efficacy of conflict resolution as a means to peace). Since the teacher was knowledgeable of conflict resolution and highly supportive of integrating it into his unit about the Middle East conflict, his attitude supported the aims of the study, rather than interfere with it. Therefore, I will focus mainly the first four levels of integration.

Student Learning Outcomes

Specific learning outcomes for each lesson of the human rights unit included aspects of conflict resolution education all of the conflict resolution knowledge and skills listed above. These examples represent some of the key ideas and skills required to understand conflict resolution and peacemaking, and student learning outcomes focused on student understanding of these skills and concepts. For example, understanding what conflict is, how it can be analyzed for root causes, how people can communicate and negotiate, and how justice is involved in building peace, how individuals can 'make a difference' as agents of social change and peacemakers, are all key ideas and skills. Weekly journal topics reinforced the learning outcomes by requiring students to reflect on whether and how the conflict resolution activities and assignments implemented in class contributed to the development of their political efficacy as peacemakers.

Learning Resources

I reviewed the teaching materials provided by the teacher concerning conflicts in the Middle East (the teacher decided that there was not enough time to explore both the Middle East and Africa). To integrate CRE into his Middle East unit, I looked for historical, social and

political events that could serve as examples of conflict that would allow students to trace the root causes. This helped students develop a better understanding of the contexts of these conflicts, thus reinforcing core curricular learning objectives. Various print material and other teaching resources on conflict resolution (e.g., videos and presentations) were integrated into the human rights unit. For example, the video “The Color of Fear” was used because it provides students the luxury of watching a conflict unfold. “The Color of Fear” features men of differing ethnic origins talking, and sometimes screaming, about racism. It uncovers important issues such as ethnicity, violence against minority peoples, fear, colonialism and white privilege it is a controversial and relevant resource that enabled students to better understand different perspectives on racism while increasing their ability to engage in intellectual and emotional discussion. Although the video took about two days to watch, it became a focus throughout the unit – one on which students could draw on in many discussions about conflict in the Middle East.

Another crucial learning resource came from “workablepeace.com.” This website contains the ‘Workable Peace Framework’ which is an excellent learning tool that can aid teachers who want to encourage students to think about the steps toward both war and peace and who want to help students understand conflicts through the eyes of those involved in the conflict. The framework is easily adapted to a conflict of choice. In this case, students were able to “see” the Middle East conflict through the perceptions of Israelis and Palestinians by working collaboratively (students organized themselves into groups) to explore the beliefs, emotions, and identities involved within each group. For example, students are asked to think about what beliefs are important to Palestinians and Israelis, beliefs they have about themselves and those they have about the “Other.” Therefore, the activity is also excellent for enabling discussions

about “Us and Them” mentality or the concept of “enemy.” The framework is a valuable activity for C.R.E. because it is essentially a sophisticated “mapping” exercise aimed at interrogating the perceptions of both groups without falling into the trap of blaming one side or the other. This was particularly helpful since it preceded a dramatic role play activity.

The teacher also arranged for presenters to address the class. One presentation, for example, was made by two young people from the Middle East who conveyed a hope for peace. They talked about their country; the people, the cities, the similarities and differences to Canada. They also talked about the Israeli – Palestinian conflict and challenged pre-conceived notions by saying that most Israelis and Palestinians want peace. Toward the end of their presentation they allowed students to ask questions. Although many students reserved questions for the teacher on the following day, such as ‘Why didn’t they have a Palestinian person here?’ students were touched by their youth and their stance on peace. This presentation helped students see the Middle East and the conflict from a different point of view, perhaps one less biased and pessimistic than some accounts.

The purpose of these resources was to provide an intellectual framework that both supported the learning outcomes previously stated by the teacher and counteracted the hopelessness among students which can occur after prolonged study of human rights violations.

Instructional Methods/Strategies

Lesson implementation involved a purposeful attempt for full student participation. A variety of instructional methods involving conflict resolution skills was employed, including, simulation and role-play, cooperative group activities, self-reflection in journals, class discussion, brainstorming and individual work assignments.

One highly innovative teaching strategy was a role play simulation called 'The Global Exchange Game.' It was led by a group of university students who organized the game in the school's gym. The purpose of the 'game' is to provide students a global and interdependent vision of the world, and various world issues, as they evolve into the year 2035. It is comprised of a huge map that students can stand on in their respective countries. Some students were world leaders, others represented transnational corporations, others represented units of population. However, all were in the 'business' of sustaining their country's resources, managing environmental concerns and natural disasters, negotiating trade and adapting to the changing industry of agriculture. Every 50 minutes there was a census, to see where the countries were in terms of these issues. The game lasted for almost three hours. It was followed by a short debriefing period.

Another customized activity that was created, for example, was inspired by "workablepeace.com" to help students better understand inter-group conflict, in this case, in the Middle East. The activity asks students to understand the conflict from the point of view of Palestinians and Israelis (what they believe about themselves and what they believe about the Other). The activity was set up as a chart, where students could fill in responses to how Palestinians and Israelis perceived their (and the Other's) perceptions about interests, beliefs, emotions and identities.

This activity is similar to other activities where students are compelled to "map" the many sources of contention within a particular conflict. However, the workable peace activity provides the added benefit of understanding the views and emotions of disputing groups, which makes resolution to the conflict slightly more imaginable. Students worked in small groups to complete this activity and provided feedback which was recorded on the overhead and discussed

among students and the teacher. This inter-group conflict assignment was particularly helpful in preparing students for a role play activity.

In order for students to effectively complete the workable peace assignment, they needed to employ certain knowledge and skills. Previously, students had learned about conflict and types of conflict through self-reflection activities meant to link conflict theory with a particular conflict in their life. These conflicts were shared and students provided insight into the root causes of the conflict and the needs of the people and/or groups involved in the conflict. To help students make links between “smaller” more personal conflicts and international conflicts, the teacher provided examples that students could discuss. For example, I asked them why people fight about the toilet seat being left up. Students are able to imagine many reasons (interests) people have when in conflict when students are presented with the opportunity to discuss examples in class.

Many of the activities students participated in required the skills consistent with C.R.E., such as how to manage personal conflicts, mapping conflicts, communication and peacemaking. Collaborative activities enhanced student ability to work together toward a goal, in particular was the role play which concluded with the signing of a “peace treaty.” Integration of CRE also required students to think about communication and what people are really saying, or in other words, what people really want. This distinction was made using resources and discussion about positions versus interests. I used various examples of conflicts and people’s reactions to the conflicts to help students express the difference. When students learned to focus on what people really need, rather than on their position, they thought conflict resolution was more possible.

Finally, peacemaking is both knowledge and skill, and is required in a balanced approach to C.R.E.. By focusing on the aspects of conflict resolution, students respond with a more

hopeful stance. First, we had to discuss what a peacemaker was – I then asked students to brainstorm in pairs before providing examples to the class. Then I recorded their responses on the overhead while we discussed each item on the list. Then I asked students to individually list the ways they act, think and feel like a peacemaker. This required me to provide examples of each, since students had not been asked to do this before. In time, students were able to add characteristics or behaviors to their list, so long as they did not have to share it with the class. Students discovered that being a peacemaker required knowledge and skills, all of which are relevant to conflict resolution.

Another activity created by the teacher was a role play that featured students as representatives of the United Nations, The United States, the European Union, the media, the Palestinians, the Arab League and the Israelis. Each group was responsible for participating in a negotiation revolving around issues of land, security and humanitarian aid. Prior to this role play activity, students researched (some better than others) their respective positions on these issues in the library. Drawing from information delivered in class and information researched individually, students challenged one another in a role play that lasted the duration of the class. The negotiation was facilitated by the teacher, who determined the topics of dispute and who mediated the discussion without steering the students towards any particular conclusion. Each group was invited to comment, express their opinions and stance toward all the issues presented. Many students did an excellent job by taking on the perspective of the group they represented and seemed to feel the desperation or frustration of those groups, allowing them to better appreciate the complexity and multi-layered dimension of the Middle East conflict.

Evaluation Strategies

Assessment of student learning mainly occurred through students' journals, where students reflected on the predominant themes of conflict, conflict resolution and peacemaking. Classroom activities such as the role play and inter-group conflict group activity provided the chance to observe and assess students' interactions and development of understanding. Written work was not evaluated since the teacher seemed reluctant to collect additional assignments and since I was not able to assess student assignments because of an issue of conflict of interest.

Data Collection Methods

Data collection methods consisted of classroom observations, student interviews and student journals.

Classroom Observations

Between the months of April and June 2005, when the unit was taught, I carried out thirty classroom observations and took down field notes in the Senior 4 Social Studies classroom. The purpose of the observations was to document the classroom interactions and teaching processes (for example, discussions between the teacher and students) as the integrated unit was implemented. Specifically, I recorded student comments, attitudes and interactions that related to conflict, whether personal, national or international, conflict resolution, hope for non-violent conflict resolution, perceptions of agency or political efficacy, attitudes toward specific conflicts, such as the Middle East conflict, and peace and peacemaking. In other words, field notes were confined to the research questions. However, I also recorded student attendance, particularly when many students were missing.

I also recorded teacher activity. I noted the instructional technique employed at the time, the content being presented or reviewed, and the type of assessment used, if any. Data from these field notes provided some of the material for interviews with the students at the end of the unit.

Student Interviews

There were two 45-minute tape-recorded interviews with the 24 students (23 in the posttest round of interviews) who agreed to participate in the study. The first interview occurred before the implementation of the integrated unit and it probed students' prior understandings and views about peace and how they perceived their own capacity to act as agents for developing a culture of peace. The second interview re-visited these initial questions as well as including other questions arising from my field notes. The purpose of this second interview was to document any changes that may have occurred in students' initial views and understandings about developing a culture of peace and their capacity for acting to build a peaceful and more just society. Interviews were transcribed verbatim and shared with students for accuracy before being analyzed as data, and the tapes were destroyed.

Students' Journals

Students were asked to maintain journals where they recorded their reactions and feelings about particular classroom activities and assignments as these related to developing students' capacity for developing their political efficacy for peace building and bringing about social change. Students were asked to reflect on prompts such as: 'Can you have peace without justice?' This prompt followed discussions about the film "The Color of Fear," and issues of racism, white privilege and inter-group conflict. Another prompt was, 'Explain from a societal view, how a specific injustice produces an atmosphere of conflict. Which group(s) is

marginalized by this conflict?' This prompt followed class discussion about different levels of conflict, such as conflict between or among individuals and conflict within, between, or among groups. And 'Was the Global Exchange game an effective learning activity? What was it about this activity that helped you learn what you learned?' This prompt came the day following the simulation activity and was followed by some class discussion aimed at student reactions to the activity. No more than two journal entries were required from each student per week. The journals were collected at the end of the Human Rights unit and were returned to the teacher June 30th, for return to the students.

Data Analysis Methods

Collected data from the classroom observations, interviews and journals were examined through the extensive process of reading and re-reading notes and transcripts to identify evidence of how the integration of conflict resolution affected students' understandings of peace, conflict resolution, perceptions of their own political efficacy and the influence of instruction on these perceptions. Student responses to interview questions, journal prompts and instruction were compared to responses before the integration of conflict resolution education and examined for evidence of an increased sense of political efficacy or lack thereof. Generally, data were analyzed with the research questions in mind. Specifically, patterns pertaining to hopefulness, lack of hope, difference, the practice of critique, perspectivity, the politics of assimilation and agency were identified throughout the data. A coding system was established which employed a color scheme that represented the different patterns mentioned above. After these themes were color coded within the data, each theme was interrogated separately through critical reflection upon theoretical readings.

Using theory to assist data analysis and interpretation

Analysis of data was grounded in theory. Therefore, I used the theories of resistance postmodernism, postmodernism, critical theory and conflict resolution to help me interpret the various words, sentences, phrases, symbols, metaphors, ideological stances, or any other significant ideas (alone or in combination) in what students communicated to me, whether they be in vivo codes or sociological constructs. The following concepts from postmodernism, resistance postmodernism and critical theory informed my analysis and interpretation of data.

Challenging "History"

Since history is a social construction, dependent upon shared agreement and the interpretation of the dominant culture in question, challenging history would mean that students understand this and therefore challenge history by analyzing the pertinent class struggles of that particular historical period and the social and political context. In other words, students would challenge the meta-narrative of history and contest that "history."

Practice of Critique

I looked for evidence that students were able to deconstruct social norms and assumptions set down by an almost non-critiqued rationality. Critique is the mental process of opposition or resistance. Critique means that students would critically deconstruct the hegemonic ideas of our culture, particularly ideas that reinforce injustice.

Perspectives of "Others"

Evidence may be seen that students have generated a growing understanding of the experience of marginalized groups and individuals and that when it comes to different racial,

gendered, and class backgrounds, there are commonalities of experience in terms of oppression and liberation. Finally, students will realize that listening to the voices of “Others” is important in the development of peace and justice.

Politics of Assimilation

Assimilation means that individuals, to a significant extent, absorb the current cultural ideas and norms as their own. This category showed to what extent students have been assimilated into white patriarchal privilege and see if they can eventually break away from those standards. Student views that reflect war culture of the politics of dominance were analyzed.

Appreciation of Difference

Student attitudes toward the “Other” will be analyzed according to postmodernist theory on difference and multiculturalism. Specifically, I looked for views of “Other” that implicitly sought assimilation from diverse groups, or responses that indicated fear of others or a desire to ignore difference.

Hope

Generally, I analyzed data for instances of hope in the pretest and posttest data. In this context, hope refers to the extent to which students believe that peace is possible. I looked for any context that appeared to increase hope among students.

Bleak Outlooks (Lack of Hope)

Conversely, I analyzed data for instances of when students expressed an intense lack of hope. In these cases, I tried to understand why there is this lack of hope, based on other ideas expressed by students about peace and conflict.

Interdependence

Since the idea of interdependence is a key concept in peace studies, I decided to look for instances where students mentioned it as part of their conception of peace.

Research Timeline

The study began on April 4th, 2005 and finished on June 1st of the same year. In March, 2005, the teacher and I collaborated on the integration of conflict resolution, and I observed classes. When the human rights unit began in April, I administered my initial interviews among the students after which my classroom observations began. By early June, I was finished my post-observations and interviews.

Summary

Chapter three has described the processes of this ethnographic study of a World Issues 40S class at a Winnipeg high school. I have discussed critical ethnography as a research methodology for my study and I have briefly described how conflict resolution was integrated into the human rights and Middle East units of the 40S social studies curriculum. I have indicated that data gathering was facilitated through interviews, analysis of journals written by students, and classroom observations. Finally, there was a description of the methods for analyzing data for significant patterns and contradictions, and some categories that informed data analysis were discussed that are based on resistance postmodernism.

In chapter 4, I present and discuss the data and the study's findings. Pseudonyms are used to disguise the identities of students. The pseudonyms are: Muriel, Matt, Mark, Ruth, Grant,

Betty, Ken, Margie, George, Maurine, Kathy, Gordon, Tim, Luke, Millie, Dorothy, Keith, Brad,
Lisa, Marla, Terry, Stephan, Mary, Wanda, Dad, and Amy.

CHAPTER FOUR

Findings and Discussions

The themes discussed below are, as stated in Chapter Three, informed by ideas presented in peace and conflict studies, postmodernism, resistance postmodernism and critical theory. These themes were derived from the data and are centered on the impact of conflict resolution knowledge and skills as a way of developing political efficacy and agency within students, (Research questions # 1 and 4) as well as the critical elements of instruction that allowed these developments among and within students to occur (Research questions # 3 and 5). Discussion of these themes will inform the overarching question of whether and how the integration of C.R.E. into social studies curriculum can develop a culture of peace.

The pretest interviews, early journal entries, and early field notes conveyed disturbing trends among students as they pertained to conflict and peace. First, very few students had even remotely sophisticated notions of conflict or peace. Mainly, student ideas of conflict and peace were elementary and clichéd. Second, many students had a bleak outlook of the future (peace), as well as a low regard and expectation of human beings, particularly in conflict situations. Third, students tended to underestimate their political efficacy and agency. Fourth, students “understand” conflict by assigning blame to people’s ‘differences.’ I will discuss common trends among students, and briefly reflect on how these views either threaten or enhance citizenship, democracy and the potential for peace itself.

Theme One: Student Conceptions of “Peace”

Before discussing student notions of peace, it should be restated that any definitive notion of what peace is, or how it could be characterized, remains uncertain and a highly controversial

topic. That said, student responses from the pretest interviews, field notes, and journal entries revealed very little reflection on what peace is, what it might look like, and/or how it is created. A disturbing majority of the students associated the following ideas with peace: happiness, getting along, 'the hands around the world' symbol, no fighting, no bombs, no wars, calm colors, quiet or serenity, the peace symbol, people smiling, being carefree, people holding hands, good times and angels and babies.

For example, (Maurine) said "Everybody friends... happy people." (Dorothy) said, "Happiness." (Luke) said, for example, "No more fighting." (Mark) commented that peace was "Calm... people smiling." (Margie) said, "No violence, no drama, no chaos, happiness, joyful, everything is alright, no problems, no conflict, nothing." More examples were, "Totally clear, no clouds, like a neutral color..." (Gordon). "Everyone's happy about the country, the rules they live with it. No wars." (Grant) "No war, without many conflicts, don't live in fear, that's it" (Terry) "Facial expressions, smiling, calm, peacefulness, human emotions" (Betty). "Everybody getting along, no wars..." (Marla). (Muriel) said, "Almost like serenity, quiet, and actually able to live without being afraid and scared." (Millie) said, "No fighting. That's pretty much it. You don't have to like each other, as long as you're not fighting." (Keith) said, "That picture of the world where everyone's holding hands around the horizon." (Matt) said, "Everyone getting along." (Wanda) said, "When people are coexisting, everybody's getting along, no wars, just everyone getting along for the most part" (Tim) said, for example, "holding hands, that symbol around the world, that's it." (Lisa) also said, "People happy together, holding hands..." (Ken) said, "Peace sign. That picture of the world of everyone holding hands..." (Amy) said, "I don't know, angels and babies, because their innocent and they're the people who can change the world later. Sunny days are peaceful..." (Kathy) said, "Peace would be no fighting, people

getting along..." (Wanda) said, "Happiness, freedom, more easy going carefree society, being nice to one another less conflict..." (Brad) said, "People living together, walking down the street without being scared, resolving conflict, no wars." According to these widespread misconceptions, peace is reduced to at best a cliché, and at worst, a joke. According to many students, peace becomes a happy dream for children who don't know any better, who haven't been exposed to the "truth" about people and how they really live.

Only five students commented on peace as in the presence of freedom, equality, respect for differences, safety, an ability to make your own choices, getting a job, going to school or resolution of conflict. For example, (Ruth) said, "I think everyone being able to accept others and looking at other people's perspectives on things. (Muriel) said, "Coexistence between different nationalities, different countries. Even if there's arguing but as long as there's no war. If there's no war there's peace." (George) said, "A big thing would be like the Tsunami that just happened. The countries and people sending money, helping sending force..." (Stephan) said, "Everyone has to have their arguments. But peace is being able to negotiate your arguments in a civilized manner." (Mary) said, "I define peace as everybody happy with where they live and not suffering and dieing for what's going on in another country. Millions of people live in the states and they live much higher than the people in Afghanistan..."

These ideas of peace reflect a wide majority of views among people who characterize peace as inactive. The underlying assumption in this belief is that peace is something that one finds; a kind of end point or destination. In other words, it lies outside humans' ability to create it for themselves - if one experiences some brief moments of peace, they are lucky. The problem with this external perception of peace is that it makes peacemaking, peace-building, or as Boulding (2000) describes; "peaceableness" unthinkable. Peaceableness denies the "stereotyped

notions of peace as a dull, unchanging end state. A static image of peace, as reflecting human inactivity, is dramatically opposed to the characterization of peace as process, of peace-building as adventure, exploration, and willingness to venture into the unknown” (Boulding 2000, p. 1). But because peace is not traditionally taught in social studies classrooms, pacifism is so often confused with passivism, thereby promoting visions of peace that are uninviting, boring, not to mention dishonest and harmful.

When social studies courses focus mainly on war, and not peace or nonviolent responses to conflict, students internalize this stereotyped “peace” that neatly erases any motivation for socially responsive agency, because it implicitly means that people cannot make a difference, and that the best strategy for survival in this world is to exceed at conformity and adherence to hegemonic ideas, warrior culture, and economic competition. Boulding (2000) explains, “the fact that historians overwhelmingly focus on the history of violence and war accounts for the widespread ignorance about nonviolence as an effective survival strategy” (p. 3).

Stereotyped peace further denies the reality of violence and nonviolence. Although there has been a proliferation of weapons, including those of mass destruction, there is also evidence that people have a capacity for peace and non-violence. People can be socialized through family, friends, and certainly the media, and to greater and lesser extents we are some how both peaceful and nonviolent as a result. As Boulding (2000) states, “Among humans, there is clearly a capacity for both cooperative and violent behavior, and children are socialized from infancy into behavioral sequences that either tend to be cooperative or tend to be violent or – not infrequently – represent some combination of cooperation and violence” (p. 4). Human beings, in other words, are capable of nonviolent conflict resolution, and have been doing so throughout time and in places around the world. Yet again, many of us are almost completely unaware of this fact.

For example, when students were asked to identify a success story where people somewhere, at some time, were working together for peace, the majority of them could not name any. The comments were usually something, for example, like; "I don't know... I haven't heard of any..." (Terry). Those three students who could name a success story were clearly students who are actively involved in extra-curricular activities that are involved in community development work. One student, for example, responded with, "parents needed to work, donation from people, they now have a daycare and provide them with food and education, and that creates peace" (Betty). Some students talked about personal friends and somewhat private matters, where friends were able to resolve an issue to some extent. Five students named the end of the Second World War as a 'success story.' "Well, I don't know... after World War II, people were tired of fighting. I know there's still fighting in Europe, I think fighting ceased somewhat after that" (Muriel). These students acknowledged that it wasn't exactly "peace" afterwards, but that it was better than before. Among these students, some talked about topics related to the end of slavery, for similar reasons. "People are more happy" (Wanda). This pattern is important because it will be difficult to transform war culture if people have little reason to believe, and therefore, work for peace. As Hinchey (2004) points out, "Every educator must decide whether to endorse the prevailing vision or to work for change" (p.115). Ignorance of nonviolent and successful peace stories reinforces war culture, an aspect of the politics of domination, in other ways.

Stereotyped "peace" also denies the negative influences of inequality, as well as the interplay between conflict on individual, societal, national and international levels. In this climate hegemonic warrior culture thrives. Boulding (2000) describes warrior culture as society's prevalent beliefs in domination and subordination. These beliefs come largely from history or

social studies classrooms and the media, two arguably powerful knowledge reproducing (or transforming) institutions. "Groups characterized by power struggles, patterns of domination of the strong over the weak, of men over women, by frequent physical violence and constant competition, and seeing nature as something to be conquered can be thought of as warrior cultures" (Boulding 2000, p. 2). This culture can be seen in many of the student responses to questions of conflict and peace, that, to the students, explains either their absence from socially constructive activities, or as an explanation for why they do/did not believe in peace.

For example, "Everyone is making weapons to kill each other." (Dorothy) "Some things seem hopeless..." (Amy). And "even [if] they make peace with one country [they will] just go and stomp on another country for no reason" (Keith). "No. One thing leads to another. In the future there won't be enough water for example, that will be the next thing to fight about, or too much population, not enough land. Conflicts are never ending, as we mess up the world more and more" (Luke). These perceptions mirror a warrior culture that has been built. This is not to say that war is unimportant. However, it is the perception of life that repeated stories of war produces that is of concern. As these student responses convey, the victims of war are not always the people at war. In the case of traditional social studies education, the victims are anyone who believes in this nihilistic inevitability. As Giroux (1983) asserts, "What is needed is a notion of alienation that points to the way in which un-freedom reproduces itself in the psyche of human beings. We need to understand how dominating ideologies limit the development of many-sided needs to particular groups..." (p. 106). Unfortunately, the more people give up hope, the more "pure" the warrior culture may become.

Also, students did not refer to the interconnection of peace at home, in a country and on the international scene. As far as students are concerned, this interconnection does not exist.

When asked about how one may help reduce conflict in a place that is far away, students often replied with negative passivism. For example; "I think they should let them just battle it up themselves" (Dorothy). "I guess you can't" (Mark). "I'm not sure what people can do" (Terry). "There's really nothing you can do. Higher people can try, like the government" (Marla). (Millie) said, "You can't do anything. Just let it go. It will die down eventually." (Tim) said, "I'm not sure" (Dad) said, "I don't think you could do anything. I can see a president do something" (Mary) explained that, "You don't experience what those people experience, you don't live there, so why worry about what goes on over there?" "I don't know" (Brad). "What can you do? I don't know" (Matt).

These ideas are unfortunate because interdependence is an important aspect of a vision for peace and global citizenship. It is a worldview that establishes the connectivity and responsibility each has to "the other." As Brantmerier (2003) has stated:

Peace educators need to further embrace the concepts of interdependence and unity that already exist in fields like deep ecology... Exported Gandhi can manifest in thematic units in classrooms that center around ideas of interdependence and unity of all spheres of life: economic, social, political, cultural, and environmental. The fragmented reality we experience that is in part shaped by the structural arrangements of a highly complex world must be put back together, we must see the unity of all life. With this Gandhian vision of the "essential way of life," the power and truth of nonviolence flow naturally because violence against the "other" will be understood as violence against the "self" (p. 18).

Brantmerier's postmodernist account of peace sounds more hopeful, mainly because it embraces a positive, non-impositional "meta-narrative," that of interdependence. Without a strong sense of interdependence, students are at a loss to think of ways to connect or to help others who live far away.

Some students talked about giving money, such as donations to a particular relief organization, or taking it upon oneself to learn about the problem. "We send money, but that's not enough" (Betty) "You can start by learning about what's going on, knowing not just caring. If they have knowledge then anything is possible. Maybe they'll go over there and promote peace" (Muriel). (Keith) "That's hard. I don't know if it's even possible. You can send letters, gift packages, and when it gets there it might warm the heart of one person." (Wanda) said, "That's kinda hard. People could... they could... send money..." (Muriel) explained, "I guess you could be a teacher and one out of a thousand kids you teach becomes one of those people who goes over there to try to help." (Amy) said, "You could write letters, I don't know." (Grant) explained, "Can learn about it, try to find ways to make peace over there. Send ambassadors to talk and try to help them with it." (Gordon) said, "Well, with world issues, making students aware, just making people aware of it makes people thinking about how can we help and get others to help, and next thing you know there's relief funds and peacekeeping missions." These examples of interconnectivity were weak. Students who talked about various forms of aid really had little idea of how it would help and barely believed it would help. However, the idea of aid soothes the student's conscience because something is being done, while absolving them of personal responsibility. In a way, it provides students with an excuse to not do their "homework."

Another reason that interconnectivity is important is that peace can begin when people understand the relationships between levels of conflict, such as the connection between their community and the international community. As Rees (2003) shows us, "the struggle to attain peace with justice begins with reflection on the nature of peace in any contest, from relation with family and friends to responsibilities as a neighbor and citizen" (p. 23). Implicitly, Rees is also

saying that responsible agency could be encouraged with a sense of interconnectivity that illustrates to people that 'your problem is my problem.'

The student's elementary notions are a result of a politics of dominance within a culture that generally glorifies and reinforces war ideologies. Within the politics of dominance, there is little room for success stories of nonviolence. To critical theorists and postmodernists, success stories might be described as "counter-narratives [that] are quintessentially "little stories" – the stories of those individuals and group's whole knowledges and histories have been marginalized, excluded, subjugated or forgotten in the telling of official narratives" (Peters and Lankshear 1996, p. 2). This view illustrates that postmodernists are not only concerned with meta-narratives, but any "story" that imposes a point of view. Here, the "official" narrative is the warrior rendition of history. Counter-narratives have been supported by postmodernists and critical theorists because of their potential for freeing a mind; for inviting opposing and therefore emancipated thought and action. Therefore, employing counter-narratives in education is inherently political. This endeavor seeks to rectify power imbalances in society by enabling students to think outside the profoundly powerful influence of hegemony by envisioning new possibilities. "Counter-narratives in this sense serve the strategic political function of splintering and disturbing grand stories which gain their legitimacy from foundational myths concerning the origins and development of an unbroken history..." (Peters and Lankshear 1996, p. 2). These ideas are also present in Boulding's (2000) work.

To Boulding, success stories mean "[changing] the image of human history as the record of war, by documenting [and teaching] the far more ubiquitous activities of everyday problem solving and conflict resolution at every level – from local communities to interstate relations – but also to demonstrate how often such behavior created effective alternatives to military action" (p.

26). Therefore, peace education becomes a counter-narrative, because it challenges “official” records of violence, conquistadors and war. When asked about “success stories” (stories of people working at and succeeding at nonviolence and peace) most students could not find an answer. A few offered guesses that were hardly success stories, such as; the end of World War One, or the division of Korea into North and South. Students sometimes qualified these responses by admitting that these examples may not be examples of peace per se, but at least “it’s better than other places. The poverty isn’t as bad” (Kathy). Or, as one student expounded, “when the atomic bomb dropped, that like, look at us, we’re kind of powerful, it (resistance) has to stop” (George). (Mary) said, “I think with the whole Palestinian... people are more happy.... They still have prejudice... I think a lot of people have to live with that.” These students, particularly the last two responses to “success stories of peace,” illustrate a problem; that without the counter-narrative of success stories for peace, “human beings [can be] static role-bearers, carriers of predefined meanings, agents of hegemonic ideologies, [that are] inscribed in their psyche like irremovable scars” (Giroux 1983, p. 83). Research indicated similar “scars” in responses to questions about conflict.

Theme Two: Notions of Conflict

Overall, students’ notions of people in conflict can be best described as bleak. When asked to reflect on conflict among people and conflict within society, students routinely expressed a dire expectation of human beings to live and fight for their own greed, ambition and power, even if it comes at the expense of others. This view was, according to 12 students, relevant to many of the interview questions, as well as some of the journal topics assigned in class. Some responses that reflected this view were, for example: (when asked about how people

create conflict) “People being people – this is how I want it and I’m not moving. That’s my decision, my view, and that’s how it’s going to stay. They don’t have an open mind...” (Maurine). “I think people are very greedy and power hungry. There’s always that fight to be number one, to be at the top” (Mary). “When they want things that they shouldn’t, they shouldn’t want more” (Kathy). Time and again, conflict was attributed to the baser instincts of “bad” people or what can be described as “attribution theory.” This view may be too narrow and may be problematic for citizenship. As Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont and Stephens (2003) point out, “students may... revert to a simplistic “bad man” explanation when asked to explain a contemporary conflict. This persistence of stereotypes, oversimplified explanations, and erroneous naïve theories seriously undermines the value of academic learning for educating citizens” (p. 133). If students believe that people cause generally cause conflict for their own self-benefit, and that “civil” society functionally operates in this way, what pretense does voting, volunteering or political office, for example, have for them?

Students need to realize that war and other forms of violent conflicts are usually caused by a lack of basic needs rather than “bad” people. In other words, conflict is most often about needs; a lack of resources, belonging, power and so on. As Francis (2004) conveys, “there has been much recent debate, within the world of ‘conflict studies’ as to the relative importance of ‘greed’ and ‘grievance’ as motives of war.... Resources are a classic war interest: the need (or desire) to acquire land, diamonds, oil or water. As population increase and living standards rise, scarcities look to set to increase, and with them, arguably, the likelihood of conflict” (p. 25). However, without a consciousness of inequalities and need, students will fall back on naïve notions to ‘make sense’ of the world.

In addition, among students involved in the study there was a pattern of belief that people, generally speaking, are stupid. As (Muriel) put it, "I'm not ignorant like some people." Or as (Maurine) said, "people, they kind off have to take the stick out of their butt." (Matt) described the roots of conflicts as, "stupid things, like; 'You're sitting on my chair.'" Or as (Wanda) put it, "I think we prevent peace from happening. With the example of Bush, people keep electing people who are greedy and who overpower people and they do crazy things." Sometimes it is difficult to refute this theory, however, believing that stupidity reigns, means that students will be more willing to support the so-called expert, the "leader," who "has to decide what we're going to work together as" (George). There cannot be a belief in the capacity of humans to govern and sustain themselves and the planet if the predominant view is that we are incapable of doing so.

This view is undemocratic, even if it is not intended to be. This is so because the view also supports military 'interventions' that leaders deem necessary to resolve conflict. For example, one might ask Iraqi citizens, "shall the new order be centrally designed by those with competence and skill and imposed on people who could not in their present state of being achieve this way of life unaided, thus helping them in spite of themselves?" (Boulding 2000, p. 37). Assumptions that people are inept reinforce war culture and the whole politics of domination that renders military intervention a 'legitimate' possibility. The significance of this view comes from its sheer magnitude (since so many students made similar comments) and the confused indignation (that sometimes accompanied such comments) that said "people are people, what else do you expect them to do? "Doesn't social science show that all people are really out for themselves and that to pretend otherwise is hypocritical?" (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, Stephens, 2003, p. 131).

Giroux, (1983) indicated the politics of domination when he wrote, “the crucial question ignored here is the way in which the power distributed in a society functions in the interests of specific ideologies and forms of knowledge to sustain the economic and political concerns of particular groups and classes” (p. 73). War politics of domination tell us that war is sometimes necessary; indeed it is just. When nothing else works, we can always resort to war. And since this war mentality has been glorified and even spiritualized, many people accept it and support it. Mass support can make peacemakers and peace educators feel kind of lonely and insecure in their beliefs. Here too is the presence of the politics of domination. However, people can oppose it. As Francis (2004) asserts, “I believe we have the capacity to choose against war and so to give peace a chance [and] that to want to do so is a sign of sanity rather than madness...” (Francis 2004, p. 4).

Meanwhile, the societal inequities and or structural violence in society were only identified by three of the 26 students involved in the study. These students mentioned examples such as: the need to stop racism in order to have peace, class inequities and so on. For example, (Betty) said, “You’d have to get rid of social classes, prejudice, and hatred, and money and that can’t happen and that won’t happen.” (Keith) said “Peace would be like no racism, no world hunger...” (Amy) said, “Everything perfect in life. No racism, everything cool.” These examples show that these few students understood to some extent that these inequalities were a site for potential conflict.

The significance of these remarks also comes from its potential impact on citizenship, democracy and the process of peace. “Achieving genuine and lasting peace means transforming societies. It involves addressing not only immediate behavior and attitudes but the whole context in which people think and act, including the prevailing culture, social patterns, and political and

economic systems” (Francis 2000, p. 118). If democracy is going to work, or work better, people need to be informed of the structural inequities in society and be reasonably sure that they can affect change. If most students cannot identify racism, sexism, or classism as a source of conflict, they are bound by their ignorance of social injustice, making them unaware participants in the politics of domination. This cynicism and ignorance may explain why so many students are either not involved in social/political activities, or why they think that their involvement would make no or little difference. (Political efficacy)

Critical theorists and postmodernist thinkers would probably not be surprised that students are cynical. They would also point out causes and the danger of such cynicism. Hegemonic ideas and values that render individuals as hopeless pawns result in a society governed by the status quo. To the uncritical mind, the status quo is “OK;” it is “normal.” Society, as many see it, has standards that we simply must meet, and if we cannot meet these standards, we are just not working hard enough. “These standards are not seen as culturally and experientially specific among the citizenry at large because within a pluralist democracy privileged groups have occluded their own advantage by invoking the ideal of a unsituated, neutral, universal common humanity of self-formation in which all can happily participate without regard to differences in race, gender, etc. (McLaren 1997, p. 528). Uncritical people cannot see that inequality is a breeding ground for conflict, they are inclined to blame the victim for their own victimization. Hegemony, as Boler and Zembylas (2003) describe it, has a way of masking “itself as common sense” (p. 118). Similarly, to many, war is ‘common sense.’

Critical scholars concerned with neocolonialism, “the mutually reinforcing systems of colonial and capitalist domination and exploitation that enslaved Africans and dispossessed indigenous populations throughout the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries,”

(Tejeda, Espinoza, Gutierrez 2003, p. 11) also interrogate this illusion of normalcy of accord and agreement that sustains elite privilege and governance and produces social inequities that threaten peace. In this situation, democracy becomes increasingly tyrannical, since the legitimate struggle of marginalized groups for equality remains misunderstood, misrepresented and opposed.

Another reason that bleak and weakly politicized views of conflict can be considered worrisome is the impact it can have on individual perceptions of agency. If students believe that human beings are greedy and power-hungry as part of their “human nature” (another popular saying among the students) they will be less likely to participate socially or politically. It is as if they are immobilized by the hegemonic ideas and values that inform them - people are not to be trusted; they are self-serving. Or as some students conveyed, “people shouldn’t want so much power” (Kathy), or “I think people are so into the whole power thing, its always there” (Mary). Also, people are stubborn, “they want their own ideas to be run, not other people’s” (Millie) people are also unwilling to communicate, share or understand, “maybe they won’t listen (Margie), they are intolerant, “you’re not my race so I don’t like you,” and we are therefore hopeless, “there’s too many conflicts in too many countries who are too set in stone and won’t change” (Lisa). As Giroux (1983) explains:

History is to be found as “second nature” in those concepts and views of the world that make the most dominating aspects of the social order appear to be immune from historical socio-political development. Those aspects of reality that rest on an appeal to the universal and invariant often slip from historical consciousness and become embedded within those historically specific needs and desires that link individuals to the logics of conformity and domination. There is a certain irony in the fact that the personal and political join in the structure of domination precisely at those moments where history functions to tie individuals to a set of

assumptions and represents history that has hardened into a form of social amnesia" (p. 39).

"Social amnesia" enables students to live and relive the logics and workings of domination and exploitation as if colonialism never officially ended.

Theme Three: Agency

Perhaps hopelessness, ignorance about injustice and weak notions of peace combine in a way that explains why so many young people lack political efficacy. When students were asked about pro-social involvement (agency) many students, prior to C.R.E. integration, commented, for example, that "you have to sacrifice, even if you're right," (Maurine) or "there's not much I could do right now," (Luke) or "I don't know how much one person can do" (Betty). Or many simply had no idea of what they could do, or did not believe they made a difference. Some students cited personal characteristics as the reason they could not make a difference; such as, "I'm shy" (Kathy) or "cause I'm just a high school kid, or maybe its cause I'm middle class, I don't have any voice," (Keith) "I'm too young." (Tim) "I'm not much of a leader," (Dorothy) or "I'm not a get-go kind of person. I'm not going to be the leader..." (Maurine). "I'm too immature to make a difference I'd have to say" (Luke). Others said that they did make a difference, but not a significant difference, "Martin Luther King made a difference, my difference would be different... I'm not really moved by my difference" (Amy), or "I don't know if that's much of a difference" (Wanda). Since students believe they cannot make a significant difference, they tend to live out that perception. Here we see hegemony's cyclical affect on individuals. Francis (2004) asserts "I believe this alienation from public affairs both results from and contributes to the sense of purposelessness that afflicts us" (p. 139). These

views illustrate how students become enveloped by immobilizing beliefs that reinforce conformity, passivity, resignation and eventually acceptance of the status quo.

Some students had very little idea of how to become involved in order to make a difference. They could not even provide me with advice about what I might do should I want to make a difference. This lack of information may also explain student lack of political efficacy. "We make efforts for those near and dear to us, but it takes more to elicit a response from us when those needing our care are far away. And it's hard to see ourselves as necessary participants when the machinery of public life is invisible to us" (Francis 2004, p. 141). Without social action or at least social accomplishment in social studies pedagogy; a feeling of connectivity and the knowledge of how to make good use of that connectivity, students can be more apt to feel that war and domination are inevitable.

Some students (two) admitted one way or another, that peace and conflict were not issues that concerned them. Simply put, they didn't much care. Admittedly, students with this view were a small minority among the group. (Millie) told me that we all should just "chill out. Not care about things too much. People who don't care about things don't care if someone is doing whatever... Just let it go." Another student explained that "I try not to get attached to things that don't concern me" (Lisa). This ambivalence may be the product of comfortable living. "Those of us who live in relatively comfortable societies with apparently innocuous governments have been bought off by temporary, local prosperity and have chosen, by and large, to abdicate our own responsibilities for justice and for peace..." (Francis 2004, p. 140). This may explain the responses of some students, but not all students were as careless or as hopeless. Perhaps it is just coincidence, the students who are involved in school and community as well as confident in their ability to create change, are also the ones who believe in an interdependent world and the

possibility of peace. Although many students did express this view, not all students felt hopeless or purposeless.

Students who had strong beliefs of political efficacy were involved in many co-curricular activities, as well as community organizations. These students quickly drew on pro-social organizations in school and in their community, illustrating their awareness of the organizations, as well as their activity in them. "We have lots of groups in school and they're helping in a small way and their making people realize that there's things happening in other countries... Even just volunteering at Winnipeg Harvest," (Gordon) and "get involved with groups, the famine thing, anything, the Harvest drives, you have to start with small communities, or UNICEF" (Betty). Just as hopelessness and purposelessness can reinforce themselves, so too can social involvement and agency. "The more students take civic action or political action, especially if they enjoy it, the more they will see themselves as the kind of people who can and want to act civically and politically. If they see that their actions can make a difference, their sense of efficacy is strengthened" (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, Stephens, 2003, p. 140). It is important to remember that not all students are involved in organizations or activities such as these.

These differences in student perceptions of political efficacy may indicate a typology of/for agentic action. As noted, many students expressed that their 'difference' in this world was not a 'big difference.' Some students commented that the only 'difference' they could make was through making donations to an organization for a particular cause. Other students expressed similar forms of political agency that was more representative; for example, they could support a political party or the U.N., after all, they have the resources, personnel and expertise. A small minority of students talked about initiating something themselves; such as running for public office or organizing a peace rally. Overall, the main difference among these forms of agency

could be thought of as differing combinations of commitment, involvement, and individual versus representative action.

For example, a low involvement, representative agency, means that students are willing to engage in political and social matters from a position of relative immunity. They are not personally involved in the project and are not necessarily affected by its systemic governance, internal and external politics, or even its outcome or success. Their agency is translated into a commitment to a project that may be demonstrated through voting, by signing a petition, or it may be demonstrated through aid, such as donations and gifts. Finally the distance between the 'cause' and themselves may be great, since there is no requirement for students or people to be particularly informed about the project to support it in these ways. Therefore, students need not learn anything about peacemaking in particular.

Student responses that illustrate this level of agency would be, for example; "You could research a country and see what charities there are" (Maurine). "You could donate money" (Luke). "Doesn't the UN try to do that?" (Mark). "There's those relief funds" (Gordon). "Higher people can try, like the government. They send peacekeepers to try to calm down the conflict" (Marla). "You can send letters, gift packages, and when it gets there it might warm the heart of one person" (Keith). "I guess I would be involved in not so much hands in, but voting for a leader and hopefully the leader will change things" (Wanda). "If someone came up to me and wanted me to sign something that would help people around the world, I would. It's just a matter of time in who approaches me" (Mary).

A high involvement, representative agency might be conveyed through active participation in politics, by way of volunteering to help a political campaign, a fund raising project, or a famine relief simulation. Students may not initiate or lead the project, yet they can

be affected by the workings of the project, and as a result, they may gain some understanding of issues related to the process of peacemaking, as well as the issues and general information about the cause they are working for. In this way, these students are not immune to the governance, politics or outcome, but rather, their agency is characterized by a greater level of commitment.

Statements that may reflect this level of agency could be, for example; “I try to get involved” (Betty) “They can get more involved in the community experiencing things, clubs and stuff and learn about other people” (Ruth). “You could become a teacher and one out of he thousand kids you teach becomes one of those people who goes over there to try to help” (Lisa). “Just simple stuff like, helping the poor, I’m in one of those youth groups, we do stuff like that” (Ken).

A low commitment, individual action form of agency means that the individual’s level of agency is demonstrated through high levels of leadership, decision-making and personal affinity for the project. They are also affected by and affecting the systems of governance, the politics and the outcome. They believe that they are greatly informed about the cause, the organization of the project, the people involved, and the logistics of how a successful outcome may be reached. However, they do not understand the broader social, political or economic context that may be negatively impacted by their efforts. “At worst, many of these notions are calls for social reform that ignore the racial and cultural dimensions of the social injustice we inherit from our colonial and capitalist past; at best, they are calls for a more social equitable (racially diverse and ethnically diverse) participation in the existing structures of domination and exploitation” (Tejeda, Espinoza, Gutierrez 2003, p. 11).

Students comments that reflect this level of agency could be, for example; “Then I would get a crew, then I could do anything, we would advertise it and tell everyone – we want to do

this, this isn't right. Get their attention, change their way of thinking" (Margie). "But I think that's contributing to peace in a way, cause like, for peace to happen... People don't... You can't change people's nature, there's nothing you can do about that, you have to work around it" (George). These students convey willingness and leadership and some level of commitment, but the politics of domination resonates throughout these responses. Their comments reflect a need to dominate the project and diminish or deny the potential contributions of others. ("change their way of thinking, work around it")

A high commitment, individual action agency means that students are willing to intertwine their personal and perhaps professional interests with the particular form of agentic action they chose. They are far from immune to the project's governance, its internal or external politics, and especially its outcome. This is because it is their personal drive that fuels the project and because their identity is tied up in the cause and their recognition is somewhat dependent on the project's relative success. However, they also have a superior understanding of the issue they are working for, and are therefore, cognizant of the importance of injustice and peacemaking in a broader social, political and economic context. Examples of this level of agency may be; "Teach my kids to accept people as they are" (Dad), since bringing up your own children not to be racist would constitute a strong personal commitment on the part of the guardian, one that would require modeling anti-racism and one that would require vast knowledge of racism and how and why children learn to hate.

This level of agency was not popular among students. But it probably does not have to do with the amount of work involved, as much as it has to do with student's perceptions of political efficacy. "Political efficacy, the belief that citizens can affect government policy making is closely related to trust and crucial to developing a will to participate" (Hahn, 1988, p. 239).

Citizenship and democracy depend on a certain level of individual agency, especially if structural violence in all of its manifestations will ever be transformed. A typology of agency conveys a need to identify what levels of agency best serve the interests of responsible, pro-social citizenship and active democracy. It can also convey the kind of commitment and action required for peacemaking in the broader context of society.

Educators must decide what level of agentic action they want their students, their community and themselves to participate on. Change of the status quo will probably happen at the second and fourth level described above, more so than the first, and certainly the third level. Educators and students need to know what is expected of them as citizens. They need to know that 'just vote' may not be enough guidance that is necessary to change the myriad of societal injustices apparent in the world. Without social involvement, people will less likely know the "promise of what peace might be: something to be known as it is made, 'an energy field more intense than war'" (Rees 2003, p. 37).

This phenomenon of the politics of domination is further reinforced by history textbooks and social studies curriculum that allows students to study "democracy on the principles of liberty, justice, and the equality of all men, while ignoring that what they actually institutionalized and practiced was a democracy that excluded women, the non-propertied, and all nonwhites" (Tejeda, Espinoza, Gutierrez 2003, p. 23). This idea is reflected in the number of students who commented on the multicultural peacefulness of Canada. (No reference to Aboriginal peoples or other nonwhites) If students remain unaware of injustices in the past, they will be less able to critique the injustices of the present. But ironically, traditional social studies pedagogy implicitly treats the people of the past as disconnected objects of study, rather than as interconnected entities somehow attached to our time and space.

“Social amnesia” and general lack of social critique was also illustrated in classroom interactions. While studying the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in the Middle East, before conflict resolution and knowledge was introduced, (Keith) commented that the Palestinians seemed greedy. “It seems like the more they get, the more they want.” This example illustrates how susceptible students are when hegemonic ideas of normalcy and accord are unchallenged and unwittingly absorbed. Students understand large, protracted conflicts (in this case a profoundly symbolic one) in ways that serve to blame the marginalized for their misery. It also ignores the greater issues of identity and recognition among many Palestinians, making them seem like the sole creators of violence and conflict, with no apparent cause or reason.

This is probably because the students were largely taught in the most traditional manner possible, for example, lectures and films that reinforce rather than challenge the textbook, followed by extended periods of question and answer drill. These drills and lectures do not capture the complexity of conflict situations. As Giroux (1983) explains, “facts, concepts, issues and ideas must be seen within the network of connections that give them meaning. Students must learn to look at the world holistically in order to understand the interconnections of the parts to each other” (p. 202). Without understanding the values and perspectives (connections) of conflicting groups, students easily oversimplify and thus misunderstand the entire conflict, despite their ability to recite names, places and dates.

Theme Four: Appreciating ‘Difference’

When students understand world conflicts in such superficial terms, their tendency to blame “the Other” for conflict and the “justification” for war appears to grow. A majority of students involved in this study routinely explained conflict, or what it is that seems to prevent

peace from happening, was “nationality, religion, we all want different things,” (Luke) and “by looking at people’s differences,” (Grant) and “differences cause the conflicts to happen. Cultural and religious differences cause people to think they’re right and then they don’t want the other people to be heard cause they think those people are wrong” (Ruth). Similarly, when students were asked about what people can do to create peace, some students explained (Lisa) “they can forget about religion and race and try to live together.” These remarks are not surprising, according to Boulding (2000) who writes: “Strong ethnic identities are today frequently seen as a source of social disintegration, violence, and terror – a retrogression to a less evolved social condition. Yet over most of human history, as well as in the present, different ethnic, cultural, linguistic, and religious groups have coexisted peacefully on common or adjacent terrains” (p. 165). The reason that students blame difference for conflict is that they are rarely exposed to pedagogy or material that integrates marginal voices and contributions to history and social advancement.

In reality, culture or other forms of difference are not the cause of violent conflict. Many people believe that certain religions, for example, encourage war as part of an ultimate religious commitment. This is particularly the case in post-September 11th society. Explanations for conflict such as these, combined with the paranoia and paralysis of fear, easily assign blame of conflict to people who represent certain religious backgrounds. Naturally, this sometimes causes localized conflict, such as border checks, increased violence and discrimination against people, and negative characterizations in the media. But as Francis (2004) explains, “though civil wars are often seen and described as ‘identity wars’ ethnic, cultural and religious differences are not in themselves a ‘cause’ of war” (p. 26).

However, students involved in this study are not alone in these beliefs. "Viewed from the perspective of resistance postmodernism, the liberal and conservative attacks on multiculturalism as separatist and ethnocentric carry with them the erroneous assumption that North American society fundamentally constitutes social relations of uninterrupted accord... this constitutes a politics of pluralism which largely ignores the workings of power and privilege" (McLaren 1997, p. 526). Many Canadians, despite our national myths of multiculturalism and "unity in diversity," believe that we should all be Canadians; not African-Canadian, not Asian Canadian, not First Nations people. 'If people come here, they should expect to assimilate.' People with this view believe that to distinguish one's self in terms of ethnicity, nationality and heritage is anti-Canadian, adversarial; indeed, separatist. This view enables the viewer to embody the politics of assimilation.

To illustrate what the politics of assimilation might be one need only turn to McLaren's (1997) essential question, "who has the power to exercise meaning, to create the grid from which Otherness is defined, to create the identifications that invite closures on meanings, on interpretations and translations?" (p. 528). This question begs us to realize that neo-liberal multiculturalism has deeply entrenched expectations of assimilation since it requires "the Other" to conform to its preset standards. Usually, when it comes to multiculturalism in Canada and "in the land of the free, difference is either overlooked, tolerated, or celebrated as a flavorful ingredient for the melting pot" (Tejeda, Espinoza, Gutierrez 2003, p. 110). Students embody this attitude, even when they think they are being politically correct.

Journal entries that focused on the idea of difference showed that students implicitly believe that we are either 'all the same,' or that they would treat "Others" as 'normal.' The prompt was 'How would you feel/act when a new student from a different cultural background

was assigned to your class?' References included: "Going to a multicultural school has allowed me to view everyone as equal and I do not act different when a person of a different culture joins my class," (Mark); "I would be calm because he's or she's just a regular person like me," (Matt); "I do not have a reaction to this because I know so many different people with different cultural backgrounds. We have so much minorities that the country of Canada is united into a respectful view of people's cultures," (Terry); "I'm just neutral about it," (Amy); "I would be friendly to them and not judge them because they are different. Everyone is the same," (Matt). Although many students mentioned that they would interact with the student in ways similar to any new person who came to the class, the underlying current in some of the responses, particularly those above, is that they are not really acknowledging difference. What 'they are just like me' and 'I treat them normal' signifies is that "with diversity comes a transparent norm constructed and administered by the host society that creates a false consensus. This is because the normative grid that locates cultural diversity at the same time serves to contain cultural difference: The universalism that paradoxically permits diversity masks ethnocentric norms" (McLaren 1997, p. 527).

Scholars, (e.g. Boler and Zembylas, 2003) have outlined models of difference in terms of assimilation and domination. The "Celebration/Tolerance Model" illustrates multiculturalism as an open invitation to difference - so long as that difference does not threaten the dominant or "host" society. Here, difference is not politicized, it is something quaintly foreign. However, "this benign multiculturalism however, fails to address power... although this conception of difference claims to celebrate all differences equally, certain differences are merely tolerated on this view" (p. 113).

The “Denial/Sameness” model of difference reasserts McLaren’s (1997) point of view, that dominant culture can define where and when difference is to be recognized. And that time is never. People of this view mean to wipe out difference. Those who subscribe to “we are all the same” embrace – however unconsciously – a commitment to assimilation. This approach reflects the dominant culture’s privileged capacity to decide when and why differences are important” (Boler, Zembylas, 2003, p. 113). When students say that “others” are the same as them, or ‘normal’ like me, they mean it as a complement and as a means for inclusion, when really it leaves the “Other” outside of something they cannot fully adhere to. It indicates superiority - ‘we like you, you’re one of us.’

McLaren (1997) calls this phenomenon “cultural stripping.” This happens, he asserts;

wherein the individuals are stripped of their former cultures in order to become transparent American citizens. While the embodied and perspectival location of any citizen’s identity has an undeniable effect on what can be said, democracy has nevertheless created formal identities which give the illusion of identity while simultaneously erasing difference” (p. 527).

The significance of this “flattening out” affect is that with the illusion of equality there is no need to discuss the inequalities that are rampant in Canadian society. “Cultural stripping” can also mean denying difference in terms of injustice. As May (2003) states, “such recognition allows one to avoid the mistake made by many hybridity theorists of “flattening out” differences, making them appear equal. This is both inadequate as theory and unreflective of practice, since it is clear that when it comes to ethnicity – or any other identity for that matter – some have more choices than others” (p. 209). Student responses that illustrate ‘cultural stripping,’ for example, were (Amy) who said, “I’m just neutral about it,” and (Matt) who said, “I would be friendly to them and not judge them because they are different. Everyone is the same.”

The Natural/Biological model for difference attempts to persuade readers that fear of differences is a normal, natural characteristic that all people share. Therefore, if fear is natural, then it is natural to live largely segregated lives and not bother to gain any perspective into the lives of "Others." This view "denies a more sophisticated understanding of the ways in which power allows certain groups to use their fear as justification of the oppression of other groups" (Boler and Zembylas 2003, p. 114). This idea carves a straight line to enemy mentality. If it is "natural" for one to fear "Others," they will always be one's "enemy." The "us-them" mentality invites hostility, competition and conflict, partly because of the way differences and identities are treated. "In this approach to identity, our notion of who we are is defined in terms of who we are not. (Francis 2004, p. 133) It creates a kind of moral justification for war; the illusion that 'we must fight these people who threaten us.' An example of this kind of thinking would be, for instance, "religion and beliefs. If my family isn't Muslim and the whole India and Pakistan thing, cause of that, we had friends that were Muslim from childhood, all that stuff happened, and that affected their relationship" (Dad).

Eventually, people have to realize that this bland version of multiculturalism is a hotbed for conflict. It may be naïve to think that people could, even if they tried, abandon certain ethnic, national or heritaged attitudes and/or beliefs. It would mean denying a genuine part of their self. The politics of assimilation is congruent with a politics of domination because "if you force [people] to be the same, the only way left for them to be different is to get on top of one another" (Boulding 2000, p. 5). Many scholars appear to agree that inherently ethnocentric approaches to difference promote a politics of assimilation. Because what these models of difference really point out that in all cases, there is an avoidance of personal responsibility to know the "Other," to understand the injustices they may face, or to interrogate one's own stereotyped assumptions,

values and beliefs. Therefore, marginalized groups are implicitly expected to assimilate into the dominant culture.

This happens easily when traditional social studies pedagogy and instruction is practiced so widely. If people wanted to know about the "Other" they could not, because traditional social studies pedagogy is so oversimplified that homogeneous images of groups are mass produced and therefore quickly internalized. The difference among so-called homogeneous groups is rarely pronounced, leaving students with stereotyped images that are perpetually legitimated within the walls of academia. As Boler and Zembylas (2003) point out;

One of the unfortunate effects of popular history, of oversimplified and reductive understandings of difference, is that we are prevented from seeing contradictions; and from inhabiting more ambiguous and less rigid, identities and relations to the world. In short, differences are often coded by the dominant culture through simplistic systems of binary, either/or, black/white meanings. The absence of space for contradiction and ambiguity makes resistance to dominant meanings very difficult" (p. 121).

When 'difference' is avoided, reduced, or patronized, education becomes part of the machinery the chugs out more of the systemic racism, sexism, classism, among other forms of violence, rendering all people vulnerable and victimized by ignorance. This constant reproduction of oppression does not lend itself well to our sustainability as people, nor does it reflect the multilingual, multicultural, or multinational majority that inhabits this earth. As Boulding (2000) has neatly written, "clearly the melting pot theory that assumes the creation of one super-nationality within each state does not correspond to reality, and a world system made up of such states does not offer a viable political future for the twenty-first century" (p. 167).

The implications this has for citizenship, democracy, and peace can be seen through the impact this has on students. As these students, for example, said, "it's understanding that that's the world type of thing... being upset about it doesn't help anything whatsoever" (George).

(Maurine) said, “Because once I see the whole problem I think, good luck, how is that ever going to be solved?” (Ken) said, “People can fight for equality, but something will happen, someone will want something, end up fighting again.” Or (Wanda) who said, “I want to feel hopeful. Not everyone grasps the concept of listening to each other – they don’t want to hear another person’s side. I wouldn’t get my hopes up.”

When students do not believe in peace or people; becoming more vulnerable to hegemonic messages that deny ‘difference’ and undermine agency; the state, the elite, and warrior culture continues to spread its totalitarian-like influence and power over us, thereby disguising our agency or efficacy, our peoples unique contributions to society and our capacity for nonviolence as unintelligible dreams for the innocent and incurably naïve. Indeed, what people and students are experiencing is an education for war. Yet, as educators and scholars, it is important to remember that “bleakness is not the whole story, and escape is not the only alternative. Change is possible.” (Kaye-Kantrowitz 1992, p.227)

Building a Culture of Peace: Integrating Conflict Resolution Education

After Conflict Resolution Education was integrated with “traditional” course content about the Middle East conflict, students were interviewed once more. The posttest interviews, as well as the latter journal entries and field notes indicated some notable movement in regard to students’ perceptions of peace, humanity, agency and difference. This is not to say that students showed no contradictions in logic, (evidence of the politics of assimilation and domination somewhat remained) or that the CRE has produced remarkable changes. It is to say, however, that through CRE, students had begun increasingly to practice critique, appreciate ‘difference,’ gain ‘perspectivity,’ rethink their potential agency, and ultimately, to challenge war and

domination, with a small increase in hope. These themes will be discussed in the following pages that illustrate the changes in students' perceptions, their significance, as well as describe the instructional/pedagogical strategies that may have allowed some of these changes to occur.

Posttest Theme One: Practice of Critique

The practice of critique was identified across a wide range of topics. Students' ability to interrogate and critique social norms and assumptions increased after the implementation of C.R.E. Students demonstrated little critique as the mental process of opposition or resistance. "Through this form of analysis, dialectical thought replaces positivist forms of social inquiry... In this case, it would be knowledge that would instruct the oppressed about their situation as a group situated within specific relations of domination and subordination (Giroux 1983, p. 35). The value of inherently practicing critique, or at least as many critical thinkers hope, is that consciousness-raising will necessarily be the first step before one is likely to take action – action toward building a culture of peace.

In the posttest interviews, students generally indicated more sophisticated notions of "peace." Although many students continued to talk about the absence of war, and so on, they also began to talk about social injustices; such as, racism, poverty, sexism, the impact of natural disasters, such as, famine and the recent tsunami. Regarding how they defined "peace," or what "peace" looks like, students responded with more sophistication than in the pretest interviews. (Maurine) said "Without conflict, no war, there's a threat maybe, but they're talking about how to respond to it. I know it's not going to be the children holding flowers thing anymore. No violence, state your differences... Everybody should be considered equal... its affects... you can't have peace if someone's starving to death... It's not only war, it can be at home at school or countries against country. (Ken) explained "I can't explain what it looks like. In my school

example, the football players are favored - to fix it people need to be equal... People who fight could talk about what they're fighting about, what they both want." (Ruth) said "I would define it as a compromise without resorting to violence and being able to understand each other, what the other people want." (Terry) asserted that "There wouldn't be war, famine, etc. There would be people looking for a greater cause, a better humanity. They won't spend money on weapons, but on people's needs, that's peace." (Wanda) said "Less fights, hatred for one another, dislike of people who are different. Every group would get equal treatment and attention, cause no one thing is better than another. So, there should be equal opportunities for their group." (Dad) said "No fighting, nothing that will cause conflict. Maybe there's some conflict... to maintain peace you'd have to stop the racial stuff, and the stuff against gays..." (Betty) explained "I guess it's changed from last time, cause last time I said peace is happiness, sunshine and rainbows, I realize now that you need conflict for peace... Cause conflict, depending on what kind, can bring about change and differentiation. Like you don't want everyone to be exactly the same, you want people to be different..." (Muriel) said "You can argue, you can not agree, there can be differences, even if there's anger, as long as there isn't war." "Someone who understands their people and like aren't selfish they want to help the whole country on behalf of their citizens and stuff. It has to do with needs if it's a good government, but if it's just for power, then it's a bad government" (Amy). "Peace is a coexistence between cultures, people and countries. Even if they don't like it, there is no need to go to war (a situation which is lose-lose) people's differences should be resolved before forceful actions are taken" (Keith). (Gordon) said "Peace to me is a process because it never ends just at peace, there will always be some kind of conflict going on because the world is always changing. Our views are always changing and things become more or less tolerable in society. Peace will always be something to aim for but as we

may come close to it, we will find ways to improve on..." (Brad) said "Peace would consist of a world without war, famine, diseases, etc. To me peace is a world where people can communicate their ideas; ways to improve the environment, effectively, as well as people's lives. People shouldn't have to be scared to express ideas and issues. Peace is where people can walk down a street at night and not be scared for their life." (Kathy) explained, "no conflicts, people will get together, no fighting or racism, no segregating people. There are certain conflicts, but not so drastic as war."

Clearly, after C.R.E., many students had the ability to criticize society's injustices and identify injustices as a major source of conflict. They began to see injustice in the larger picture; as a root cause of conflict and as a threat to peace. Not every student in the class achieved better understanding of peace and injustice, however, almost all of those students were absent on and off throughout the integrated unit, as well as off-task, during some of the activities. This does not mean that better attendance and attention to activities would improve their understanding, but it is worth noting. These students maintained an almost entirely uncritical stance toward "peace" and injustice, as illustrated in these comments: "I think it's the absence of war now. You can't have everybody happy all the time, it's more like compromising" (Dorothy). (Margie) said "No crime, no guns or weapons or anything. All of us have to be good people too, and have a change of mind. No bad thinking about anything." (Dad) said "The perfect society, after you get peace, after you change everything." (Lisa) explained "Peace is everybody happy and getting along." (Matt) said "Without guns, no violence." These students were unable to connect injustice to peace; so therefore, the original immature notion of peace was maintained

The significance of sophisticated rethinking of peace is that "peace cultures thrive on and are nourished by visions of how things might be, in a world where sharing and caring are part of

the accepted life-ways for everyone. The very ability to imagine something different and better than what currently exists is critical for the possibility of social change... People can't work for what they can't imagine" (Boulding 2000, p. 29). The important link between student ability to imagine peace and their willingness to participate in social change (agency) will be described later.

Another dimension to student's increased understanding of peace was their ability to see themselves and others as peacemakers. This was a somewhat radical shift in self perception for many students because they began to see themselves more clearly as agents of change. This paradigmatic shift is illustrated in responses to the question 'What can you do to create peace?' "Be a friend to someone; give them some insight into who you are" (Dorothy). "You can take both sides, if there is a conflict, you shouldn't choose any side; you should take both sides into account" (Ken). "By learning about other people and having that whole school thing, understand other's culture" (Ruth). "You can understand the other person's point of view first before jumping to conclusions... It makes you realize how, how their life is first before you judge, you could say stuff that isn't true, then you have more problems and it's hard to change after" (Amy) (Terry) said "End hatred towards other people, resolve conflicts... like in Rwanda, where they were killing Tutsi's just 'cause they were Tutsi's." "I think if you understand where they're coming from more, then you can negotiate with them and come with something everyone can live with" (Wanda). "By generation to generation – my parents don't like Muslims; I'm not going to teach my kids that" (Dad). (Marla) explained "Try to meet other people's needs while trying to meet your own. Try to come to an agreement without going to war. Try to make everything work for everyone else." "Little things, like when someone's in trouble you can stand up for them, instead of letting it happen. Instead of not voting, you can vote" (Muriel).

The practice of critique also appeared in responses to various prompts regarding conflict. Not only did students begin to see how structural violence in society creates a climate for conflict, many began to see how they could manage conflict themselves. By understanding the sources of conflict, students were better able to see what needed to be done to create peace. (Dorothy) said "I think that everyone in the world just wants to be treated fairly and if there's injustice, who's got the crappier end of it, will want to fix it, and some people want to be more important, no one wants to be less important. Equality is the only way to accomplish peace." (Maurine) explained "By higher people power people giving people special privileges." (Betty) said "There's not equality in the world. We say that we're so multicultural." (Grant) said "A specific injustice that produces an atmosphere of conflict is prejudice along with racism. Individuals and groups are viewed or seen as something negative, when really, they aren't. I think at some point, it is legitimate for these groups to fight back because after some time, they've heard and seen enough." (Stephan) said "Humans need to feel wanted, they need to know their life is not pointless, they need to be loved." (Mark) explained that "Justice brings peace as justice diminishes problems that create an unpeaceful environment." (Muriel) said that "Social needs have to be met because if a person does not feel wanted and appreciated, a person can turn their feelings into violence and hate." "You cannot have peace without justice because if there is an injustice, one side still has a conflict" (Millie). (Betty) said that "If you are starving and homeless you are more likely to resent your situation and since you have virtually nothing you may resort to violence as you have nothing to lose." (Gordon) explained that "Limited resources, unmet needs and different values all contribute to producing conflict." Clearly, student began to understand conflict in terms of needs and injustices, rather than blaming the "bad" people and assigning all conflict to differences.

Students who did not move away from the politics of domination and assimilation tended to still blame conflict on “bad” people who will always be greedy, jealous, and so on. For example, (Betty) said, “There are so many extremists in the world, and they’re not willing to compromise. You can’t get that until you give them a little of what they want, otherwise it’s not going to stop.” Or (Lisa) who said, “People are too greedy – the Americans are too greedy. The world doesn’t like the way they run their country, but they’re not going to change cause they’re such a successful country.” (Mark) said, “Everyone has to understand where everyone else is coming from [and] not take advantage of their power. I think that’s always going to happen... We need more people working for peace, there are a lot of non-peaceful people out there.” (Millie) said “Everyone has too much pride.” These student’s perceptions pose a larger problem in the pursuit of peace. “In spite of many de-legitimizing forces at work, the deeply held belief that war is a basic, inevitable, and divinely ordained process in human history will not easily be changed” (Boulding 2000, p. 28).

Despite the example above, among students there was an increased awareness of conflict that helped them better understand the Middle East conflict. “Palestinians are fighting for land, they’re not known. They don’t even have a land to call their own; the ownership of it and their not recognized. They’re treated inferior living in refugee camps, they don’t have anything to call their own” (Ruth). (Terry) explained that “The Palestinians hate the Israelis cause they took land from them, the Jewish people, and it was over territory. Israel too over Golan Heights, it’s mostly about power and need.” (Wanda) said, “Like the Palestinians and land, recognition and acceptance. If you leave the anger... you’re not resolving the issue.” “It can be a sibling fighting over a toy to a country fighting over land” (Dad). The significance of understanding the Middle East conflict from the point of view of the Israelis and Palestinians is that students can begin to

develop what Visano and Jabowski (2002) would call a “historical consciousness” (p. 16). Students gain insight into the values, perceptions and beliefs of the people engaged in conflict, thereby better understanding how conflict is sustained. Otherwise, the Middle East becomes objectified; a place where people kill each other almost indiscriminately; simply because they are different.

The student’s responses to difference, as they were, and as they evolved, are very important for citizenship, democracy and peace. Without a respect for human rights in their various forms, democracy again comes to appear more as a dictatorship. As Rees (2003) explains, “advocacy of human rights as a contribution to a just and lasting peace involves respect for ethnic and language differences, respect for rights to own land and to practice religion” (p. 210). People cannot have respect for differences without an understanding of differences.

Posttest Theme Two: ‘Perspectivity’

Patterns in student responses indicate that after CRE was integrated, students gained increased perspectivity, as well as an increased appreciation for perspectivity. This is reflected in many of the comments revolving around themes of difference and conflict resolution. Examples of how students came to value perspectives were many. “I listen to both sides and help them figure out a solution” (Grant). “Peacemakers go out of their way to listen and understand others” (Mary). (Wanda) explained, “I don’t really feel any different from when any student is assigned to our class. However, sometimes it is interesting to hear what stories they have to tell or what is different about their lives, as opposed to ours.” (Dad) said, “Talk about it, listen to both sides, think of how you can resolve instead of taking it so far you’re killing each other.” (Mark) said, “Acknowledge other people, put yourself in their shoes, or you don’t get a good understanding of

what they do... If you understand them, you have a chance of working it out" (Muriel) said, "Listen to each other, not just race to the same conclusion over and over." (Brad) explained, "Negotiating, talking it out. You try to see which path to take that will help both people." (Grant) said, "Negotiating, listen to both sides, you try to make a decision that everyone will be happy with." These comments constitute of small portion of the comments made about the value of taking on perceptions of others.

The significance of perspectivity is its relation to democracy. "A psychological dimension presupposed a quality of empathy, a capacity to walk in others' shoes. A cultural sensitivity contributes to a willingness to explore others' assumptions about norms and customs which affect relationships and the management of institutions" (Rees 2003, p. 143). This cultural sensitivity enables people to understand, empathize, indeed, 'walk in another person's shoes.' This perspective enables understanding and respect for differences, thereby inviting difference, and encourages others to delve into their unique characteristics and contributions as members of certain groups. This self-knowledge can be enriching and create greater peace among people at home and in the community.

The value of perspectivity in understanding conflict in particular has been explained by Werner and Case (1997):

Groups and individuals bring diverse assumptions and values to events and issues, and these viewpoints often are related to particular times, places, purposes and experiences. Since there are various ways of characterizing things and events, no one account has a privileged claim to uncontested truth. Perspectives are partial, and no universal and ahistorical vantage can be assumed. Promoting a global perspective involves raising student awareness of the very notion and inevitability of perspectivity, and exposing students to diverse worldviews" (p. 181).

Perspectivity relies on student understanding of worldviews as something produced by a particular special, temporal and political environment that will inevitably change. Since identities also change and are created through many affiliations, cultural backgrounds and the like, a student's ability to appreciate a different perspective will be tied to their appreciation for difference in general.

Posttest Theme Three: 'Difference'

Students appeared to have greater appreciation of difference after the integration of CRE. In part, the appreciation of perspective illustrates this. Other comments that better appreciate difference, for example, were; "I understand how that Victor felt, he is equal but he's not treated equally. Palestinians aren't treated the same. If everything is not equal it creates a problem, the Palestinians want to be treated equally... it creates so much of a mess" (Dorothy). "Like those people who came to talk to us, and how they told us that most of the younger people want to have peace in Israel and not everyone – not all hate each other" (Ruth). (Betty) said, "Like you don't want everyone to be exactly the same. You want people to be different, and you can't have different without conflict." (Stephan) explained, "On that video, to resolve their conflict, they had a group meeting and they gave all their problems and how they could help. I think that would help resolve a lot of conflicts. I think David and Victor, I think it settled after they told what they needed. Group meetings probably do help. They were giving their opinions; everything on the table David said the silliest things in the world but he was trying to make an effort to understand." (Keith) said, "We have our differences and they don't agree with some of our laws like the pot laws, or we don't agree with the death penalty but we still just live side by side, coexisting."

These comments indicate a change in student understanding of difference. Difference was no longer perceived as the cause of all conflict. Instead, some students began to respect difference and see respect for difference as a possible beginning to resolving conflict. This growth can mean something quite substantial. If students can see difference as positive rather than negative, as a source of power and creativity, rather than a source of violent conflict, then peace will not seem so impossible. "In showing us that difference can be seen as a fund and that our creativity can spark passion and interconnection... [opens] possibilities for challenging and extending the safety and security of our personal comfort zones; it is possible to act upon these borders in the name of such creativity and the practice of each life as its own telos" (Boler and Zembylas 2003, p. 111) Not only can students begin to draw on difference as a source of meaning, experience and knowledge, they can see it as part of a legitimate way to govern democratically.

Posttest Theme Four: Agency

Student willingness to engage in pro-social activity as a result of C.R.E. did not increase dramatically. Most students answered questions about agency in much the same manner as in the pretest. However, their perceptions of themselves as someone who 'could make a difference' did improve a little, showing some degree of empowerment. This movement appears to be the result of peacemaker activities where students were allowed to reflect on themselves as someone who exercised some power over their world, and more mature conceptions of peace that characterized it as a process and as something that can occur. Student responses that illustrate a shift in attitudes toward agency were; (Ken) said, "I'm a peacemaker. I always stop all the fighting at home with all my cousins. I make them stop and talk." (Amy) explained, "I like helping people,

even though I don't do anything big, I still help." "I try to see the good things in people" (Wanda). (George) said, "I try to think about their issues as well, why they're upset, instead of acting right away." (Dad) said, "I'm trying to teach my friends not to be racist." (Betty) explained, "A little bit at a time. I know that I could make a difference, then why not get involved? Those landmine people came, I talked to them afterwards, and I'm going to help them next year. It's something small, but it does matter, getting rid of landmines is one step closer to peace..." (Mark) said "Even when my friends get into conflicts, we work it out." (Stephan) explained, "My teacher made a big difference in my life. I hope one day, I can do that too, even if it's just one person." (Muriel) said, "I like learning and knowledge, that's another thing about if peace is possible. People, instead of ignoring stuff, they should get knowledge." (Keith) explained, "I do the small things that count."

Not all students began to see themselves in this new light. It appears that two students who retained stereotypical notions of peace and conflict also retained feelings of hopelessness and did not appear more willing to contribute, and did not expand self-conceptions to include 'peacemaker.' This may be because there is a link between perceptions of self efficacy and willingness to participate. A student response that illustrates this was (Millie) who said, "I'm just trying to graduate, party and go to Mexico. I could make a difference... could, if I tried to. But I probably wouldn't try to... I'd have to know that I'm a person who could make a difference. It would have to be told. Then I'd probably make a difference." This comment illustrates an important link between agency and perceptions of political efficacy. Another example was (Dorothy) who said, "If there was a conflict, you could try to be the peacemaker. But a lot of conflict is about stupid things – not about anything important." As Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont and Stephens (2003) said, "the more students take civic action or political action, especially if they

enjoy it, the more they will see themselves as the kind of people who can and want to act civically and politically. If they see that their actions can make a difference, their sense of efficacy is strengthened” (p. 140).

Needless to say, this calls for pedagogy that includes social action. Still, some students began to see themselves, even in their so-called ‘small ways,’ as people who do command some ability to affect change. When people begin to incorporate peacemaking self knowledge into course content as well as into their self image, it is possible that “they are no longer passive recipients of services, no longer mere observers of their own predicament” (Rees 2003, p. 41).

The link between agency and democracy is very clear. As Ichilov (1998) states:

In many Western democracies there is a trend among citizens to claim their rights and to retreat into their own privacy. However, a neglect of the community, of the national public place as well as of the international public space results in the loss of the sense of trust, efficacy and neighborliness. There are rising levels of crime and violence, homeless people, racism, social inequality, abuse of the environment, violations of human rights, etc., which all pose problems, nationally and internationally (p. 271).

Posttest Theme Five: Hope and Peace

In the posttest analysis, some students did begin to feel a bit more hopeful about the possibility of peace. Others felt that peace was further away than ever since they had an understanding of conflict theory and basic needs. However, students did indicate a strong link between hope for peace and their willingness to get involved in pro-social activities. When students were asked if they would get involved in something if they thought peace was possible, some students replied; “Sure, I’m not a big fan of conflict” (Dorothy). “Ya, and if it was, sort of like if we did it, it would work. I might not do the biggest thing, but in my own community” (Maurine). “If we could see that it’s heading that way, then I think people would get more

involved. Just because things would get better, the problem would get resolved” (Ruth). “Ya, I think so, because it would be a goal I would want to reach I wouldn’t want to see myself get into something and fail afterward. That would be hard on me. If I could get more people, like a support group...” (Amy). (Dad) said, “yes I would cause I want to stop all this violence right now. If I was well known in this world, I would write a speech like Martin Luther King and say that.” (Betty) said, “Ya. Just because I know that I could make a difference, then why not get involved?” (Stephan) explained, “I wouldn’t go to extremes, like a peacekeeping mission. But if I can volunteer... give money if I have some to spare. I would go to rallies.... I would definitely participate.” (Marla) said, “Ya, cause if it’s possible then I’d rather get into it.” (Muriel) explained, “Ya. If I thought it was something good and it would benefit people.” (Gordon) said, “Ya, definitely. I think, when you volunteer or something you get that power surge, I’m helping someone else for a change.” (Brad) explained, “I think I would be more willing. I want to help.” (Grant) said, “Cause there’s other people, not just me... I would be more motivated to get things done.”

This pattern in the perceptions of students has important implication for citizenship, democracy and peace. Believing that peace is possible appears to be a crucial element in motivating people to participate socially and politically. However, this is in marked contrast to war culture and the politics of domination that legitimize war as a legitimate source of power. As Francis (2004) points out, “many people go on supporting war because they can think of no alternative form of power” (p. 129). If students do not believe in themselves, they will also be more likely to support decisions made by those leaders that chose war and legitimate it with various reasons.

Critical Elements of CRE that made a Difference to Student's Perceptions of Self-Efficacy

When students were asked to identify activities that made a definite impact on them as learners of C.R.E. and peace studies, students routinely talked about role play and controversial activities as well as the film, "The Color of Fear." Many students talked about the role plays and how those activities gave them a new perspective into the minds of those involved in protracted conflict. Activities that enabled a level of controversy were mentioned, mainly because students were allowed to bring in their emotions and challenge their original points of view. "The Color of Fear" was mentioned also because of its controversial edge, but also because of the new perspective it provided about racism. Many students also mentioned a presentation that was made by two young people from the Middle East. Other activities were mentioned, but far less frequently. Nonetheless, I will convey the student responses about these activities as well as describe a peace 'success story' because I believe it did catalyze some interesting dialogue about the possibility of peace.

The 'The Global Exchange Game' was an activity that many students talked about positively in the posttest interviews. However, not all students thought this game had purpose. Some students, although they fully participated, did not seem to understand the 'larger picture' ideas that permeated the activity. For example, one student 'played' a transnational corporation' and had no idea that he was probably more powerful than everyone else on the map, although he did contradict himself later when he told me that "the game changed my concept of the world by making me realize how much power one person can have and the effect one person can have" (Lisa). However, the number of students who could not glean something from the activity was minute (2).

Many students conveyed an appreciation for the activity by briefly talking about what they learned. "I didn't think I was going to get into it. I thought I was going to stand there and do nothing... It really shocked me when the girl threw all those black ribbons down; that meant that 10 million people died" (Amy). "I was one of the world leaders, I got to see how they have to pay and work with everyone else to keep their continent going. You got to see how other continents were dying because of food. Some people were spending money on some things but not others, like weapons" (Terry). (Margie) said, "People were dying, pollution is really bad cause the technology isn't up" "The Global Exchange Game, the role play game. I'm a hands on learner, going through it, you recognize a conflict, and you decide whether to do business with that person. If I had power, how would I do it, and what would I give up to get it" (Keith). (Grant) said, "I think the activity was effective because it made me realize that there could actually be 3,000,000.00 people that could die every week because they aren't being looked after by their government." (Ruth) said, "[I learned that] transnational corporations can easily take advantage (especially in poor countries), certain natural disasters can ruin a continents entire economy, how it would be to run a country, see the poverty and how many people are treated unfairly by government and die." (Dad) explained, "I learned a lot like how to deal with deadly disasters like flooding and drought. I learned how to deal with poverty and over-population."

These comments seem to support theory about the value of role play activities, particularly for C.R.E. and education for peace. Smith and Fairman (2005) describe the power of role play activities in terms of internalizing values and perspectives. "The value of perspective-taking has been made clear to us over and over again. In a study of our work with Israeli and Palestinian school Haifa University researchers found that after participating in Workable Peace role plays on other historical conflicts, students demonstrated substantial changes in their ability

to see the Israeli-Palestinians conflict through the eyes of the other” (p. 50). When students take on the perspective of individuals or groups involved in a conflict situation, they tend to benefit; they can see the conflict ‘through the eyes’ of those people who are involved. There is a kind of emotional quality that students inherit as part of these roles. The conflict, however removed from their personal experience, and however far away it may have occurred on the planet or in the past, becomes their conflict. The needs of the conflicting groups become more salient, as the names, dates and places become anchors in this simulated storm, rather than the wind.

This brings the ‘Workable Peace’ framework back into the discussion. Based on the framework, we were able to come up with a collaborative activity where students tried to understand how Israelis and Palestinians felt and believed about a number of issues. The key was to try to understand it from two differing points of view. This framework was used to help students prepare for another role play which will be described next, and is, I believe, somewhat responsible for student’s increased ability to understand how different perspectives can be interrogated and how perspective-taking can be important. The research findings that Smith and Fairman (2005) refer to have similar results to those in this study. “At posttest, virtually all of the Workable Peace students were able to write with understanding and empathy from the other group’s perspective” (As quoted in Smith and Fairman 2005, p. 50).

The second role play was facilitated by the teacher. It involved groups of students who represented the United Nations, the European Union, the Israelis, the Palestinians, the United States, the Arab League and the media. The purpose of the activity was to try to resolve (negotiate) contentious issues in the Middle East, such as; Jerusalem, terrorism, security, humanitarian aid, establishing a democratic Palestinian government, and related issues that emerged during the exercise. The value of this exercise, according to student responses, was in

its unique way of enabling them 'get into it.' Many students actually spoke as if they were a person that might represent their group. For example, representatives of the Palestinians said about terrorism; "It's not terrorism, its resistance; we are in a situation of injustice" (Keith). The US said, "we won't give funding and not be involved" (Muriel) The UN said, "With 3.7 million refugees, if the US withdraws funding, the UN doesn't know where the money will come from" (Gordon). These field notes represent a small portion of the many comments and dialogue sparked throughout this class. Still, students had plenty to say about this activity's value as a learning tool.

A strong majority of students recommended the role play exercise. "I liked that debate we had. We got into the role and found out how they felt. We were the Palestinians we were lower and wanted to feel equal" (Dorothy). (Maurine) explained, "The role play, we didn't research enough to play properly, to actually understand, but we worked through. It made more sense. You get the opinions from both sides. You get a different point of view, not just what's written on paper." (Ken) said, "It got us to understand more about what's happening, you realize how much Israel has and what other countries want and how little they have and how their not at peace yet." (Ruth) explained that "It made me understand the US role with the funds and the European Union, and the Arabs." (Terry) said, "you got to see how each side felt, how they expressed themselves, what they wanted, what they were willing to give up; like a UN meeting; their looking for a common goal for peace." "We really got into the role play, the people who were Israelis and Palestinians got into it. It's almost as if they felt the desperation of what they need" (Betty). "The role-play with everybody, that was good. We were more arguing our point... you could see their needs and everything" (Mark).

According to Ochoa and Engle's (1988) configurations of social studies, social action epitomizes the best we can offer students as young social scientists. Due to different circumstances, we were unable to organize this level of experience. However, because of the richness of such role play experiences, it can be said that students achieved a kind of "social accomplishment." As Visano and Jabowski (2002) assert, "an interpretative perspective views the process of teaching and learning as a social accomplishment, constructed and negotiated in ongoing interactions with various social agents. This perspective challenges the normative characterization of teaching as given and static" (p. 14). As the students, and to a lesser extent, the teacher, negotiated their way through the conflict resolution simulation, they were simultaneously creating and experiencing a more socialized and political account of history, and in a way, of the present. As Giroux (1983) writes; "through this form of analysis, dialectical thought replaces positivist forms of social inquiry. That is, the logic of predictability, verifiability, transferability, and operationalism is replaced by a dialectical mode of thinking that stresses the historical, relational, and normative dimensions of social inquiry and knowledge" (p. 35). This 'dialectical mode' may enable people by providing a cause for action.

Another component of role plays and perspectivity in general is the prominence of values. Some scholars argue that values should not be obliterated from social studies content. "Students must learn not only how to clarify values, they must also learn why certain values are indispensable to the reproduction of human life" (Giroux 1983, p. 203). In other words, gaining perspective of "the Other" is part of the daily construction of an active, democratic life. Indeed, an important aspect of citizenship is the ability of the individual to tackle controversial issues with the knowledge of 'difference' and multiple views or interpretations.

Other learning experiences that students mentioned in the posttest interviews were “The Color of Fear” and “the death penalty thing.” “The Color of Fear” is a documentary-style film that portrays men, representing different racial and cultural backgrounds, discussing racism in an open, honest, and sometimes angry manner. Again, the perceptions from each man; Black, Hispanic, Asian or White, were expressed about a variety of topics like white dominance and privilege, the importance of ethnicity, inter-group conflict, as well as fear and trust. Because the video introduced controversy, students were encouraged to debrief or ‘vent.’ Comments that illustrate the value of this film, for example are, “I understand how that Victor felt, he is equal but he’s not treated equally... I like that “Color of Fear” film, I like that that guy was crazy, it was a good insight about how different ethnicities feel. You can be racist and not even know it” (Keith). (Maurine) said, “Maybe the film, cause you actually see how people react to it, when he stated a point, you think about whether you agree, it makes you think of what you would say.” (Ken) said, “The movie made me notice how clueless the white guy was. I don’t think it’s only white people.” (Amy) said, “The Color of Fear – like the racist guy, he doesn’t mean to be but he was born like that and he got to see what other people are actually going through, who they represent, and the other people can understand what it means for a racist, they don’t mea it all the time too.” (Wanda) explained, “I really liked that Color of Fear film; that was the best thing they showed in class... The white guy didn’t know, I think he learned a lot from that.” (Dad) said, “The Color of Fear, I really liked how they had the main races, and the colored people explained to the whites how they felt and how they were taught.” (Betty) said, “The Color of Fear... I don’t know. I guess it did open my eyes to certain things, even I didn’t notice how beat up people feel... I guess some people feel victimized.” (Mark) explained, “That Color of Fear film was pretty good. I never thought about where other people were coming from, like the non-white

people, like we are looked at higher in society, or privileged.” (Marla) said, “It made me realize how racist... and how it makes other people feel - how sometimes it happen subconsciously...” (Brad) said, “White privilege and that video - I understood how people of different races viewed people. Like that guy, he said they don’t stand on their own ground, they stand on the heads of people of color. By watching you could tell how people feel.” (Grant) said, “I think the film... it was just. I don’t see racism everyday. It’s different to look at how they react and how they would solve it. I didn’t think men would express themselves like that. They didn’t keep it inside, they did something about it.”

Controversy in the classroom is important because as Figueroa (2000) asserts, “a central part of citizenship education is exploring and discussing the key concepts, values and issues, and coming to grips with their practical everyday implication. Topical issues, such as asylum seekers, racism and local or general elections, need to be addressed in an informed and mature way” (p. 61). However, controversy in the classroom is not without its risks.

Upon viewing the film, two students expressed feelings of resentment, frustration and anger, while others remained intently attuned to the unfolding discussion. Student responses that illustrate these feelings were; “The video – made me think of Canadian identity. A lot of the conflict was caused by your people and my people, and white people. There’s a big difference between Scottish and Irish people. Victor was being racist as well. There’s not just white racism, it’s not the culture that causes it - it’s the people” (George) (Keith) said, “The color of fear... I didn’t really get. For someone to assume I’m a racist ‘cause I’m white – that’s racist against me.”

This reaction to controversial content in school seems to be well described by scholars, such as Visano and Jabowski (2002) who point out that;

“Understanding inequality requires making some tough choices.
Positions of authority are sites of struggle but successful struggles

will result in greater pedagogical authenticity. Authenticity means a commitment to resistance... authenticity moves beyond Western thinking to begin the work of constructing alternative social relations, authenticity encourages an awareness of the other, and envisions the self as a knowing being a powerful person who possesses a clear understanding of his/her world" (p. 15).

Teachers risk enabling various forms of resistance, aided by various emotional stances that also oppose the ideas they are trying to promote. However, allowing students to discuss their feelings and ideas, however counter they may be, allows students and teachers to hold up their views against the light of reason. Careful and guided reflection about controversial issues can use some of the power and drive of emotions to bring about reasoned and sophisticated thought. As Dewey (1938) has written, "over-emphasis upon activity as an end, instead of upon intelligent activity, leads to identification of freedom with immediate execution of impulses and desires" (p. 69). Controversy without reflection can help students to entrench naïve notions to an even deeper level than before, thereby allowing deeply embedded racism and discrimination to prosper.

Clearly the increased ability of students to see the perspectives of diverse groups of people, including the Palestinians and Israelis, stems somewhat from "The Color of Fear." This may be because (although it is a film) if chose wisely, film too can "build on the premise that learning requires students to be active and emotionally engaged in their work. This can happen in the context of a lecture course of the lectures are provocative enough to engage students actively seeking answers to puzzles the readings, [videos] or lectures raise, stimulating them to reflect, make connections, and organize and draw conclusions from some body of knowledge" (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, Stephens, 2003, p. 138).

Another controversial activity that was described in posttest interviews was something the students refer to as that 'death penalty thing.' To illustrate the difference between positions and interests, and the importance of these concepts in resolving conflict, the teacher used the

controversial topic of death penalty. On the overhead, death penalty was written, with a long line underneath it. The teacher asked students if they had any opinions on whether or not the death penalty was a good idea. Before long, students were talking to each other, talking to the teacher, and explaining their point of view in an attempt to make it legitimate. As the students described their beliefs the teacher plotted their names along this line on the overhead as a means of estimating how strongly they felt about the topic (for and against). Students that responded covered the continuum (line on the overhead) and the conflict among students in the classroom was quite evident.

The teacher went on to point out that these were the students' positions. Then the teacher said, "but who here would argue with things like safety or freedom?" (The point there was that concentrating on interests, rather than positions, will help to resolve conflict) The class was quiet for a while. Eventually, students were drawn back into the debate. But when the teacher said, "OK, but do you understand what I mean when I talk about interests?" (Keith) said, "Ya, it's like we're on different roads but we're all going to the same place." This example also illustrates the value of controversy in the classroom. Some students agreed. (Wanda) said, "The death penalty was fun, to argue our point and stuff." (Stephan) explained, "that one where we said what we believe for the death penalty. I didn't know some people were for it. It more touched base with people... You put people on the chart and you could see the spectrum." (Keith) explained, "Positions and interests, the death penalty, as soon as you said 'focus on the issues,' safety or whatever, this is what we need, zone in on that..."

The use of controversy in the classroom relates to citizenship and democracy since schools can foster attitudes that support social reconstruction. As Hinchey (2004) asserts, "if the central pedagogy of schools is to become inquiry, then students must be free to suggest and

explore issues of importance to them; if they are to learn to use their voices, they must first be allowed to develop and employ them in a safe and supportive educational environment, one where what they have to say is taken very seriously indeed; if they are to become citizens respectful of the rights and views of others, then they must be given practice listening to, understanding, and assessing a plurality of perspectives” (p. 133).

On the other hand, if students do not participate in the challenge of controversial ideas, teacher authority and control continues the assumption that one-dimensional, Eurocentric values and interpretations are the ‘norm.’ As Giroux (2003) states, “reducing critical pedagogy to the imposition of dominant authority can only imagine teacher authority working in the interest of moral regulation and social control... It is also commodified and turned into an inert theory to be enacted irrespective of the historical realities and material circumstances that shape the context in which it is enacted” (Giroux 2003, p. 154-155). “Traditional” styles of expository teaching reinforce a politics of domination that implicitly reinforces a lack of individual activity because it avoids the content that may best bring to surface the inequities within a given society. If they remain unaware of the need, if they receive no counter-narrative to hegemonic vibrations of agreement, accord, and normalcy, students will not participate in activities that seek to better the suffering of marginalized groups. Instead, they will wind up participating in “democracy” which to marginalized groups can feel more like tyranny. Giroux (2003) puts it best, “authority in this context is always on the side of domination and its attempt to forge a connection between critical learning and social change is doomed to reproduce a master narrative of domination” (p 155).

Many postmodern thinkers would support controversial material in pedagogy, not only because of its ability to address injustice, but also because of its ability to incorporate multiple points of view. When students are not exposed to different points of view, even if it is the

conflicting points of view within the class itself, students are receiving a pedagogy framed by domination. As Visano and Jabowki (2002) explain, “courses that refuse to grapple with controversial topics affirm a certain privilege to particular cultural interpretations by supplying experiences from which inferences are quickly drawn. For example, traditional pedagogic canons reflect the primacy of a binary code of “either/or” dichotomies: right and wrong, etc” (p. 12). The oppressive nature of modernist thought threatens citizenship, democracy and peace because it imposes the dominance and “legitimacy” of dominant culture; a dominance that too often “legitimizes” unfair treatment of marginalized groups. As Rees (2003) clarifies nicely, “one dimensionality promotes virtually a totalitarian view which tolerates no opposition. In a climate characterized by claims that the way to control people and policies has already been found, officials say that justice already exists” (p. 79).

But because controversial issues challenge students to think and respond to differing points of views, that are often supported by differing beliefs and values, they can become more critical of power asymmetries in society and begin to see themselves as people empowered by knowledge. As Freire (1970) wrote:

Students, as they are increasingly posed with problems relating to themselves in the world and with the world, will feel increasingly challenged and obliged to respond to that challenge. Because they apprehend the challenge as interrelated to other problems within a total context, not as a theoretical question, the resulting comprehension tends to be increasingly critical and thus constantly less alienated. Their response to the challenge evokes new challenges, followed by new understandings; and gradually the students come to regard themselves as committed (p. 68-69).

Perspectivity is extremely important in democracies and for peace. Being able to empathize with others is a skill and a knowledge that is too often devalued in dominant culture. “A psychological dimension presupposed a quality of empathy, a capacity to walk in others’

shoes. A cultural sensitivity contributes to a willingness to explore others' assumptions about norms and customs which affect relationships and the management of institutions" (Rees 2003, p. 143).

Another activity that may have made a significant impact on student perceptions of peace and conflict was the use of 'success stories.' This refers to the use of peace 'counter-narratives' that describe individuals or groups working toward peace through non-violence, human rights and a commitment to humanity. Students did not indicate the use of success stories as an activity that in some way helped them learn. However, when students were asked about conflict resolution and hope, many students referred to Neve Shalom/Al Wharat, 'The School for Peace,' 30 miles away from Jerusalem. There, Israelis and Arabs in together and educate their children together in bilingual, bicultural and bi-national classrooms that have both an Israeli and Arabic teacher. Because of the apparent link between hope for peace and this example in the Middle East, I believe that the use of success stories may be quite significant despite the lack of attention it received by students.

Comments that illustrate my point, for example, are the following: (Ken) said, "The school for peace is successful because they wouldn't be like others. 'I don't like Arabs or Jews.' They would treat each other as equals, their not fighting other stereotypes, their more accepting..." (Ruth) explained, "The school for peace, I think people are getting more aware of the problem and finding, getting to know other people's side..." (Wanda) said, "They haven't fully resolved the land issue, if they send their kids to school together, their generation will grow up living together and understanding each others religion and that could be a step toward peace." (Dad) said, "In the Middle East, it's a new generation, and so their interacting and learning, they're friends, not hating each other." (Betty) explained, "The school for peace is successful,

they're taking the youth, and that's a big step. The elders are set in their ways and don't see themselves living with others cause they see them as enemies. But if you're raising the children who are going to take over, they're used to living together, they'll be more willing to listen to their friends." (Muriel) said, "I think the School for Peace is half way there. The whole way there would be getting the terrorist people to go to the school." (Keith) explained, "In Israel, the kids go to school together. The only concept of enemy would come from their parents. They just play together. That's obviously a success story. A school like that is a smaller scale, then maybe Israel and Palestine could coexist."

These reactions appear to be supported by research that conveys the importance of teaching students about peace and peacemaking. These counter-narratives provide students with an alternative imagination that can envision the construction of a culture of peace. As Boulding (2000) points out, "change will come about only with a much wider recognition of the actual peace processes at work in every society and a wider awareness of success stories of conflicts resolved and wars avoided" (Boulding 2000, p. 28). This enables students to think of power as something that can be nonviolent. Another aspect of this success story theme that was integrated was peacemaking on a personal level.

Students were asked to reflect on themselves as peacemakers by thinking and writing about the different ways they think and act that are consistent with peacemaking. At first, students had difficulty with the concept as it connected with them. Eventually, some students were able to see themselves in a new, more empowering light. (Maurine) said, "When there is a conflict around me, whether it involves my family or friends, I always try to help them resolve their conflict." (Muriel) explained that "A peacemaker would be somebody who is conscious of what people go through, someone who is not ignorant to other people and their suffering. A

peacemaker would listen to someone with a problem. Also, someone who would step up, or stuff they knew wasn't right, like racism and sexism." (Betty) said, "Standing up for people, volunteering, thinking that everyone should be equal, everyone deserves human rights, nobody should be put down based on race and sex." (Amy) explained "In my experience, I think what makes me feel peaceful is when I go volunteering at the hospital." (Ruth) said, "Look at both sides of the conflict." (Brad) explained, "Doing things to help people, helping resolve a conflict, helping people who are helping others and thinking positively toward other people, religions and races."

This growing appreciation of nonviolent conflict resolution, as a process and viable alternative to war, may demonstrate the impact of inspiration. As Rees (2003) points out, students "can derive inspiration not only from courageous charismatic leaders such as Martin Luther King Jr.... but also from the examples of ordinary citizens such as the forgiving mother of the murdered Cecilia Rodegaard or the protesters against the rapaciousness of multinational companies" (p. 182). A convenient source of inspiration, however difficult self reflection can be, is ourselves and our relationships with others. "The struggle to attain peace with justice begins with reflection on the nature of peace in any context, from relations with family and friends to responsibilities as a neighbors and citizens" (Rees, 2003, p. 23). Students who took the time to reflect in this way illustrated the counter-affect it has on war culture and the politics of domination.

If people never really reflect on their connections and responsibilities to others, the politics of domination is reinforced once again. As Giroux (2003) asserts, "as freedom is defined increasingly through the logic of consumerism, the dynamics of self-interest, an e-commerce investment culture, and all things private, there appears to be a growing indifference on the part

of the general population to those noncommercial values such as empathy, compassion, love and solidarity that bridge the private and the public and give substance to the meaning of citizenship, democracy, and public life” (p. 143) Peacemaking activities, such as success stories and personal reflection, introduce an explicitly positive aspect to conflict that can help students transcend grand narratives of power that are framed by war and domination.

The possibly broader impact of success stories and peacemaking has also been explained by Boulding (2000), who asserts that success stories should have equal emphasis as battles and conquests when it comes to the past and the present. “In spite of many de-legitimizing forces at work, the deeply held belief that war is a basic, inevitable, and divinely ordained process in human history will not easily be changed. In fact, change will come about only with a much wider recognition of the actual peace processes at work in every society and a wider awareness of success stories of conflicts resolved and wars avoided” (p. 28). Maybe, success stories generate increased hope in the peace as a process, thereby motivating students to get involved

After the C.R.E. integration, students had mixed feelings about the possibility of peace. Some began to feel that peace is possible, while others began to feel that peace was further away than ever. However, the more positive group outnumbered the more pessimistic, 17 to 9. Student responses that demonstrate an increase of hope included: (Ruth) “I think it does. It seems like the youth are getting more into the roadmap for peace. We’re trying as a class, they’re trying to reach a resolution, but you can see how it could be done.” (Amy) explained, “I don’t know. Before I had no clue... I think we can do it, just give it more time.” (Terry) said, “A little. I’m seeing that people are still for peace. Even though it’s hard, they still want it, willing to give up something to get it, some more than others.” (George) said, “I don’t know. There are people who are trying to change things. It lets you see what conflict is and what starts it... you can make

your own decision about what starts conflicts, and that's stronger and more believable as well." (Betty) explained, "I always thought peace was possible someday. Now it makes me understand how we could get peace. So understanding how we could get it, makes me more hopeful, knowing that there are things we can do about the problems in the world, not, it's just a hopeless situation." (Matt) explained, "Ya. The awareness of anything that comes by your way, resolve it. There's going to be lots of obstacles in your life, so you should enjoy it." (Keith) said, "The general idea of peace, ya. Not the sugar candy coating. Everyone can get along in the future. Instead of trying to parent each other, just be a brother or sister. Be on the same level. The US is trying to parent everyone. It's like, 'we're our own country now dad, we're not little kids anymore.'" (Grant) explained, "Ya. I guess we've learned that other people... there's different ways to solve conflict and have peace. (Brad) said, "Ya, cause there are lots of places having conflicts, you hear about it on the news everyday, you just think its fighting, but its fighting for a purpose. To improve their society."

There were comments that illustrate skepticism. Not everyone decided that peace is possible. (Maurine) said, "No, because once I see the whole problem I think, good luck, how is that ever going to be solved? Focusing on what they need rather than want they're doing, you kind of like, you see what they are fighting for, you see where their coming from, by learning about it." (Terry) explained, "It's a possibility, but it's very hard to get for a lot of places. There's... just can't get rid of racism or hatred for another tribe, its possible, but it won't be easy." (Wanda) "Maybe not completely, but it could improve a lot. The stuff with war, I don't think that's necessary. And even things on a societal level, when you have support, I think it's something we could improve on." (Margie) explained, "In some places yes. Obviously, the Middle East, that's not going to change, never going to change, cause they're so dumb, their

weird. Cause George Bush and the Middle East is weird and everything is wacked.” (Dad) explained, “I don’t think so anymore. You can never maintain it. You get everything to normal, then an issue will come up. It wouldn’t last for long. In Israel, for ten years they were fine, Then another issue came up. If the Palestinians got more land, I don’t think they would fight.” (Lisa) said “I think it can get better than it is now. Some problems can be resolved. But people are too greedy, the Americans are too greedy. The world doesn’t like the way they run their country, but they’re not going to change cause they’re such a successful country. Just because some poorer country doesn’t like it, I don’t think they’re going to change.” (Muriel) said “Like, kind of. But there needs to be lots of change. People need to realize, people with two different things can be right. It’s not just right and wrong.”

It is possible that one impact of C.R.E. (for some students) is that the increased knowledge about conflict theory and injustice make peace seem further away than before such knowledge was made. Two examples are: “Not really. I used to think peace was easy to achieve, we all just stop fighting, but now there are a million things that need to be done, which is good cause there are other problems that need to be solved, the injustices. It would be harder to achieve peace in that sense” (Luke). “I thought peace was easier before, now I can’t see it anymore. I think, people, they need to establish their basic needs, then you can branch off and get higher and higher” (Gordon). These students conveyed an increased awareness of the complexities of peace, however their pessimism was reinforced.

However, a pattern that is evident in some other pessimistic responses is the way students appear to be defining peace and conflict. Their definitions implicitly indicate a not-quite sophisticated understanding of the concepts, as well as a partial adherence to naïve theories about “bad” people. Giroux (1983) may offer some insight:

Experience, whether on the part of the researcher or others, contains no inherent guarantees to generate the insights necessary to make it transparent to the self. In other words, while it is indisputable that experience may provide us with knowledge, it is also indisputable that knowledge may distort rather than illuminate the nature of reality. The point here is that the value of any experience will depend not on the experience of the subject but on the struggles around the way that experience is interpreted and defined (p. 21).

Still other students did not leave behind the pessimistic nature that adheres to war culture. For example; (Ken) said, "People could easily negotiate things, and stop conflict, but there's always something that will cause more conflict. If people knew how to resolve conflict, some people may not listen, some people don't care what others think." (Mark) said, "We need more people working for peace. There are a lot of non-peaceful people out there." (Millie) explained, "I don't think so. I feel about the same I just really don't care." Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont and Stephens (2003) offer a possible reason for why some students cannot transcend war culture.

Students are known to hold these naïve theories not only before but also after instruction in every discipline, and these misconceptions continue to impede consolidated understanding. Students often learn interpretation that conflict with their naïve theories, but they learn them in the narrow context of the classroom and on a superficial level. When they are asked to explain or are confronted with a comparable issue outside that narrow context, their original misconceptions emerge intact. They have not achieved any real understanding of the ideas... (p. 133).

Perhaps a richer, more meaningful learning experience, one grounded in the community, one that focused on conflict and success stories of peace with improved balance, involving people and situations outside of the classroom, would have increased the believability of peace and nonviolent conflict resolution.

Summary

Chapter four has described the research findings and the scholarship on which I drew to analyze and interpret these findings. Important patterns that speak to agency, difference, hope and peace were identified in the pretest and posttest interviews, journal entries and field notes.

Important findings (pretest) described students' elementary notions of peace that ignored the role of injustice or inequality in conflict, what effect traditional social studies content has on notions of war, (and therefore the proliferation of war culture), how stereotyped version of peace can inhibit action to create peace, the lack of a worldview or consciousness of interdependence, and the urgent need for 'success stories' of non-violence action.

Pretest findings also conveyed students' bleak notions of people involved in conflict. Students spoke of people's greed, ambition and stupidity as factors in the cause and maintenance of conflict. They also conveyed perceptions that accepted or legitimized war as a legitimate response to conflict. This means that students must learn about inequality as a source of conflict, so that social reconstruction becomes a focus rather than blaming the "Other." When students blame 'human nature' for conflict, they may become less interested in participating in social change. Therefore, a typology of agency was conveyed so that teachers may be more able to encourage individual and representative action in ways that require personal commitment and involvement.

Students also explained their perceptions of difference, on which they laid blame for conflict. Many students illustrated ideas congruent with models of difference that reduce difference to cultural celebrations which fosters assimilationist attitudes that stress "sameness" and fear of difference as a "natural" response to difference. Many students ignored difference in

terms of power and injustice, which has implications for global citizenship, active democracy and peace and conflict studies.

After Conflict Resolution Education was integrated into the Human Rights unit, students illustrated increased ability to practice the art of critique. This was evident in their sophisticated rethinking of peace and their ability to regard themselves as peacemakers. Students also developed a sense of perspectivity which was illustrated in their increased appreciation of difference of worldview and needs. Therefore, difference was rarely blamed for conflict. Many students began to regard difference as a necessary part of life. Finally, while students demonstrated no drastic change in their views of agency, their self-perceptions as “peacemakers” may enable participation, since their political efficacy as peacemakers was generally increased.

The activities that appear to have enabled these changes were role play activities, controversial topics or content, speakers from the Middle East and success stories of non-violent intervention in conflict situations. These activities did not increase hope for all students, however, since conflict theory, for a minority of students, made them acutely aware of injustices that will require extreme (and possibility unrealistic) changes to occur in the world.

Chapter five briefly discusses some conclusions and recommendations based on this research and related theory.

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusions and Implications

The findings of this study indicate a need for Conflict Resolution Education to be integrated into senior level Social Studies curriculum. Specifically, educators must: pay attention to war culture in its various manifestations (which requires them to examine their own assumptions first); use activities that encourage perspectivity and an appreciation of difference; cultivate critical thinking through the implementation of controversial topics; integrate peaceful or nonviolent success stories to provide a powerful counter-narrative, encourage students to reflect on themselves as peacemakers; and integrate opportunities for social action into their pedagogical and assessment practices. More specifically, the study yielded the following conclusions and pedagogical implications that are of vital significance for the implementation of CRE into the Social Studies Curriculum.

Watch for the Politics of Domination

War culture is all around us; in the media, in textbooks and imbedded in profound ways in our psyche, and though it is one aspect of the politics of domination, it is extremely pervasive in school and in society. As this study suggests, it affects the way people think about concepts such as peace, agency, difference, and humanity, and hope in general. These are some topics that people should be better acquainted with if there is any hope for peace. The effects of the politics of dominance are numerous but generally speaking, this mentally engages many of us in its reproduction. As a result, those that suffer the most are marginalized groups, in much similar ways characteristic of colonial times. As Tejeda, Espinoza and Guitierrez (2003) put it, “working class indigenous and nonwhite people are often reduced to ontological foreigners in the very

space and time they occupy. In these contexts, people are assaulted by multiple and mutually constitutive forms of violence in the various dimensions – the economic, the cultural, the political, the linguistic, the sexual, the spatial, the psychological, and epistemological – of their daily lives” (p. 10). Educators who do not or cannot identify this culture simply cannot do anything to counteract it. As such, they and their students may become powerful though unwitting cogs in the machinations of dominance producing and perpetuating peacelessness.

To counteract the politics of dominance educators must begin to conceive of their pedagogical practices as counter-narrative to war mentality, however difficult it might be. As Giroux (1983) asserts, “it is important that students come to grips with what a given society has made of them, how it has incorporated them ideologically and materially into its rule and logic, and what it is they need to affirm and reject in their own histories in order to begin the process of struggling for the conditions that will give them opportunities to lead a self-managed life” (p. 38). My study suggests that if students are to struggle against domination, it will have to originate in their consciousness of war culture and how they may be reproducing it through their behaviors, attitudes, “knowledge,” assumptions and values. Otherwise students will continue to believe, for example, that peace “is a fairy tale, (Keith) or as (Lisa) said, “Peace is impossible in making some people happy it is necessary to come at someone else’s expense.”

One way to challenge students to engage in this kind of outward and self-reflective critique is through the implementation of controversial topics. But first, educators need to understand an important dynamic involved in teaching controversy. Educators must anticipate that counter-narratives will be probably met with some resistance. That is because the whole point of counter-narrative is to challenge a person’s worldview. However, if educators know how to anticipate resistance, they will know that it is a natural part of the process of critique, and that

it is not necessarily a reflection of their teaching abilities. As Boler and Zembylas (2003) put it, “to engage in critical inquiry often means asking students to radically reevaluate their worldviews. This process can incur feelings of angry, grief, disappointment, and resistance, but also offer students new windows on the world: to develop the capacity for critical inquiry regarding the production and construction of differences gives people a tool that will be useful over their lifetime. In short, this pedagogy of discomfort requires not only cognitive but emotional labor” (p. 111).

One suggestion is for educators to think about how they have internalized war culture and the politics of dominance. Teaching controversial topics as well as peace and the causes of conflict will aid them in this process. One way teachers might facilitate this process is to introduce controversy into the classroom by encouraging students to think about the “justifications” for war. Educators could select a particular conflict in the curriculum and encourage students to reflect on its “justifications.” This could lead to a very productive and challenging discussion. As (Keith) said, “Peace is a simple co-existence between cultures, peoples and countries. Even if they don’t like it, there is no need for war, a situation which is lose-lose.” Francis (2004) echoes this thought:

If peace is ever to become a reality, it is a prime necessity to deconstruct the myth of war’s necessity, legitimacy and power for good... a myth: that war is what works, the ‘means of last resort’ – the one thing that we can rely on when all else fails. This myth is based on three false assumptions. The first is that leaders are trying to do things that really need to be done: that the causes for which they go to war are just. The second is that they do really try everything else before going to war – that all alternatives are exhausted. The third is that war is effective in achieving the good goals claimed as their causes. This threefold war myth is so firmly established that it is hardly ever questioned at a fundamental level (p. 18-19).

Creating a culture of peace means that Conflict Resolution Education may be a necessary component of social studies curriculum if it is to be an education for citizenship, democracy and peace. As Francis (2004) nicely put it, “we need to develop the will and the skills that are necessary for peace-building work, at whatever stage and of whatever kind: resistance, advocacy of all kinds, bridge-building, mediation, education, building movements or constituencies’ for peace, participation in peace processes and negotiations, institution-building and more general social and political participation” (p. 118)

Students in this study illustrated the knowledge and skills consistent with Francis’ suggestion. For example, (Maurine) said, “Focusing on what they need rather than what they’re doing, you kind of like, you see what they are fighting for. You see where they’re coming from.” (Grant) said, “I guess we’ve learned that other people... there’s different ways to solve conflict and have peace.” (Terry) said, “I’m seeing that people are still for peace. Even though it’s hard, they still want it... willing to give up something to get it...” (George) said, “There are people who are trying to change things. It lets you see what conflict is and what starts it. You can make your own decision about what starts conflicts, and that’s stronger and more believable as well.” (Betty) said, “It makes me understand how we could get peace. So understanding how we could get it makes me more hopeful; knowing that there are things we can do about the problems in the world, not, it’s just a hopeless situation.” (Keith) said, “even the conflict resolution, if you don’t use it on a global scale, you can use it personally or whatever too... it’s good to see what’s going on in the rest of the world and how making the smallest decisions make a big difference.” (Brad) said, “Ya cause there are lots of places having conflicts, you hear about it on the news everyday, you just think its fighting, but its fighting for a purpose. To improve their society.” (Mary) said, “It makes me feel... no one talk about it before, when I’m in a conflict situation later on, I’ll

have a general idea of what I'll say, or what I'm going to do, or what might happen, and what I can do to make a change." Ultimately, C.R.E. can help both teachers and students confront all kinds of beliefs that reinforce the politics of domination.

Another conclusion suggested by this study is that in order to counteract the politics of dominance, educators must seek pedagogical practices that surpass "traditional" teaching methods defined by exposition and oversimplification. Since CRE runs in opposition to war culture, there will be students who need every opportunity to understand peace and nonviolence through interactive teaching methods. As (Betty) said about the role play, "we really got into the role play. The people who were the Israelis and Palestinians got into it. It's almost as if they felt the desperation of what they need." Likewise, Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont and Stephens (2003) have written that "lecture courses often do not support deep and enduring understandings of ideas and are even less well suited to developing the range of problem-solving, communication, and interpersonal skills toward which moral and civic education aspire" (p. 133). Therefore, the traditional methods of lecture periods and question answer type drills will only reinforce authority and domination (as the hidden curriculum clearly indicates). Rather, educators need to active participation, critique and reflection.

Educators may introduce opportunities for critique by posing problems that are controversial in nature and relevant to the curriculum topics at hand. In "problems based learning," students' work is organized around evaluating problems better enables students to propose "possible solutions for concrete, usually real-world problems" (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, Stephens, 2003, p. 135). For example, teachers may ask students to consider one or more of the following: "Is war ever justified as a way to "resolve" conflict? What could peace without justice look like? How do issues of identity, recognition, emotions and beliefs make

conflict within the Middle East particularly complex? Questions or problems such as these can create a space where current conceptions of governance and authority come to be questioned, thereby creating a small space for new conceptions to emerge and be shared. This is, after all, one of the essential features of a democratic life.

To help educators and students interrogate war culture, the language of war must be examined carefully. Although it is primarily used in the media when conflicts are described in ways that “inform” and entertain. Francis (2004) points out, for example, “the punishment rhetoric of the War on Terror – ‘we must go after them and bring them to justice’ – is in line with one of war’s age-old justifications. It is the blood feud writ large and carries the same connotations of honor and retribution. These are ethical concepts, but are they ones that we should accept?” (p. 86). When teaching topics about various conflicts, such as terrorism for example, educators must be careful not to oversimplify the content and/or explicitly reinforce old-testament-like notions of “justice” in terms of ‘payback’ or as retribution. This may mean that educators must also address the concept of ‘justice’ as something that may not necessarily reflect day-to-day judgments made in courts.

As my study suggests, students may not readily understand the kind of justice being interrogated in class. Some journal entries, for example, conveyed a connection between “justice” and peace as legalistic, focusing on blame, punishment and retribution, rather than, for example, equality and freedom. Student responses that demonstrate this reductive notion of justice were, for example, “To get peace you need to punish the terrorists. Justice must be delivered in order to maintain peace” (Keith). “I think that you cannot have peace without justice because without justice, you can’t prosecute and convict the people who prevent peace from happening” (Wanda). “Justice helps keep peace by putting up laws and such. Without justice it

would be corruption” (Dad). Although these comments convey some degree of insight, a strictly legal interpretation of social justice counteracts conflict resolution theory that stresses nonviolence and interdependence.

Implementing Peacemaking Activities and Success Stories

Another conclusion from this study, with important curricular and pedagogical implications, is that teachers wishing to integrate CRE will need to go beyond traditional sources of materials, such as the library to be able to locate resources for peacemaking activities or success stories, two of the factors that appeared to have a profound effect on the students in my study. As some of them commented, “I learned about stuff I didn’t know about before, like the peace thing” (Maurine). “The school for peace... I think people are getting more aware of the problem and finding... getting to know the other people’s side. I think that’s why the youth are trying to get it out” (Ruth). “Those young people when they talked about their life and stuff and how they’re trying to change how they’re living...” (Amy). “They haven’t fully resolved the land issue. If they send their kids to school together, their generation will grow up living together and understanding each others religion and that could be a step toward peace” (Wanda). “The peacemaking stuff, I liked it better than the conflict stuff. I found it more positive” (Muriel). These comments illustrate the need to incorporate the positive elements of peacemaking when implementing C.R.E.

Educators wanting to integrate success stories as a counter-narrative to war culture can look to UNESCO. UNESCO provides an anthology of peace stories that can be integrated into Social Studies curriculum. Examples within the anthology demonstrate a range of non-violent

reactions to conflict throughout time. These stories can provide the knowledge necessary to create a culture of nonviolent conflict resolution and peace.

Another resource that can be integrated into social studies curriculum comes from the local community. Different groups of people, particularly those “Others” that bring diverse knowledge and stories of conflict resolution, can be invited to speak to students. As my students involved in this study indicate, speakers can challenge stereotypes and create an expanded notion of reality. Boulding (2000) further suggests that “communal groups are to varying degrees storehouses of folk wisdom and technical problem-solving skills that increase the chances for survival for their members within polities where they are disadvantaged” (p. 166). Not only can these experiences or counter-narratives challenge dominating assumptions, they can enrich students’ appreciation of difference by providing some amount of perspectivity. In essence, success stories allow students to challenge history, because it explains that not all is hopeless and that people can make a difference without resorting to war.

When students are cognizant of success, as Francis (2004) explains, they are better able to participate in active, democratic life. She explains that “substituting nonviolent resistance for violent responses to tyranny and injustice could create a space for a process to abolish militarism – its structures, hardware and culture” (p. 129). Abolishing structural violence and creating justice are the main goals for an education for peace. This all means, the success stories need to be integrated thoroughly, not additively, to ensure a constant exposure to the “truth” about the power of nonviolence.

Commitment to Social Action

Educators also need to implement activities with social action components. The development of agency and political efficacy require learning opportunities characterized by

social action. Social action can create an opportunity for students to see themselves working for peace and seeing others who value nonviolence and peace. They will forge connections to “Others” who can either help in the project, or who will benefit from the project. Either way, as Giroux (1983) asserts, social action is needed, but it must be preceded by those subjective preconditions that make the need for such action intelligible. As one student stated, “I want to but I don’t know what to do... Sometimes I want to do more things” (Ken).

Social action can be empowering, meaning that students can develop greater perceptions of political efficacy or agency. But in order to do this responsibly (avoiding level three in the typology of agency) students must be thoroughly informed about the character and ramifications of their projects and be knowledgeable and respectful of peace and human rights. As Rees (2003) explains, “the term ‘empowerment’ captures the trinity of ideas which govern coherence to efforts to achieve peace through non-violence, through the attainment of human rights and by the recovery of humanity” (p. 73-74). As (Muriel) pointed out, “a peacemaker would be somebody who is conscious of what people go through, someone who is not ignorant to other people and their suffering.”

Educators must also be careful to remind students that violence under any circumstance is wrong, even if an individual is challenging an unjust situation. When teachers help students understand the origins of conflict and then urge them to participate socially or politically, teachers need to emphasize to students that “to oppose tyranny with counter-violence is to depend on and legitimate violent structures and technologies, to perpetuate the culture and cycle of violence” (Francis 2004, p. 104). So when an educator may say that a certain group is ‘fighting oppression,’ they must be clear about what they mean by ‘fighting.’ This is important since

violent ways of fighting oppression legitimate violence and reinforce war culture as a legitimate means of emancipation.

Appreciating Difference

A final conclusion derived from this study is the importance of integrating activities and concepts that speak directly to difference. As noted, citizenship and democracy can be enhanced by an appreciation of difference, that is, the appreciation of ethnic and cultural differences among people, as well as the power asymmetries experienced among groups in society. The understanding that some groups are more “privileged” than others challenges the banal sense of difference that celebrates food and dress, and therefore diminishes culture. This difference is compelled by notions of injustice. As Giroux (1983) asserts, “if citizenship education is to be emancipatory, it must begin with the assumption that its major aim is not “to fit” students into the existing society...” (p. 201). Therefore, students will need to identify the politics of assimilation that promote attitudes of dominant culture superiority so that they can transcend models of difference that reinforce a rationale for assimilation. As noted in Chapter Four, many students conveyed ideas about conflict that placed at the root of much conflict differences of nationality, religion or race. Educators who teach students, rather, to appreciate difference as a necessary aspect of human beings will embody an inherently politicized approach that requires a social reconstructionist agenda.

This agenda could be conceived as part of an ongoing attempt to eliminate the effects of colonialism and globalization, such as the omission of marginalized voices and the promotion of only Eurocentric points of view. As Tejeda, Espinoza and Gutierrez (2003) argue, “we argue for a notion of social justice that recognizes that the contemporary United States is essentially

characterized by an internal neocolonialism. That has its origins in the mutually reinforcing systems of neo-colonial views that represent oppressed groups as homogenous, meaning that there is little recognition of the diversity within groups.” (p. 12) Whereas, it is vital that when students such as (Maurine) ask, for example, “why is everyone in Africa so poor,” that educators can not only explain the effects colonialism and globalization have had on marginalized groups, but these phenomena have not always injured or benefited groups in a predictable manner. Therefore, difference within groups of people must be emphasized. This helps educators to challenge oppressive stereotypes that ultimately reinforce the political advantage of dominant society.

Concluding Remarks

Conflict Resolution theory, critical theory, postmodernism and resistance postmodernism are theoretical constructs that highlight the importance of challenging meta-narratives that impose, politicizing difference, addressing societal injustice, human agency, and creating a sense of hope. A significant value found in all of these theories is their continual critique of injustice and a strong commitment to peace. Integrating Conflict Resolution Education into the Social Studies curriculum in order to help develop students’ political efficacy for contributing to peacemaking is one approach that can enhance students’ ability to practice critique, develop perspectivity, appreciate difference, gain greater hope in the possibility of peace, and commit to various degrees of personal agency.

These themes are vitally important to the concepts of citizenship, democracy and peace. In the pretest interviews, for example, students’ responses to questions about conflict and peace illustrated a bleak picture indeed. Students had elementary notions of peace, often characterized

by childish images and clichés. Students also believed that people, particularly in conflict situations, are guaranteed to be selfish, power-hungry and stupid. They also blamed difference as the main source of conflict. Finally, they did not believe in their ability to make a difference in this world.

These beliefs can have devastating implications for our future. Young people who cannot imagine peace and who do not believe in people's ability to attain it will be unable and unwilling to work towards peace. Furthermore, if young people blame difference for many of the conflicts in the past, present and future, the struggle of many minority groups will remain largely misunderstood and in many cases illegitimately opposed. Therefore, social transformation of structural injustices may become even more unlikely. Ultimately, these students conveyed a politics of dominance that rendered them students unaware of injustice and unaware of their own ability to transform it.

After the integration of C.R.E. into a Social Studies issue-based course, students began to see conflict and peace very differently. Elements of instruction, such as role plays, for example, enabled students to gain perspective – the ability to see things through “the eyes of another person.” This means that students began to understand the Middle East conflict from the point of view of Israelis and Palestinians because they were able to understand the role which interests, emotions, identities and beliefs play in protracted social conflicts. Perspective can provide a counter-narrative to the stereotypes that seem to be attached to such areas, stereotypes that promote judgments and blame, and a kind of resigned hopelessness. When students learn, through C.R.E., that Israelis and Palestinians, for example, can live and learn together (School for Peace) they begin to imagine a new source of power that need not be delivered in the form of bullets or bombs. It increases students' hope for a peaceful future. It makes peace something

worth talking about, perhaps even working toward. This may have great implications for agency, for if students believe that the peace is possible, they are more likely to get involved. Here, global citizenship and active democracy become more meaningful to students since they believe that they too can participate and have positive impact on the world.

Political efficacy appears to work in a similar way. Students who believe in their ability to make a difference are those that, more often than not, are involved in pro-social activities. Therefore, implementing activities in Social Studies courses that promote social action, or at least a kind of social accomplishment, is a way to promote the idea that students can make a difference while showing them that there is reason to believe in people and the possibility of peace. But first, agency as a concept must be further explored. For example, data derived from student responses conveyed a typology of agency ranging from low involvement, representative action to high involvement, individual action. The four distinguishable forms of agency discussed in chapter four illustrate our need as educators to understand the level of agency (read: citizenship) on which we want our students to participate. For instance, can we continue to merely encourage students to vote, an example of low involvement, representative action, in this era of globalization and neo-colonialism?

At times like these citizenship education will need to provide students with critical knowledge and skills to help them successfully navigate their way around the forces of these trends and see their implications for shaping the choices available for individual and communal action. When Conflict Resolution Education is integrated into the Social Studies curriculum, for example, students can become more critically and globally aware and empowered. Through classroom activities that promote perspectivity, deliberation, engaged and impassioned thinking, and social action, students are better empowered to live as critical and caring global citizens,

willing to participate democratically in ways that acknowledge and address social injustice as a source of conflict, and see themselves as peacemakers whether that be within their families, their communities, in their country or in the world.

Appendix A: Pretest Interview Questions

1. What do you like/dislike about the World Issues class?
2. Do you find the course depressing?
3. How would you define “peace?”
4. What does “peace” look like?
5. Do you see yourself as someone who could make a difference?
6. Is “peace” a possibility in the future?
7. Would you get involved in something if you felt that peace was possible?
8. What do you associate with conflict?
9. What prevents “peace” from happening?
10. How do people create conflict?
11. How does society create conflict?
12. What can people do to create peace?
13. What can people do to help reduce conflict in places that are far away?
14. What are some appropriate ways to resolve conflict?
15. Why isn’t “peace” realistic?
16. If you wanted to make a difference, what kind of things could you do?
17. Do you know of any success stories, where and when peace has been achieved?
18. What do you associate with “peace?”

Appendix B: Posttest Interview Questions

1. How would you define “peace?”
2. What does “peace” look like?
3. What can people do to create peace?
4. Is “peace” a possibility in the future?
5. Why isn’t “peace” realistic?
6. Do you now see yourself as someone who could make a difference?
7. Would you get involved in something if you felt that peace was possible?
8. If you wanted to make a difference, what kind of things could you do?
9. What do you associate with conflict?
10. How do people create conflict?
11. How does society create conflict?
12. What can people do to help reduce conflict in places that are far away?
13. What are some appropriate ways to resolve conflict?
14. Do you know of any success stories where and when peace has been achieved?
15. What activities for conflict resolution and peace studies did you particularly like/learn from the most? Why? (How did that help you? What impact did it have?)
16. Does the information about conflict resolution and peace make you feel more hopeful? Why/not?

Appendix C: Journal Prompts

1. Dr. Jacoby mentioned four main issues in the Middle East that have sustained conflict over the years. What were they, and why are they so contentious? (You can refer to hockey metaphor if you like) Finally, what potential for peace do you think there is for the Middle East?
2. Conflict and conflict resolution is about needs. What are some needs that if left unmet, help produce conflict? Explain.
3. Can you have peace without justice? Why or why not?
4. How do you feel/act when a new student from a different cultural background is assigned to your classroom? Explain your reasons for your behavior.
5. Explain how the Global Exchange Game has changed your concept of the world (what did you learn) How did that particular activity help you learn in such a short time? (Was that activity effective?)
6. Explain from a societal view, how a specific injustice produces an atmosphere of conflict. Which groups is/are marginalized by this conflict? Is it ever legitimate for these groups to fight back?
7. Is peace an end point or a destination? Or is it a process? Explain.
8. If School was a more peaceful school, what would it look like? What would need to change so that School could be called peaceful?
9. What are the different things that we do and think and feel when there needs to be peace? What did you do to be a peacemaker?
10. Create a description of peace that includes some of the important conditions, ideas, and values etc. that have been discussed.

References

- Aronowitz, S & Giroux, H. (1990). *Postmodern education: politics, culture, and social criticism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Azar, E. (1990). *The Management of protracted social conflicts*. Dartmouth: Dartmouth Publishing.
- Banks, J. A. (2002). Teaching for diversity and unity in a democratic multicultural society. In W. Parker (Ed) *Teaching for democracy: Contexts, curricula, assessments*. *Research in Social Education*, vol. (2) Report – Research (143) 211-242
- Banks, J. A. (2001). Multicultural education: Its effects on students' racial and gender role attitudes. In J. A. Banks & C.A.M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education* (pp. 617-627). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Banks, J. (1994). *Introduction to multicultural education*. Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon.
- Barash, D. and Webel, C. (2002). *Peace and conflict studies*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Barrera, M. (1979). *Race and class in the southwest: A theory of racial inequality*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Bartos, O. and Wells, P. (2002). *Using conflict theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Boler, M. Zembylas, M. (2003). *Discomforting truths: The emotional terrain of understanding difference*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Boulding, E. (2000). *Cultures of peace: The hidden side of history*. Syracuse University Press, New York.
- Boulding, K. (1990). *Three faces of power*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Brantmerier, E. (2002). *Exporting Grandhi's theory of peace and nonviolence for enhancing peace education*. Indiana University Press.
- Bretherton, Weston, Zbar. *Peace education curriculum development in post-conflict contexts: Sierra Leone*. Curriculum Corporation,
[Http://www.curriculum.edu.au/projects/peace.php](http://www.curriculum.edu.au/projects/peace.php)
- Briskin, L. (1990). *Feminist pedagogy: Teaching and learning liberation*. Ottawa:
 CRIAW/ICREF
- Brown, S.and Dorbin, S. (2004). New writers of the cultural age: From postmodern theory shock to critical praxis. In *Ethnography Unbound*. S. Brown, S. Dorbin (Eds) New York: State University of New York Press.
- Brown, P. and Lauder, H. (1997). Education, globalization, and economic development. In . Halsey, H. Lauder, P. Brown, A. Wells (Eds) *Education: Culture, Economy and Society*. New York: Oxford University Press. 172-192
- Burgess, T and Burgess, G. (1997). *Transformative approaches to conflict*. University of Colorado. Conflict Research Consortium,.
<http://www.colorado.edu/conflict/transform/index.html>
- Byrne, S. Carter, N. and Senehi, J. (2001). Social cubism and social conflict: Analysis and resolution. In *ILSA Journal of International and Comparative Law*. 8 (3) 725-740.
- Carson, T and Lange, E. (1997). Peace education in social studies: trends and issues in Canadian social studies. In I. Wrights and A. Sears (Eds) *Trends and Issues in Canadian Social Studies*. Vancouver: Pacific Educational Press.

- Chapman, A. (2003) Reflections on a social semiotic approach to discourse analysis in educational research. In T. O'Donoghue, K. Punch (Eds) *Qualitative Educational Research in Action: Doing and Reflecting*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Cochrane, A. and Pain, K. (2000). *A globalizing society? A globalizing world? Culture, economics, politics*. London: Routledge.
- Colby, A. Ehrlich, T Beaumont, E Stephens, J. (2003). *Educating citizens: Preparing America's undergraduates for lives of moral and civic responsibility*. California: Jossey-Bass
- Counts, G. (1969). *Dare the school build a new social order?* New York: Arno Press.
- Daunic, A. Smith, S. Robinson, T. Miller, M. Landry, K. (2000). School-wide conflict resolution and peer mediation programs: Experiences in three middle schools. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 36 (2), 94-100.
- Denzin, Norman. (2003). *Performance ethnography: Critical pedagogy and the politics of culture*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Deutsch, M. Coleman, P. (2000) *The Handbook of conflict resolution: Theory and practice*. California: Jossey-Bass.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Diaz, C. F., Massialas, B. G., & Xanthopoulos, J. A. (1999). *Global perspectives for educators*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Dukes, F. (1996). *Resolving public conflict*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

- Effrat, A. and Schimmel, D. (2003). Walking the democratic talk: Introduction to a special issue on collaborative rule making and citizenship education: An antidote to the undemocratic hidden curriculum. *American Secondary Education*, 31 (3) 3-15.
- Engle, S. H., Ochoa, A. (1988). *Education for democratic citizenship: Decision making in the social studies*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Figueroa, P. (2000) Citizenship education for a plural society. In A. Osler (Ed) *Citizenship and Democracy in Schools: Diversity, Identity, Equality*. England: Trentham Books.
- Fisher, S., Dekha, I., Ludin, J., Smith, R., Williams, S., Williams, S. (2000). *Working with conflict: skills & strategies for action*. New York: Zed Books Ltd.
- Fisher, R. Schneider, A. Borgwardt, E. Ganson, B. (1996). *Coping with international conflict: A systematic approach to influence in international negotiation*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Francis, D. (2004). *Rethinking war and peace*. Michigan: Pluto Press.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: The Continuum Publishing Company.
- Gaudelli, W. (2003). *World class: Teaching and learning in global times*. New Jersey: Erlbaum Associates.
- Gibson, R. (1986). *Critical theory and education*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Giroux, H. (1993). *Living dangerously: Multiculturalism and the politics of difference*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Giroux, H. (1983). *Theory and resistance in education: A pedagogy for the opposition*. Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey Publishers Inc.
- Giroux, H. (1997a). *Pedagogy and the politics of hope: Theory, culture, and schooling*. Colorado: Westview Press.

- Giroux, H. (1997b). Crossing the boundaries of educational discourse: Modernism, postmodernism, and feminism. In A. Halsey, H. Lauder, P. Brown, A. Stuart Wells. (Eds) *Education: Culture, Economy, Society*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Giroux, H. (2003). Pedagogy of the depressed: Beyond the new politics of cynicism. In M. Peters, C. Lankshear, M. Olssen (Eds) *Critical Theory and the Human Condition Founders and Praxis*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc. 143-167
- Hahn, C. (1988). *Becoming political: Comparative perspectives on citizenship education*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Handwerker, W. (2001). *Quick ethnography*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Hargraves, S. (1999) Peace education: politics in the classroom? In R. Case and P. Clark (Eds) *The Canadian Anthology of Social Studies*. Vancouver: Pacific Educational Press
- Harris, I. Morrison, M. (2003). *Peace education*. North Carolina: MacFarland and Company, Inc.
- Heath, D. (1967). *Humanizing schools: New directions, new decisions*. New York: Hayden Book Company, Inc.
- Held, D. (2000). *A Globalised world? Culture, economics, politics*. London: Routledge.
- Hinchey, P. (2004). *Becoming a critical educator: Defining a classroom identity, designing a critical pedagogy*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Ichilov, O. (1998). *Citizenship and citizenship education in a changing world*. Oregon: The Woburn Press Portland.
- Jakubowski, M. (2001). Teaching uncomfortable topics: An action-oriented strategy for addressing racism and related forms of difference. *Teaching Sociology* (January) 29, (1) pp. 62-79.

- Kanu, Y (2005). *Does the integration of Native cultural knowledge into school curriculum increase school achievement for Native students? Preliminary results*. Paper presented at the AERA conference in Montreal, Canada. April, 2005.
- Kaye-Kantrowitz, M. (1992) *The Issue is power: Essays on women, Jews, violence and resistance*. California: Aunt Lute Foundation Books.
- Kimmel, R. (2000). Culture and conflict. In *The handbook of conflict resolution: Theory and practice*. (with M. Deutsch and P. Coleman) 453-474
- Kriesberg, L. (2003) *Constructive conflicts: From escalation to resolution*. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Lantieri, L. and Janet, P. (1996). *Waging peace in our schools*. Boston: Beacon.
- Lederach, J. (1995). *Preparing for peace: Conflict transformation across cultures*. New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Lederach, J. (1997). *Building peace: Sustainable reconciliation in divided societies*. Washington: United States Institute of Peace.
- Mackay, H. (2000). The Globalization of culture? *A globalizing world? Culture, economics, politics*. London: Routledge.
- Manitoba Education, Citizenship and Youth, (2003). *Kindergarten to grade 8 social studies: Manitoba curriculum framework of outcomes*.
- Marino, D. (1997). *Wild garden: Art, education and the culture of resistance*. Toronto: Between the Lines.
- May, S. (2003) Critical multiculturalism. In *Critical Theory and the Human Condition Founders and Praxis*. (with M. Peters, C. Lankshear, M. Olssen) (Eds) New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc. 199-212

- McLaren, P. (1997) Multiculturalism and the postmodern critique: Toward a Pedagogy of Resistance and Transformation. A. Halsey, H. Lauder, P. Brown, A Wells (Eds) *Education: Culture, Economy, Society*. New York: Oxford University Press. 520-538
- McNiff, J. Whitehead, J. (2002). *Action research: Principles and practice*. New York: Routledge/Falmer.
- Molnar, S. (1998) *Human variation: races, types, and ethnic groups*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Muhammed, B. (2004). *Journey to the Holy Land*. NCPCR/Network of Communities for Arizona: Peacemaking and Conflict Resolution, <http://www.apecemaker.net/journey.html>.
- Munoz, M. (2002.) *Early prevention of violence: The impact of a school-based program in social skills and conflict resolution learning*. Reports – evaluative (142), Jefferson County Public Schools.
- Ornstein, A, and Hunkins, F. (1998). *Curriculum foundations, principles, and issues*. Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.
- Osborne, K. (1995) *In Defence of history: Teaching the past and the meaning of democratic citizenship*. Toronto: Our Schools/Our Selves Education Foundation.
- Osborne, K. (1997). Citizenship Education and Social Studies. In I. Wright, A. Sears (Eds) *Trends and Issues in Canadian Social Studies. Trends and Issues in Canadian Social Studies* British Columbia: Pacific Educational Press.
- Peters, M. and Lankshear, C. (1996). Postmodern counternarratives. In H. Giroux, C. Lankshear, P. McLaren, M. Peters *Counternarratives: Cultural Studies and Critical Pedagogies in Postmodern Spaces*. New York: Routledge. 1-39

- Powers, S. and Price-Johnson, C. (2002). *Teens in action: In pursuit of peace curriculum*. Final evaluative report. Arizona: Creative Research Associates, Inc.
- Reardon, B. (2000). *Global responsibility: Teacher designed curriculum for peace education, K-12*. New York: Teacher's College Press.
- Rees, S. (2003). *Passion for peace: Exercising power creatively*. Sydney: University of New South Wales University, Ltd.
- Ross, M. (1993). *The management of conflict: Interpretations and interest in comparative perspective*. London: Yale University Press.
- Sandole, D. (1999). *Capturing the complexity of conflict: Dealing with violent ethnic conflicts of post-cold war era*. London: Pinter.
- Sharp, G. (2005). *Waging nonviolent struggle*. Boston: Extending Horizon Books.
- Slattery, P. (1995). *Curriculum development in the postmodern era: Critical educational practice*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Smith, S. and Fairman, D. (2005). The Integration of conflict resolution into the high school curriculum: The example of workable peace. In N. Noddings (Ed) *Educating Citizens for Global Awareness*. New York: Teachers College Columbia University. 40-55
- Stevahn, L., Johnson, D., Johnson R. (2002). Effects of conflict resolution training integrated into a high school social studies curriculum. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 142 (3), 305-331.
- Stephan, W. and Stephan, C. (2001). *Improving inter-group relations*. London: Sage Publications.
- Stringer, S. (2004). *Action research in education*. Ohio: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Tejeda, C. Espinoza, M. Gutierrez, K. (2003). Toward a decolonizing pedagogy: Social justice reconsidered. In P. Trifonas (Ed) *Pedagogies of Difference: Rethinking Education for Social Change*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Thompson, G. (2000). Economic globalization? *A globalizing world? Culture, economics, politics*. London: Routledge.

Trifonas, P. (Ed) (2003). *Pedagogies of difference: Rethinking education for social change*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Vaughan, G. (2001). *Democratic miseducation: Preparing students for democracies that do not exist*. (Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, San Francisco, CA, (August 30-Sept. 2)

Visano, L. and Jakubowski, L. (2002). *Teaching controversy*. Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing.

Werner, W. and Case, R. (1997). Themes of global education. In I. Wright and A. Sears (Eds) *Trends and Issues in Canadian Social Studies*. Vancouver: Pacific Educational Press. 90-