DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 480 127 TM 035 199

AUTHOR	Harris, Ian M.
TITLE	Peace Education Evaluation.
PUB DATE	2003-04-00
NOTE	28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 21-25, 2003).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Violence
IDENTIFIERS	*Peace Education

ABSTRACT

Peace education refers to formal school-based and informal community education programs that teach about the dangers of violence and alternatives to violence. This paper explains some problems associated with the evaluation of peace education programs. These problems include analyzing the multifaceted causes of violence and the complexities of strategies geared to reduce violence. Difficulties in constructing rigorous followup studies with participants in peace education programs make it hard to determine if graduates of those programs transfer their learning to the real world and act in ways that contribute to the creation of peaceful cultures. Peace educators should avoid extravagant claims that their efforts stop violence. The effectiveness of peace education cannot be judged by whether it brings peace to the world, but rather by the effect it has on students' thought patterns, attitudes, behaviors, values, and knowledge stock. (Contains 45 references.) (Author/SLD)

PEACE EDUCATION EVALUATION

Paper presented at AERA, Chicago, April 23, 2003

Ian M. Harris

Department of Educational Policy and Community Studies

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

P.O. Box 413

Milwaukee, WI 53201

imh@uwm.edu

Peace Education Evaluation

Abstract

'Peace education' refers to both formal school based and informal community education programs that teach about the dangers of violence and alternatives to violence. This presentation will explain some problems associated with evaluation of peace education programs. These problems include analyzing the multifaceted causes of violence and the complexities of strategies geared to reduce violence. Difficulties in constructing rigorous follow-up studies with participants in peace education programs make it hard to determine if graduates of those programs transfer their learning to the real world and act in ways that contribute to the creation of peaceful cultures. Peace educators should avoid extravagant claims that their efforts will stop violence. The effectiveness of peace education cannot be judged by whether it brings peace to the world, but rather by the effect it has upon students' thought patterns, attitudes, behaviors, values, and knowledge stock.

Peace Education Evaluation

> "The tests and exams normally used in schools are unsuitable for the evaluation of peace education outcomes, because they do not evaluate a state of mind, but rather the level of acquired knowledge." (Bar-Tal, 2002, p. 34)

Peace educators provide an awareness of the problems of violence and teach about the ability of peace strategies to alleviate violence. Education implies, at best, a change in consciousness. In most cases it implies learning facts and theories--information that may or may not result in a change in attitudes or a desire to work for peace. Even if peace educators persuade students about the dangers of violence and instill in them a desire to do something about those threats, students may have neither the will, the capacity, the knowledge, the skills, nor the power to take action that would result in a more peaceful world. Therefore peace educators face an important quandary: How can they best assess their effectiveness in bringing peace to the world?

For over 100 years enlightened educators have been practicing peace education in schools and community settings promoting values of planetary stewardship, global citizenship, and human relations (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993). In spite of their efforts and the activities of millions of people who have joined and actively supported peace movements during this past century, the world has grown more violent with ethnic and religious conflicts. Many well-meaning individuals who turn to peace education sense an increasing reliance on peace through strength strategies to manage human affairs and despair about the inability of humans to manage their conflicts with peacemaking and peace-building strategies. Feeling that their efforts will not been able to stem the flood of

militarism, they often become cynical about the prospects for peace. If they had a realistic sense of what their peace education efforts could achieve, they might take more satisfaction from their efforts.

This article will attempt to answer the question: What can and can't be provided from peace education evaluations? After a discussion of some of the pressure upon peace educators to produce valid assessments of their efforts, this article will summarize research on peace education evaluations, describe what can be expected of such evaluations, and discuss challenges associated with them.

Need for Evaluation of Peace Education

Pressure to prove that peace education activities reduce violence comes from many sources—from the educational research community, from policy makers, from taxpayers, and from the larger peace community.

The educational research community seeks to document new techniques for teachers that can improve instruction. Ever since the time of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act (1994), passed by the U.S. government that included as one of its goals, "Every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning," there has been considerable attention paid to educational efforts to reduce levels of youth violence in and outside schools (Burstyn, et al., 2001; Cassela, 2001; Elliot, Hamburg, & Williams, 1998). These efforts include violence prevention and peace-building strategies in schools (Gladden, 2002; DiGiulio, 2001; Harris, 2000). Evaluations of these efforts attempt to show that they are successful in reducing school violence and hence in providing a peaceful climate for learning.

Funders want to know if they are getting a 'bang for their bucks' (Church and Shouldice, 2003). Policy makers want to know: Is peace education an effective way to address problems of violence? This pressure for tangible results is felt increasingly as levels of civil violence rise in a society. In various cities in the United States community leaders and politicians have launched violence prevention programs to reduce youth violence. These efforts have included hiring more police (a peace through strength strategy) and developing emergency security plans for schools (Vestermark, 1996). Peace education programs in schools and community centers aim to reduce youth violence (Catalano, R. et al., 1998; Prothrow-Stith, 1991). These efforts in combination have been producing lower levels of street crime in some cities (Braga, A., Kennedy, D., Waring, E., and Phiehl, A., 2001). The problem is in demonstrating that peace education activities helped produce these improvements.

The peace research community is also interested in peace education evaluation to understand how educational efforts contribute to reducing violence and building peaceful societies. The problem with providing clear statements about the efficacy of peace education has to do with the level of analysis. Is violence (or peace) caused by educational programs, government policies, media exposure, cultural and community norms, or individual behavior? The answer, of course, is all of the above and many other factors determine whether or not a person or a group of people become violent or peaceful. In order to provide valid research about the effects of peace education, peace educators have to demonstrate how their activities contribute to constructing a culture of peace.

Brief Summary of Research

Baruch Nevo and Iris Brem (2002) in a comprehensive review of peace education (PE) literature from 1981-2000 found 79 studies that attempted to measure peace education program effectiveness. The majority of these demonstrated that they were effective. However these authors did notice the following shortcomings of these studies:

A) "Not enough attention is given to behavior."

B) "The majority of PE programs appeal to rationality."

C) "Delayed posttest is important; nevertheless, it is very rare in PE research."

D) "generalizability of the program onto related individuals was hardly studied." (p. 274, 275)

They concluded their study by noting, "80%-90% of the programs are effective/partially effective. This is an encouraging picture." (p. 276) Most evaluations of peace education programs have not reported adequately on the results upon their students, the communities they inhabit, and the broader problems of violence that these programs seek to address.

In discussing evaluations of peace education programs this article will use a broader definition than that used by Baruch and Nevo who used the descriptor 'peace education' in searching data bases to review PE evaluations. Peace education takes many different forms that may not have been included in the Baruch and Nevo study. For example, there is a large developing literature about conflict resolution education programs in schools.[1] Other forms of peace education include development education, environment education, violence prevention education, global studies, human rights

education, and nonviolence education (Harris, 1999). Many of the studies conducted under the heading 'conflict resolution education' focus on evaluations of programs designed to reduce conflicts in schools. Peace education programs have a broader focus on the sources of violence that exist outside schools.

There are considerable differences between quantitative and qualitative approaches to peace education evaluation. Quantitative studies use control groups and sampling techniques to determine what a group of people have learned as a result of instruction. Qualitative studies typically study in depth a small number of participants and interview them or observe them to see what impact instruction has had upon their behavior. Quantitative studies have for a long time demonstrated the benefits of school based conflict resolution education upon children (Grossman, Neckerman, and Koepsell, 1997; Johnson, Johnson, and Dudley, 1992; Metis Associates, Inc., 1990). In general these programs decrease aggression among children, reduce bullying in schools, and motivate children to achieve in schools.

Several researchers have demonstrated that conflict resolution in schools has improved the capacity of students to handle conflict nonviolently, their relationship with peers, and their attachment to school. (Bickmore, 2002; Johnson & Johnson, 1996). The most extensive evaluation of a conflict resolution program in schools conducted with thousands of children in the New York City public schools showed a decrease in discipline problems with children who received instruction within a Resolving Conflict Creatively Program (R.C.C.P.) compared to their peers who did not get the instruction (Roderick, 1998). These studies define peace education in a narrow way: Does it have positive effects upon the behavior of children in schools? While it is valuable for

teachers to know that conflict resolution education has positive benefits for children, these studies do not evaluate the long-term effects of this instruction upon the behavior of students to see if their actions promote peace and hence reduce levels of violence in the larger society. As Joan Burstyn (2001) has pointed out:

> Violence in schools mirrors the violence in society and is exacerbated by the availability of guns, urban and rural poverty, drug and alcohol abuse, suburban anomie, and the media's celebration of violence. Each of these must be addressed if people want to end violence. (p. 225)

Peace education evaluation is more complicated than conflict resolution education because peace educators hope to contribute to 'peace writ large.'[2]

In depth qualitative studies of the effects of peace education are hard to find. One study about an intentional peace community established in a Jewish-Palestinian village in Israel (Feuerverger, 2001) discovered that a comprehensive approach to learning about each other's different language and culture can help to reduce enemy images, but such feelings of empathy are influenced strongly by current events, so that hostilities that erupt in places like the Middle East can affect attitudes that are acquired in peace education classes.

Very little summative research on the effects of peace education classes has been conducted. According to one study by William Ekhardt (1984) peace education itself does not produce changes in personality that might result in more peaceful behavior. Such changes in personality might lead to more compassion and less fatalism. This study (with a very small group of twelve students) does show attitude changes in the areas of ideology, morality, and philosophy.

Peace educators can evaluate their students before and after instruction to determine if students have adopted new attitudes as a result of instruction. Michael Van Slyck and Marilyn Stern (1991) have demonstrated that it is possible to measure students' attitudes about conflict before and after an educational intervention to see if their attitudes change, but these studies do not demonstrate that the behavior of individuals has actually changed. Ian Harris has conducted several studies of peace education evaluations using quantitative and qualitative methods (Harris, 1995; Harris and Callender, 1995; Harris and Jeffries, 1998). In them he found that a holistic approach to peace education is more effective than a piecemeal approach.

In summary, there have been very few rigorous quantitative or qualitative evaluations of peace education efforts. Most of those that have occurred have been school based, demonstrating that as a result of lessons on peace students have different attitudes and/or understandings. These studies are not longitudinal and fail to demonstrate whether or not individuals exposed to new ways of thinking about peace strive to address the many complex sources of violence in their lives. The rest of this paper will try to explain why these endeavors cannot rigorously assuage the concerns of those who want to know how effective peace education is. This discussion will include an explanation of what realistically might be accomplished from evaluations of peace education programs.

Complications

Evaluations of the ability of peace education activities to produce peaceful behaviors, norms, institutions, and policies are trying to grasp extremely complicated phenomenon. The creation of peace is complex.[3] For example, consider the extensive

anti-nuclear educational efforts that took place around the world in the 1980s. College courses, street demonstrations, and considerable community education efforts attempted to educate people about the threat of nuclear weapons and tried to influence policy makers to reduce their reliance upon deterrence theory. Political actions such as reducing nuclear stockpiles, passing of a comprehensive test ban treaty, and decreasing cold war hostilities seem to indicate that these efforts were successful. However, these changes in policies could be due to the personalities of Ronald Reagan and Michael Gorbachov, who were heads of the United States and the Soviet Union at that time. They might also have been caused by economic considerations, where politicians were concerned about the cost of producing nuclear weapons. How could it be proved that changes in nuclear policy were due to peace education activities?

Peace educators teach about peace, such a complicated aspect of human behavior that it is hard to structure valid evaluations: "Peace education needs to be based on a holistic approach. Consequently, knowledge, values, attitudes, and behavior should go hand in hand." (Bjerstedt, 2002). There are many different aspects to peace learning that vary from an understanding of international relations to the ability to be compassionate. These include attitudes like tolerance and empathy, and knowledge of peacekeeping, peacemaking, and peace-building strategies, conflict resolution skills, strategies for ecological sustainability, etc. 'Peace' acquires different meanings as strategies for peace adjust to different conflicts that vary in their scope from international to civil to domestic. There are positive (presence of democracy, economic well-being, sustainability, and human rights) and negative aspects (cessation of violence) to peace (Galtung, 1969).

'Peace' has different meanings within the spheres in which peaceful processes are applied (Groff, 2002). There is a difference between inner and outer peace. Inner peace concerns a state of being and thinking about others, for example, holding them in reverence; while outer peace processes apply to the natural environment, politics, culture, international relations, civic communities, families, and individuals. Within each one of these spheres it can have different meanings, e.g., within the international sphere it is often construed to be balance of power. In conducting evaluations, peace educators have to be clear about their objectives. What types of violence are they trying to address and what peaceful outcomes do they hope to achieve?

With peace education, it's difficult to demonstrate the instrumentality of a particular act of instruction, e.g. does that educational activity contribute to 'peace writ large?' Let's assume that one student in a peace education class afterwards works for peace. Is that due to what the instructor did, or was it caused by that student observing the behavior of the student's peace activist parents, or was the main reason that person acted peacefully because she was religious and believed in following the tenets of her spiritual beliefs? What about the other students who did nothing that reflected upon their instruction in the ways of peace? Does their inactivity negate the worth of the instructor whose one student became an activist? Different people respond to peace education instruction in different ways.

Peace educators in schools have a hard time developing rigorous studies to validate their efforts. Ideally such studies would compare a group of students who had received peace education training with a comparison group that didn't, but such studies are hard to carry out in schools for many reasons: 1) They require pre and post tests,

access to school records, and to classrooms. Researchers have to get permission from schools, the teachers, and parents in order to conduct research on minors. 2) In countries where children are mobile, it's hard to find the same subjects to gather follow-up data. 3) Comparison groups are hard to control. Two samples of students may appear similar, but their participation in peace education learning can be influenced by a wide variety of factors, including parent beliefs, religious upbringing, previous experiences with conflict resolution education and external levels of hostility—factors over which teachers have no control. Subtle and dramatic exposure to violence and/or experiences with peace inside and outside the classroom would also influence how well students responded to peace instruction. 4) Such studies are expensive and there is little money available for peace education research. These many obstacles to conducting valid evaluations of peace education instruction make it hard for peace educators to satisfy the expectations of educational policy makers—school boards, principals, and superintendents--to verify the value of educational approaches to resolving conflict.

Questions of teacher effectiveness raise the specter of educational evaluation Teachers do not cause students to do anything. They plant seeds in pupils' minds and cannot know whether or not those seeds will develop into plants that ultimately bear fruits. 'To bear a fruit' for a peace educator would be to have a student become peaceful and so concerned about the fate of the earth that the student does something to make the world more peaceful; however, teachers cannot follow their students around to see whether they initiate efforts to bring peace to the world. Therefore, they cannot evaluate the effectiveness of their work by seeing whether their students become peace activists or the world grows more peaceful. Presumably we want peace studies to contribute toward

peace and less war, but peace educators seldom if ever have any control over world events such as war and peace. The most we can do, as a general rule is to influence the minds of students who attend classes. (Lazlo, 1974, p. 84) Teachers should evaluate themselves according to more immediate criteria. What effect has their teaching had upon their students' minds? Do their students understand various peace issues or can they demonstrate that they have acquired peaceful skills?

Even if a peace educator effectively motivates students to work for peace and those students follow through on those commitments, such actions may not produce results for many years. Because any such changes in the world may take years to come about, peace education does not appear to be an effective way to stop the immediate threats of war.

What Can be Done?

Peace education evaluation tries to determine the extent to which a peace education program (p) within a context (x) entailing a particular type of instruction (i) attains an outcome (o).[4] Program evaluation should establish criteria for assessing success or failure that will provide feedback. Evaluators of peace education programs can evaluate the goals of those programs. Do they explain the roots of conflict and hence lay out the problems of violence strategically, so that those studying conflict see new ways to address problems of violence? Is the intervention proposed by educators based upon an adequate analysis of the conflict? Is it realistic? In such a way evaluators can see if the goals of peace education programs are appropriate, both in terms of pupils' needs and in terms of peace theory.

Peace educators conduct both formative and summative evaluations of peace education programs. Formative evaluations evaluate the context within which a peace education program takes place. Formative evaluations concerning the delivery of a peace education program determine what activities were conducted, whom the intervention reached, number of participants, number of meetings, etc., and whether or not the goals of the education project were achieved. Was the project completed? Did it reflect appropriate use of resources that fit the capacity of the organization doing the instruction? Such evaluations can use quantitative and qualitative means to assess learner satisfaction with a particular peace education program. Formative evaluations of peace education programs operations can lead to program improvement.

Summative peace education evaluation tries to document the impact of peace education instruction upon pupils. It addresses such questions as: "Are pupils more peaceful as a result of this instruction?" "Do they have knowledge of alternatives to violence?" "Are their attitudes more tolerant towards others?" "Have they been striving to produce peace?" Peace educators can look to their students to see if they have developed new beliefs about economic well-being, sustainability, peace strategies, and justice as a result of their teaching endeavors. Do they have new ways of thinking about enemies? Whether or not these students actually work to promote changes in the world is another question. Peace educators cannot control all the complex variables that may contribute to whether or not a particular student works for peace (the action component).

Formative peace education evaluation can always look at the types of instruction involved in peace education programs, evaluating both the teachers' and the students' language, the pedagogy, and the appropriateness of peace instruction. How does the

teacher talk about peace? Does that teacher use peaceful words, or does the instructor use violent terms of speech, like 'stick to your guns.' Does the instructor bring into peace instruction uncritically violent cultural myths that glorify slaughter? Peace education pedagogy should entail cooperative instruction, where pupils in small groups are exploring the various problems of violence they face. Because everybody has experiences with violence, students have important insights to contribute in how to reduce it. A peace education classroom should therefore be inclusive and democratic, so that diverse viewpoints are heard and respected:

Evaluators can look at a particular peace education program to see if it reflects local cultural norms about peace. Are peace educators able to make connections between the micro and the macro level of conflict analysis? A popular peace slogan is, "Think globally, act locally!" Do the goals of that program reflect the full scope of the problem(s) of violence addressed in that program?

Formative peace education evaluation can look to determine if the lessons taught about peace are age appropriate. During the 1980s peace educators were very careful not to frighten young people with devastating scenarios brought about by the wholesale use of weapons of mass destruction. Young people have more immediate concerns about violence that peace educators should be addressing rather than abstract aspects of peace theory more appropriate to a college classroom. Likewise, community members in adult forums focused on problems of violence want practical solutions to their concerns. Individuals have different ideas about peace and different notions about how to achieve security. Peace education content should allow for these differing perspectives to surface and be debated in peace education instruction.

Peace education evaluators can also look to see if peace educators are practicing critical thinking skills in their lessons. Peace education instruction should not present just one point of view and advocate for a particular solution. People within a conflict have different notions of peace. Does a peace education activity account for different perspectives? "Even though their objectives may be similar, each society will set up a different form of peace education that is dependent on the issues at large, conditions, and culture, as well as the views and creativity of the educators" (Bar-Tal, 2002, p. 35). The creation of peace is often controversial. Do peace education programs encourage students to see conflicts from contradictory points of view? Peace education programs should present a variety of responses to conflict, known in peace theory as peacekeeping, peacemaking, and peace-building strategies, and let students evaluate which are most appropriate for the particular conflict under discussion.

A further consideration for evaluating peace education instruction has to do with moral sensitivity:

> When peace educators involve their students in group projects, students can learn to make choices both with a view of what is good for themselves, as well as what is good for the group. Developing feelings of responsibility for others in learning can become the basis of moral thinking. (Harris & Morrison, 2003, p. 218)

A fundamental assumption of peace educators is the intrinsic value of all living beings and preserving the integrity of natural systems. Their instruction should focus on important values like caring and compassion, allowing students to reflect upon the intrinsic value of all living creatures. Empathy allows students in intractable conflicts to

understand the reality of enemy perspectives. To understand the complexity of war and peace requires students to delve deeply into the values that undergird social organizations. By confronting the real life decisions that cause violence, peace educators enable deep reflection upon the human condition. In spite of the omnipotence of conflict, peace educators can emphasize that humans have a choice about how to behave—and can follow moral precepts to guide their behavior.

Peace education evaluators can use summative evaluations to assess the outcomes of peace education instruction. They can test students to see what knowledge they have acquired and what skills they have learned. This, of course, is best determined by pre-intervention and post- intervention comparisons. Here peace education evaluations are concerned with the cognitive goals of peace education instruction. Much harder to determine are the affective, dispositional, and behavioral outcomes.

Indicators of success can help peace educators conduct summary evaluations. In the United States common indicators for school-based violence prevention and conflict resolution education programs are numbers of suspensions, expulsions, and referrals to the principal's office, etc. (Hunter, Elias & Norris, 2001). If these indicators decrease, that alternative dispute resolution program is said to be successful. In evaluating dialogue groups peace researchers look to the number of friendships developed between members of antagonistic groups (Pettigrew, 1998).

Indicators of success for community based peace education programs include: Were any new agreements reached subsequent to the instruction? Were there any observable changes in climate surrounding the conflict? Did people respond differently to the conflict after the peace education intervention? Were the peace proponents engaged

over time in trying to address the conflict? Did the educational program lead to institutional solutions and a linking dynamic where people concerned about the problems reached out to others to seek solutions?

Summative evaluations of peace education programs provide feedback about the impact of these programs. Evaluators can look at some of the indicators presented above or they can look to see what knowledge and skills have been acquired as a result of instruction. These kinds of evaluations can help determine whether or not pupils have changed their attitudes about war and peace issues. They fail to show whether or not those changes in attitudes will lead to changes in beliefs, which in turn will lead to changes in behavior that might result in changes in policies and institutions that cause violence (McCauley, 2002). Summative peace education programs can document cognitive changes, but loose their predictive validity in trying to assess emotions, dispositions, and behaviors that may occur as a result of peace education instruction.

Teachers can control both the information given students and the manner in which it is presented. Peace educators can evaluate at the end of educational programs whether students have acquired knowledge about the roots of violence and strategies for peace. The effectiveness of peace education, therefore, cannot be judged by whether it brings peace to the world, but rather by the effect it has upon students' thought patterns, attitudes, behaviors, values, and knowledge stock.

Discussion

In order to avoid frustrations about the lack of their direct ability to make the world more peaceful, peace educators have to understand the complex nature of their endeavors. They sow seeds that may germinate in the future to produce new levels of

peace strategies and degrees of consciousness about the problems of violence that plague human existence. In teaching about peace and violence they take one small step towards creating a less violent world, and they should appreciate the importance of that step. Apropos is a Buddhist saying that a journey of a thousand miles starts with the first step. Peace educators may not be changing the social structures that support violence, but they are attempting to build a peace consciousness that is a necessary condition for creating a more peaceful world.

A particular student, stimulated by a peace course, who talks to his/her friends or family, might provoke others to think more carefully about the commitment to militarism that governs political affairs. Often students who take peace education classes become peace educators themselves by organizing forums on war and peace issues. When these forums stimulate others to think about different peace strategies, they create a ripple effect, where people who learn new knowledge share their insights, and the message spreads. These activities lie outside the control of the original peace educator who started this chain of events, but the important point is: If that educator had not had the courage to denounce the violent state of the world, none of those people subsequently affected by that peace message may have ever been challenged to think about alternatives to violence.

Peace educators make important contributions to peace by building upon the peaceful instincts of students and creating a space for discussion of the problems of violence. These educational efforts are not a sufficient condition for achieving peace, but they are necessary. People's traditional patterns and ways of thinking need to be challenged in order to overcome the culture of violence that dominates world.

In a computer age peace education takes on exciting global dimensions as peace educators link up with colleagues in distant parts of the planet. Internet-based peace education activities can help create the kind of consciousness described by Teilhard de Chardin (1965) --where people become aware of planetary limitations, and where individuals reach out to others across national and ethnic boundaries. Hence peace educators share with their students a global awareness about the complex problems of violence and a consciousness of alternatives to violence. Without that consciousness, we are all doomed (as Hobbes predicted) to wars, pestilence, and struggles for resources.

> If the world is to move away from the brink of terror, then new approaches, new combinations of reality, new risks must occur. Higher education should play a vital role in the evolution of such an imaginative spirit. (Dwyer, 1984, p. 318)

Education for peace has to build a belief in the future by creating a sense of hope that the world will be less violent and a sense of value for the differences that peace educators bring about through creating a peace consciousness.[5] Peace educators use their professional skills to contribute to a dialogue to create a safer world. They may not see immediate results, but they have to appreciate the importance of taking that first step, of doing something about the violent threats that dominate modern life, and of using their training to build a consensus for peace.

> Peace education does not pretend radically to change the pupils' attitudes in the course of a few lessons. It considers itself as one of the factors on a long-term process of transforming ways of thinking. And it will only produce any real effect if an attitude of international solidarity is

advocated by politicians or at any rate by important and influential groups within society. (Bartelds, 1984, p. 308)

Political action will be necessary to change human behavior from reliance on violent means to settle disputes, and resolve conflicts. Peace educators may at some time participate in peace movement activities or support particular causes, but as educators, they should focus primarily on teaching activities, appreciating the importance of educating others to help build the consensus that will provide a breeding ground for a sustainable future.

Peace educators are, therefore, engaged in a frustrating enterprise. They teach about human rights but still abuses occur. They provide knowledge about positive interpersonal communication but still partners batter each other. They warn about the dangers of war but still wars erupt throughout this planet. Living in a violent world, they teach peace education courses because they want to make the world less violent, but the most they can do is provide knowledge about peace strategies and/or change some students' attitudes or dispositions towards violence:

> The prospects for peace education are thus not very encouraging. The patterns of violence in the international system, in individual societies, and in the minds of people are so ingrained that one needs to have a kind of neurotic stubbornness to hold fast to the concept of peace. Sigmund Freud once depicted the weakness of reason in the face of madness, unreasonableness, and the superiority of instincts. Yet, as he indicated, there is something special about this weakness: 'The voice of the intellect is low, but it doesn't rest until it is heard. Finally, after countless repeated

> impulses, it is heard. This is one of the few points where one may be optimistic for the future of mankind.' Education for peace can and must trust this low voice of reason. (Ekhardt, 1984, p. 79-80)

Peace educators resemble prophets from classical Greek drama, crying out against the madness of violence and human slaughter, who are often ignored. They may never know if their efforts have an effect on 'peace writ large.' Seeing threats to the world, they predict doom and are denounced as being crazy, utopian, or unrealistic. They disseminate the findings of peace researchers about how to create a more peaceful world. Research advances a body of ideas that may or may not become part of public policy. Insights gained from peace research can provide information that might develop important strategies to create alternatives to violent policies pursued by individuals, groups, institutions, and nation-states. However, whether those strategies ever become official policy remains a function of political activity not controlled by peace educators.

Conclusions

This world will not become more peaceful until citizens develop a moral revulsion to current violent practices and the will to change reality in more peaceful directions. Education, by influencing students' attitudes and ideas about peace, can help create in human consciousness values that will lead to a more peaceful future. Peace educators can provide knowledge about the roots of violence and different strategies for peace. They can contribute to students' attitudes about conflict. Formative evaluations can determine the appropriateness and quality of peace education lessons and how they can be improved. Summative evaluations can help determine what knowledge and skills have been learned as a result of instruction.

Bringing peace to this world is a complex activity that ranges in scope from political leaders negotiating arms agreements to lovers amicably settling disputes. Influencing community and school-based politics seems outside the classroom realm. Peace educators have certain cognitive and affective goals for their students, but they should avoid extravagant claims that their efforts will stop violence. Teachers may want their students to become aware of the role of violence their lives, but awareness does not necessarily lead to action. What happens as a result of a particular instructional act is quite outside a teacher's control. The activities of educators do not seem so much to be changing political structures as creating both a belief system and a way of life that embraces peace. Building such beliefs and skills may be a necessary condition for building a culture of peace. They help tear down enemy images and forge a consensus against the use of violence.

Notes

[1] For a review of this literature see *Does It Work: The Case for Conflict Resolution in Our Nation's Schools* (Jones and Kmitta, 2000)

[2] The broader impact of peace education programs (peace writ large) refers to "peace in the big picture or overall situation in the country." (Church and Shouldice, 2002, p. 38)

[3] For an interesting discussion of the many aspects of peace see: *The art of peace* Nobel laureates discuss human rights, conflict, and reconciliation (Hopkins, 2000)

[4] I am indebted to Professor Gavriel Salomon from the Center for Research on Peace Education at Haifa University for this formulation.

[5] For a description of future studies see: *Youth Futures: Comparative Research and Transformation Visions*, (Gidley and Inayatullah, 2002) or *Educating beyond Violent Futures* (Hutchinson, 1996).

References

Bar-Tal, D. (2002). The elusive nature of peace education. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo (Eds.), *Peace education: The concept, principles, and practices around the world.* (pp. 27-36). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bartelds, C. (1984). Peace education and solidarity. *Gandhi Marg, 6*(4,5), 306-315.

Bickmore, K. (2002). Good training is not enough: Research on peer mediation program implementation. In I. Harris (Ed.), *Social alternatives: Peace education for a new century* (special edition), 21(1), 33-38.

Bjerstedt, A. (2002). *Peace education and teacher training.* Malmo, Sweden: School of Education.

Braga, A., Kennedy, D. M., Waring, E., & Phiel, A. (2001). Problem-oriented policing, deterrence, and youth violence: An examination of Boston's operation ceasefire. *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency, 38*(3), 195-227.

Burstyn, J. (2001). The challenge for schools: To prevent violence while nurturing democracy. In J. Burstyn, G. Bender, R. Cassella, H. Gordon, D. Guerra, K. Luschen, R. Stevens & K. Williams (Eds.), *Preventing violence in schools: A challenge to American democracy.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Burstyn, J., Bender, G., Cassella, R., Gordon, H., Guerra, D., Luschen, K., Stevens, R., & Williams, K. (2001). *Preventing violence in schools: A challenge to American democracy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Casella, R. (2001). *"Being down:" Challenging violence in urban schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Catalano, P., Arthur, M., Hawkins, D., Berglund, L., & Olsen, J. (1998). Comprehensive community- and school-based interventions to prevent anti-social behavior. In R. Loeber & D. Farrington (Eds.), *Serious and violent juvenile offenders* (pp. 248-283). Thousand Oaks: CA.

Church, C., & Shouldice, J. (2002). *The evaluation of conflict resolution interventions: Framing the state of play*. Londonderry, Northern Ireland: INCORE International Conflict Research.

Church, C., & Shouldice, J. (2003). *The evaluation of conflict resolution interventions part II: Emerging practice and theory*. Londonderry, Northern Ireland: INCORE International Conflict Research.

De Chardin, T. (1965). *The phenomenology of man*. New York: Harper Colophon Books.

DiGiulio, R. C. (2001). *Educate, medicate, or litigate? What teachers, parents, and administrators must do about student behavior*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Dwyer, J. A. (1984, August). The catholic bishops' peace pastoral and higher education. *Harvard Educational Review, 54*(3), 315-328.

Ekhardt, W. (1984). Peace studies and attitude change: A value theory of peace studies. *Peace and Change, 10*(2), 75-85.

Elliott, D., Hamburg, H., & Williams, K. (1998). *Violence in American schools*. New York: Cambridge.

Feuerverger, G. (2001). *Oasis of dreams: Teaching and learning in a Jewish-Palestinian village in Israel*. New York: Routledge Falmer.

Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research 6*(3), 167-191.

Gidley, J., & Inayatullah, S. (2002). *Youth futures: Comparative research and transformation visions*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Gladden, M. R. (2002). Reducing school violence: Strengthening student programs and addressing the role of school organizations. In W. G. Secada (Ed.), *Review of research in education, 2002*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Groff, L. (2002). A holistic view of peace education. In I. Harris, (Ed.), *Social Alternatives: Peace education for a new century* (special edition) 21 (1), 7-10.

Grossman, D., Neckerman, J., & Koepsell, T. (1997). The effectiveness of a violence prevention curriculum among children in elementary school: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 227*(20), 1605-1611.

Harris, I. (1995). Teachers' response to conflict in selected Milwaukee schools. In Horst Ledgren (Ed.), *Peace education and human development* (pp. 197-219). Lund, Sweden: Department of Educational and Psychological Research.

Harris, I., & Callender, A. (1995). Comparative study of peace education approaches and their effectiveness. *The NAMTA Journal*, *20*(2), 133-145.

Harris, I., & Jeffries, R. (1998). Coding the climate: Using peace education in an urban middle school. *Middle School Journal*, *30*(2): 56–64.

Harris, I. (1999) Types of peace education. In A. Raviv, L. Oppeheimer, abd D. Bar-Tal (Eds.) *How children understand war and peace*. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Harris, I. (2000). Peace-building responses to school violence. *NAASP Bulletin*, *84*(614), 5-24.

Harris, I., & Morrison, M. (2003). *Peace education* (2nd edition). Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company.

Hopkins, J. (2000) *The art of peace: Nobel laureates discuss human rights, conflict reconciliation* Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion Press.

Hunter, L., Elias, M. J., & Norris, J. (2001). School-based violence prevention: Challenges and lessons learned from an action research project. *Journal of School Psychology, 39*, 161-175.

Hutchinson, F. (1996). *Educating beyond violent futures*. London: Routledge.

Johnson, D., & Johnson, R. (1996). Conflict resolution and peer mediation programs in elementary and secondary schools: A review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, *66*(4), 459-506.

Johnson, D., Johnson, R. T., & Dudley B. (1992). Effects of peer medication training on elementary students. *Mediation Quarterly, 10*(1), 89-97.

Jones. T. & Kmitta, D. *Does it work? The case for conflict resolution in our nation's schools*. (Washington, D.C.: Crenet).

Lazlo, E. (1974). *A strategy for the future.* New York: Brazillier.

McCauley, C. (2002). Head first versus feet first in peace education. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo (Eds.), *Peace education: The concept, principles, and practices around the world* (pp. 347-358). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Metis Associates, Inc. (1990). *The resolving conflict creatively program, 1988-1989: A summary of recent findings.* New York: Metis and Associates.

Nevo, B., & Brem, I. (2002). Peace education programs and the evaluation of their effectiveness. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo (Eds.), *Peace education: The concept, principles, and practices around the world* (pp. 271-282). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. In J. T. Spence, J. M. Darley & D. J. Foss (Eds.), *Annual review of psychiatry,*(49) 65-85.

Prothrow-Stith, D. (1991). *Deadly consequences: How violence is destroying our teenage population and a plan to begin solving the problem.* New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

Public Law 103-227. (1994). *Goals 2000: Educate America Act*. 20 USC 5801.

Roderick, T. (1998). Evaluating the resolving conflict creatively program. *The Fourth R, 82*, 1-9.

Stomfay-Stitz, A. M. (1993). *Peace education in America, 1828-1990: Sourcebook for education and research*. Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press.

Van Slyck, M., & Stern, M. (1991). Conflict resolution in educational settings: Assessing the impact of peer mediation programs. *Community mediation: A handbook for practitioners and researchers.* New York: Guilford Press.

Vestermark, S. D. (1996). Critical decisions, critical elements in an effective school security program. In A. Hoffman (Ed.), *Schools, violence, and society* (pp. 101-122). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

TM035199

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC Educational Resources Information Center

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Peace Education Evaluation	
Author(s): Ian M. Harris	
Corporate Source: University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: Ian M. Harris	Printed Name/Position/Title: Ian M. Harris Professor
Organization/Address: Dept. of Educational Policy & Community Studies, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee P.O. Box 413, Milwaukee, WI 53201	Telephone: (414) 229-2326 FAX: (414) 229-3700
	E-Mail Address: imh@uwm.edu Date: 8/6/03

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

University of Maryland
ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation
1129 Shriver Lab, Bldg 075
College Park, MD 20742
Attn: Acquisitions

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

University of Maryland
ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation
1129 Shriver Lab, Bldg 075
College Park, MD 20742
Attn: Acquisitions