



# The Communication Discipline and Peace Education: A Valuable Intersection for Disrupting Violence in Communication Centers

Victoria McDermott, Cortney Smith, and Amy May

**Keywords:** interdisciplinary; peace education; communication pedagogy; educational violence; resource centers

**Abstract:** Violence is a significant issue impacting the physical, mental, social, and economic health of our learning communities. For decades the discipline of peace education has explored the effects of nonphysical violence on students and educators, as well as ways to create more peaceful, less violent, and equitable educational practices. While communication frameworks have been used in peace education research, no research found has theorized the potential value of peace education for the communication discipline. Using the contextual background of communication centers, this piece seeks to disrupt steadfast norms and practices within communication centers from the perspective of peace education. We provide an overview of the field of peace education and explicate opportunities within the communication discipline to use peace education frameworks, theory, and practice to develop pedagogies of renewal and close with practical recommendations for communication centers going forward.

*A violent structure leaves marks not only on the human body but also on the mind and the spirit.*  
(Galtung, 1990, p. 294)

Violence is “a significant public health problem,” impacting the physical, mental, social, and economic health of our communities (Rutherford et al., 2007, p. 676). While often framed within the context of the intentional use of force or power against an individual or group, violence does not have to be a physical

Victoria McDermott, University of Alaska Fairbanks, Fairbanks, AK  
Cortney Smith, Oberlin College, Oberlin, OH  
Amy May, University of Alaska Fairbanks, Fairbanks, AK  
CONTACT: [vmmcdermott@alaska.edu](mailto:vmmcdermott@alaska.edu)

act to affect an individual or group negatively. Marginalized and disenfranchised populations endure the ancestral trauma of collective violence, “the instrumental use of violence by people who identify themselves as members of a group . . . against another group or set of individuals, in order to achieve political, economic or social objectives” (Zwi et al., 2002, p. 215). Slavery, the massacre of Native and Indigenous peoples, and the internment of Japanese Americans during WWII are examples of collective violence that still plague our society and limit equal access and opportunity for entire cultural groups, including access to higher education and the ability to achieve educational goals within a structurally oppressive system designed to exclude them.

For decades peace education has explored the effects of nonphysical violence, including the legacy of collective violence and the resulting cultural trauma, on students and educators in the classroom. Recent scholarship (Ladva, 2020; May & McDermott, 2021), popular press (Barber et al., 2020; Ezarik, 2021; Sangaramoorthy & Richardson, 2020), and activism (Academics for Black Survival, n.d.; GLSEN, n.d.) underscore the pervasive nature of violence in our educational systems and the need for inclusive strategies. For the communication discipline specifically, communication centers offer a starting point for challenging long-standing oppressive pedagogical practices that impact the entire campus community (Fotsch, 2008). Within the field of peace education, Ladson-Billings (1995) argues for full programmatic reform, a disruption to the system. This is the perspective in which this piece is positioned: disruption. Building upon recent scholarship that has ignited the conversation regarding the absence of Black Language in the communication center (Ladva, 2020) and questioned the invisibility of Indigenous learners through Western public speaking practices (May & McDermott, 2021), this piece continues the conversation to disrupt steadfast White Mainstream English (WME) values promoted within communication centers and the institutions in which they are situated. Moreover, since little scholarship has explored the intersection of the communication discipline and the field of peace education, this piece highlights future directions for enhancing educational practices and scholarship through the intersection of communication and peace education.

Starting with an overview of the field of peace education, this article argues the value of intersecting the communication and peace education disciplines. We then explore the ways in which communication centers may perpetuate structural and cultural violence within their policies and practices. The piece closes with recommendations for communication centers to begin disrupting and dismantling violence and racism through pedagogy practice and training.

## **Situating the Authors**

Disruption challenges educators to confront a version of reality (Berger & Luckmann, 1967) steeped in colonialism and dominated by White mainstream norms and values. Across the United States (U.S.), university faculty and administrators remain predominantly White (roughly 75%) (Davis & Fry, 2019) as student populations continue to grow in all aspects of diversity. Within the communication discipline specifically, White masculinity remains at the center of research, practice, and pedagogy (Chakravartty et al., 2018), and underrepresented faculty are often tasked with doing the “work” associated with diversity and belonging, creating additional burden and trauma (Flaherty, 2019a). As White, cis-gender, heteronormative scholars committed to disruption, the authors recognize their privilege and power while inviting their peers to critically reflect on their scholarship to create space for different ways of knowing. As educators and practitioners, we seek to disrupt our practice through continuing education, research, and National Communication Association (NCA) membership in caucuses and divisions that help us

---

further understand the experiences of students and peers working in predominantly White spaces. Perhaps most importantly, we embrace failure and recognize our students as partners in disruption.

## Literature Review

### What Is Peace Education?

Communication scholars have a rich history of integrating communication pedagogy with complementary disciplines to develop scholarship and practice. Goodboy (2018) highlighted the value of using instructional communication scholarship and communication pedagogy in tandem with diverse disciplines for providing educators with micro (i.e., communication pedagogy) and macro (i.e., instructional communication) perspectives for understanding the communication courses they teach. Danielson (2018) explores the potential value of engaging in the principles of good Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) practice to elucidate communication pedagogy expansions and practical applications at the (inter)national level. As we continue to find value in the intersection of disciplines, one field with immeasurable potential for disrupting oppressive communication pedagogy is peace education.

Peace education scholarship considers “content, processes, and educational structures that seek to dismantle various forms of violence, as well as move toward broader cultures of peace, justice, and human rights” (Hantzopoulos & Bajaj, 2021, p. 1). Peace education has grown in the last several decades from the margins of educational policy into mainstream educational practices and scholarship (for a full review of peace education history see Hantzopoulos & Bajaj, 2021; Lum, 2021). Scholars have characterized the field as wide-ranging, viewing it as a “vehicle both to undo violence in its various forms (e.g., direct, cultural, and structural) and to build conditions for sustainable peace” (Hantzopoulos & Bajaj, 2021, p. 16). As defined by Hantzopoulos & Bajaj (2021), peace education “considers how practice, theory, and pedagogy combine to develop the necessary skills and ideologies to envision and move toward a more equitable, just, and nonviolent future” (p. 16). Thus, peace education can be used to disrupt structural violence that oppresses individuals, and instructors and scholars within the field seek to disrupt systematic, systemic, and direct violence through various forms of peace education practices (e.g., human rights education, anti-racist education, social justice education, conflict resolution, etc.) (Galtung, 1990; Lum, 2021).

In addition to centering peace, justice, and human rights, the field of peace education provides a new lens with which to define and identify *violence*. Perhaps traditionally thought as extreme force that can cause physical harm, Galtung (1990), argues that violence takes three main forms: “*Direct violence* is an event; *structural violence* is a process with ups and downs; *cultural violence* is an invariant, a ‘permanence’” (Galtung, 1990, p. 294). Although direct violence may occur within the context of a specific event(s), such as corporal punishment or sexual assault, structural and cultural violence are more indirect, albeit hidden, forms of collective violence (Zwi et al., 2002) that plague educational systems. Structural violence considers how social and economic systems reproduce inequity as one group exerts power and control over another. Structural violence may take the form of poverty, hunger, or even exclusion for not conforming to normative standards (Cremin & Guilherme, 2016; Harris, 2007). This violence encompasses anything that hinders a student from developing their capabilities or opportunities (McConnell et al., 2021; Winter, 2012). Cultural violence is “any aspect of a culture that can be used to legitimize violence in its direct or structural form” (Galtung, 1990, p. 291) and often refers to how people are “denied dignity, rights, and opportunities based on their ascribed identities to bolster racism,

patriarchy, militarism, classism, and other forms of systemic oppression” (Hantzopoulos & Williams, 2017, p. 3). Ultimately, cultural violence is comprised of norms and behaviors that support or allow for direct and structural violence to be perpetuated.

For decades within the educational system, questions and concerns regarding structural, cultural, and direct violence have been raised as historically marginalized students are required to conform to Western values and standards. Concerns regarding school administration policies, pedagogical methods, educational labeling, classroom interaction, childhood games, and teacher reactions, as well as child abuse, have been raised for sustaining violent systems in schools (Baker-Bell et al., 2017; Epp & Watkinson, 1997; Harris, 2008; Martin et al., 2019). From the Indigenous boarding schools where students were not even allowed to speak their own language (Miller, 2008; Pihama & Lee-Morgan, 2019) to “Whitewashing” Black Language (Ladva, 2020), violence in schools may be perpetuated by thoughts, words, and deeds, under the guise of assimilation and accommodation (Chubbuck & Zembylas, 2011). Within the context of the modern classroom, specifically, cultural violence may be curricular, such as limiting discussions of other faiths, cultures, and/or failing to consider the achievements of women and historically underrepresented people (see Cremin & Guilherme, 2016, for more information). Cultural violence can also be unintentionally inflicted through assessment practices that fail to recognize different ways of knowing outside of WME. No matter the type, however, violence in all its forms (direct, structural, and cultural) limits human flourishing (Galtung, 1969) and perpetuates ancestral trauma for students of historically marginalized backgrounds.

Although scholars have argued that education, in general, can help disrupt all forms of violence, researchers and practitioners have identified and examined systemic violence in schools, underscoring the need for reform and further disruption. As argued by Ladson-Billings (1995), “the goal of education becomes how to ‘fit’ students constructed as ‘other’ by virtue of their race/ethnicity, language, or social class into a hierarchical structure that is defined as meritocracy” (p. 467). As a result, historically marginalized student learning is often framed from a deficit perspective, and educators may require students to assimilate/accommodate/reject their culture to understand and succeed within a White, Western, neoliberal system. These practices not only silence historically marginalized voices but may serve to further traumatize these learners by requiring them to adapt/adopt Western norms and practices or risk failure (Hantzopoulos & Bajaj, 2021; Harris, 2008)—an approach used by colonizers to diminish and destroy traditional ways of knowing (Pihama & Lee-Morgan, 2019). As educators strive to be more responsive to the “demands placed on communicators by the social and political conditions of our time” (Fry, 1986, p. 76), peace education becomes a tool for dismantling violent (direct and indirect) structures in the educational system. We argue that peace education provides a valuable starting point for analyzing potentially violent structural and cultural policies and practices within communication research, education, and pedagogy.

## **Communication and Peace Education**

Communication is often cited as a vital tool for engaging in peace education practices (Baesler & Lauricella, 2012; Duckworth, 2011; Harris, 2008). As argued by Ellis and Warshel (2011) communication and media studies are central to peace education as communication channels such as radio, TV, film, the internet, music, and more can be used to facilitate peace education outside of the classroom. Further, communication frameworks, such as conflict management, interpersonal communication theories, and audience analysis, can enhance the overall communication of peace education practices (Ellis & Warshel,

---

2011). However, no research has argued or showcased the reciprocal value of peace education theories and practices within the communication discipline, classrooms, and support centers to dismantle violence and create sustainable peace in higher education and society at large. Through the specific example of the communication center, we argue that communication and peace education in conjunction can be used to lessen the inequities of Western public speaking practices and work toward disrupting racism.

## Opportunities Within the Communication Discipline

Recently, in the communication discipline, scholars have called attention to the lack of diversity within the discipline (Calvente et al., 2020), in regard to scholarship (Simmons & Wahl, 2016; Trepte & Loths, 2020), and within some prestigious award nomination practices (i.e., #CommsoWhite; Flaherty, 2019b; Murthy, 2020). As written by Simmons and Wahl (2016), “we are overdue in productively addressing issues of ‘diversity—or the lack thereof—in mainstream communication education research’” (abstract). Unfortunately, this lack of diversity is not sequestered to just research practices and award nominations as scholars have argued that hegemonic Whiteness extends into discipline-specific textbooks (Manning, 2020). Since research often informs teaching materials and best pedagogical practices, the research conducted and published within the discipline may affect how communication is taught, framed, and tutored. Manning (2020) found in “most (interpersonal communication) texts it appears authors sought to diversify contents by using non-white representations as an add-on rather than as a central part of the text” (p. 235). These examples reflect the absence of diversity in our discipline and how issues of race are often considered an afterthought in our study and pedagogical practices. Viewing diversity as an “add-on” and emphasizing the concept of “inclusion” over disruption, the communication discipline “maintains a (white, male, straight, able-bodied) identity with power over the bodies it ostensibly includes” (Simmons & Wahl, 2016, p. 234).

Furthermore, the lack of diversity within the discipline itself creates an environment that privileges certain norms of language and thought. As scholars like Ladva (2020) have sought to uplift the voices and perspectives of students, educators, and scholars from the Black community, similar calls are being made regarding Native and Indigenous communities. May & McDermott (2021) highlight that invisibility is the “modern form of racism used against Native Americans” (see the American Indian College Fund, 2019, p. 5 as cited by May & McDermott, 2021), calling for culturally responsive education in public speaking classrooms. May and McDermott argue that individual educators can change public speaking practices (i.e., nonverbal standards) and policies (i.e., what is a “credible” source, acceptable speech topics) to create more inclusive classrooms for Indigenous learners.

Building on these previous works, however, we seek to push the conversation further, calling for communication centers to implement peace education theories and practices to further disrupt violence within the communication discipline. We continue to silence historically marginalized communities and voices by gatekeeping what counts as knowledge and language in our classrooms, in our campus resource centers, and in our campus communities. As communication scholars, however, we have tools to begin disrupting and dismantling this structural and cultural violence within our centers and our discipline if used in conjunction with peace education scholarship.

---



### Communication Centers

Communication centers, while they may range in size and services available, generally provide oral communication tutoring to undergraduate students within the communication basic course (Yook & Atkins-Sayre, 2012). While no two centers are alike, due to their function within the campus community to support the oral and/or written communication skills of students, these centers may inadvertently work to silence non-Western communication norms despite their historical charge to promote student success. Resource Centers, or Learning Assistance Centers, started appearing on college campuses in the 1970s as a “natural response to growing needs by an increasingly diverse heterogeneous college student body” (Arendale, 2004, p. 4) (i.e., a diverse population that did not represent one singular experience with one dominant discourse, but instead reflected a diversity of cultures, identities, experiences, and languages). Oftentimes, students who are perceived to be “at-risk” of dropping out due to personal or academic struggles are often referred to tutoring and counseling resources to promote retention and improve academic performance (Barefoot, 2004; Henchy, 2013). Previous research has shown that students most likely to use campus resources are historically marginalized and first-generation college students (Brock, 2010; Strada-Gallup, 2017) who may speak WME as a second language. For communication centers, this mentality shapes the cultural assumptions that students of color need help in order to level the playing field (Grimm, 2011). With such assumptions in place, students of color are expected to learn the conventions of WME and, in the process, “rid themselves of all linguistic features that may identify them with communities of color” (Greenfield, 2011, p. 46). Not only does this negate their cultural identity, but it also creates a *cycle of repression and violence* as they try to conform to standards in the classroom that are only reinforced by resource centers designed to support them.

While scholarly research on communication centers is limited in scope, writing center research speaks to the value and importance of language diversity in pedagogical approaches in pursuit of racial justice and equity. In 1974, the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) at their Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) adopted the Students’ Right to Their Own Language (SRTOL) resolutions. This resolution, in part, states:

We affirm the students’ rights to their own patterns and varieties of language—the dialects of their nurture or whatever dialects in which they find their own identity and style. Language scholars long ago denied that the myth of a standard American dialect has any validity. . . . We affirm strongly that teachers must have the experiences and training that will enable them to respect diversity and uphold the right of students to their own language. (Baker-Bell, 2020, p. 6)

Even with the SRTOL passage and its recognition and affirmation of language diversity, writing studies scholars continue to address inequities in the writing center and writing pedagogy. Writing centers, “like their institutions in which they are situated, are not racially neutral sites of discourse and practice” (Greenfield & Rowan, 2011, p. 1). This includes contemporary scholarship which challenges the pedagogical approach of code-switching— “[teaching] students to translate codes of their Englishes into the codes of standard academic prose” (Hardee, n.d., para. 4). Critics of code-switching believe it to maintain the superiority of one English and inherently dismisses others. In “An Updated SRTOL?” (2011) Canagarajah acknowledges the limits of SRTOL and the need to embrace “a critical, reflective use of hybrid linguistic resources” (Diab et al., 2012, p. 3). Vershawn Ashanti Young (2014) characterizes this hybridity of language as code-meshing, or the welcoming of all linguistic resources, including those considered “nonstandard,” into academic prose.

### ***Perpetuating Violence and Racism: A Reinforced Cycle***

As scholars and practitioners, we are challenged to consider how violence is enacted in our communication centers. For example, a critical review of rubrics used to evaluate competency demonstrates possible adherence to WME expectations. Some educators in the classroom and coaching staff in the communication center still assess a student's pronunciation or use of appropriate (re: WME) vocabulary as part of determining competency and level of preparedness. When we use WME as the standard to which everyone is measured, we invalidate other ways of knowing and communicating and continue to oppress. As Greenfield (2011) expresses, racism is uniquely tied to the denial of language diversity:

the language varieties deemed inferior in the United States (so much so that they are often dismissed not simply as inferior varieties but not as varieties at all—just as conglomerations of slang, street talk, or poor English) tend to be the languages whose origins can be traced to periods in American history when communities of racially oppressed people used these languages to enact agency. (p. 36)

As argued by Freire (1970), hooks (1994, 2003), and McLaren (2002, 2005), teaching is inherently political. When we are in the classroom, we are taking a stance, even in courses which may seem apolitical (i.e., public speaking). We argue this extends to those who direct and staff campus resource centers as well. Currently, communication center practices may silence the communication norms of non-Western students by valuing WME above all else. Thus, communication centers are urged to reflect on and change the knowledge and language that is valued within their spaces.

### **Communication Center Recommendations**

Through the synthesis of peace education scholarship and current communication center practices, recommendations are proposed for moving centers toward more peaceful education pedagogies and practices. These recommendations challenge communication centers to evaluate their current practices for hidden perpetuations of violence (direct and indirect) to better support historically marginalized students, dismantle violence, and promote the communication competence of the communities we serve.

#### ***Critically consider and evaluate language and public speaking framing to explore how the communication discipline can play a role in interrupting the reproduction of violence.***

Overall, scholars within the communication discipline need to be aware of the damage exclusionary language can have on students' cultural and personal identities. As argued by Davies (2010), "rebuilding culture can be an important part of restoring identity post-conflict" (p. 492). However, many Indigenous and other historically minoritized individuals have not been given the space to restore their identity and culture. Although slavery and Indigenous boarding schools may be in the "past," once out of these direct violence experiences, oppressive systems do not give traditionally marginalized communities the space to reclaim their identity. For example, as we still require those from non-Western cultural identities and languages to code-switch, elders are not considered "credible" academic sources, and slang words in speeches result in point deductions.

As such, the first step in dismantling the reproduction of harmful ideology and practices is through breaking the cycle of education's reproduction of conflict (Davies, 2010). In terms of communication centers, this can be done via the reframing of Westernized public speaking norms. We may need to teach our students WME and Western public speaking norms due to accreditation standards; however, as

educators, we do not have to frame these standards of public speaking as the only ideal. We can allow our students to explore storytelling as a form of public speaking (May & McDermott, 2021), not just as a type of attention-getter or concluding remark. In addition, we can acknowledge the differences in nonverbals across different cultures. Taking the time to overview different nonverbal norms and acknowledge the role of nonverbals in a community's culture can help to empower a diversity of nonverbal practices. A more radical approach is to allow students to present in their native language. One of the authors, who also serves as a Center Director, recently taught a communication-based intensive to Yup'ik Indigenous learners in rural Alaska. When students were given the space to present in their native language (Yugtun), the entire dynamic of the learning community shifted. From the level of comfort communicated in their posture and gestures to the active participation from the peers, it was humbling and inspiring to watch. Additionally, the students provided main points in English to satisfy the grading process; however, a word-for-word translation was not needed as the presentation transcended language.

Collectively, if we are to engage in dismantling violence at the individual level, it must also be done within the upper levels of our discipline in order to enact actual change. We need to frame Western public speaking norms as *a form*, not *the standard* of public speaking. By doing such, we are engaging our students in the possibilities of rhetorical flexibility. Rhetorical flexibility means knowing different communicative tools and strategies, and “being able to choose the best tools and strategies to create and communicate your meaning for any given context” (Dartmouth Institute for Writing and Rhetoric, n.d., para. 2). As many educators know, we have colleagues who still believe in and want to maintain the norms of WME. Students must take courses from these colleagues. However, by empowering students with the knowledge that Western public speaking norms is one form, not the *only* form, they can choose whether or not to adhere or to challenge and use rhetorical flexibility (recognizing their audience) when making that decision. Furthermore, they may take this knowledge into the workplace to continue to shift business communication norms. For communication centers, this means grounding rhetorical flexibility in tutor/coach training. Tutors trained in rhetorical flexibility would then be able to address rhetorical flexibility with students in the center by discussing assignment requirements, audience expectations, and reflect upon how this may (or may not) be grounded in a certain idea of knowledge sharing and assessment (re: Western norms/standards). And consider the possibilities and limitations of resisting or challenging these set standards.

### ***Evaluate current versus ideal communication center practices and role in the campus community.***

Second, communication centers are challenged to question the current and ideal role of the center within their campus communities. Referencing writing centers, Inoue (2016) argues such spaces can “facilitate structural changes in society, disciplines, and the institution itself,” and can serve as “centers for revolutions, for social justice work.” This also applies to communication centers and their ability to challenge the status quo by supporting student advocacy in the ways of knowing and expression. As Ladva (2020) stated, “The core of communication center work is to support students (and others who use our centers) to speak their truth in college and beyond” (p. 4), yet when we teach only Western cultural communication practices, we deny those who communicate outside of Western cultural norms “their truth.”

Likewise, Native and Indigenous traditional knowledge systems are also missing from these norms. By encouraging Indigenous ways of knowing into the classroom, there is a recognition of its value and how this knowledge contributes to non-Indigenous understanding of the world (Battiste, 2002). Questioning

---



the current role and function of communication center practices may provide a starting point for evaluating the gap between the current resources provided and students' needs during and after their degree. Bajaj (2015) argued, "attention must be paid to the format, structure, and methods of the peace education process in order to prevent good intentions from causing harm or adverse consequences" (p. 2).

Therefore, the second step in implementing peace education practices and dismantling violent systems is through the evaluation of current practices. Questions to evaluate current practices for communication centers might include evaluating barriers to access (i.e., work/life of student population vs. the time the center is open, cancellation policies), recruiting, retaining, and training practices for coaches (i.e., who is represented on the staff, how are staff expected to structure a coaching session), what is the ideal role of the center in the campus community (i.e., does it just serve 100-level public speaking students, is the center a touchstone for students struggling throughout their college career), and what trainings could be beneficial for the campus community (i.e., providing training for fellow faculty to critically reflect on expected speaking standards in their classrooms).

Center directors are also encouraged to partner with other organizations on campus committed to diversity, inclusion, and belonging to further disrupt White, mainstream practices which may be invisible to the dominant majority. As a tangible example, one of the authors invited the Director of Multicultural Student Affairs to evaluate not only their practices but their physical environment to identify strengths and opportunities for further disruption. The Director and her "board of student diversity ambassadors" challenged the center to develop a mission statement that decenters Whiteness, increase recruitment efforts to promote representation, de-emphasize WME, and physically leave the confines of the four walls that "limit" our center and engage with students where they feel the most comfortable and empowered.

***Peace education is co-creational, dynamic, and continuous; so should be our constant reflection and evaluation of the role and success of the communication center.***

Finally, as with any long-term cultural and structural change, we need to constantly reflect on and evaluate the role and success of the communication center. Within peace education, scholars have argued, "teachers must engage in critical self-reflection about their positionality and role in the educational process" (Bajaj, 2015, p. 2). Similarly, the communication center must engage in continuous reflection and evaluation of their positionality and role in campus communities. Therefore, we need to solicit feedback, quantitative and qualitative, from the students we serve in the classroom and at our communication center. During an intensive course with Indigenous learners,<sup>1</sup> for example, one of the authors created an assignment where learners were invited to share their feedback on this research paper and the tenets of peace education. Through reflective prompts, students were given space to not only connect with their experiences as emerging communication scholars, they were also invited to share their feedback on peace education, a pedagogical practice designed to disrupt higher education and better support their needs as learners. In addition to collecting data that allows for strategic curricular revisions, the students shared their stories of trauma and resilience as they continue to work toward degree completion.

Furthermore, we are invited to consider critical analysis of how changes to policies and practices may need to adjust to reflect changing social landscapes. However, Galtung (1990) cautions that,

---

1. The authors honor the reflections of these Indigenous learners. Moreover, we consider their contributions just as valid as a formal academic/scholarly source when it comes to Indigenization, promoting different ways of knowing, and disruption.

A major task of peace research, and the peace movement in general, is that never-ending search for a peace culture—problematic, because of the temptation to institutionalize that culture, making it obligatory with the hope of internalizing it everywhere. And that would already be direct violence, imposing a culture. (p. 291)

Changes made for one semester or one tutor session may not promote social justice, equity, and peace in the following semester or session. Thus, constant monitoring, assessment, and evaluation of changes to practices and policies are vital for promoting a peaceful curriculum and for gaining the support of peers, administrators, and the larger communities we serve to promote disruption and reform.

## Future Directions

Although this article provides a starting point for the intersection of peace education and communication, as well as directions for dismantling violence in public speaking, more scholarship is needed. Both peace education and communication may provide essential avenues for expanding scholarship and practice in both disciplines. For example, social justice practices may benefit from intercultural communication research. Sustainable development education may benefit from scholarship and practices in the subfield of public relations. While Ellis and Warshel (2011) started the conversation about the contributions of communication and media studies to peace education, there are endless possibilities for educators and scholars at the intersection of peace education and communication.

## Conclusion

Overall, as argued by this piece, the intersection of the field of communication and peace education has the potential to enhance the scholarship, education, and practices of scholars from both disciplines. Peace education provides a framework for understanding peace and violence in cultural, structural, and direct ways in the communication discipline. Communication provides the tools for engaging people in conversations about peace and dismantling hidden cultural and structural violence within the education system. It is important to note that these or any cultural changes must be accompanied by structural changes to avoid unanticipated or counterproductive effects (Kaomea, 2005).

As stated by Davies (2010), “It is always hypocritical of educational institutions to preach tolerance or peace when their own students are not given respect, or to preach democracy when they are hierarchical institutions, or to preach cooperation when they are fiercely competitive places” (p. 496). By exploring the intersection of peace education and the communication discipline within the context of communication center, we can start to build and foster equitable, empathetic, and culturally sensitive communication behaviors and skills in our students, our classrooms, our resource centers, and our campus communities.

---

## References

- Academics for Black Survival and Wellness. (n.d.). Home. <https://www.academics4blacklives.com/>
- Arendale, D. R. (2004). Mainstreamed academic assistance and enrichment for all students: The historical origins of Learning Assistance Centers. *Research for Education Reform*, 9(4), 3–21.
- Baesler, E. J., & Lauricella, S. (2012). Teach peace: Assessing instruction of the nonviolent communication and peace course. *Journal of Peace Education*, 11(1), 46–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17400201.2013.777899>
- Bajaj, M. (2015). ‘Pedagogies of resistance’ and critical peace education praxis. *Journal of Peace Education*, 12(2), 154–166. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17400201.2014.991914>
- Baker-Bell, A. (2020). *Linguistic justice: Black language, literacy, identity, and pedagogy*. Routledge.
- Baker-Bell, A., Butler, T., & Johnson, L. (2017). The pain and the wounds: A call for critical race English education in the wake of racial violence. *English Education*, 49(2), 116–129. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26492793>
- Barber, P. H., Hayes, T. B., Johnson, T. L., & Márquez-Magaña, L. (2020). Systemic racism in higher education. *Science*, 369(6510), 1440–1441. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abd7140>
- Barefoot, B. O. (2004). Higher education’s revolving door: Confronting the problem of student drop-out in U.S. colleges and universities. *Open Learning*, 19(1), 9–18.
- Battiste, M. (2002). *Indigenous knowledge and pedagogy in First Nations education: A literature review with recommendations*. National Working Group on Education and the Minister of Indian Affairs, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada. [https://www.afn.ca/uploads/files/education/24\\_2002\\_oct\\_marie\\_battiste\\_indigenousknowledgeandpedagogy\\_lit\\_review\\_for\\_min\\_working\\_group.pdf](https://www.afn.ca/uploads/files/education/24_2002_oct_marie_battiste_indigenousknowledgeandpedagogy_lit_review_for_min_working_group.pdf)
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality*. Penguin Books.
- Brock, T. (2010). Young adults and higher education: Barriers and breakthroughs to success. *The future of children*, 20(1), 109–132.
- Calvente, L. B. Y., Calafell, B. M., & Chávez, K. R. (2020). Here is something you can’t understand: The suffocating Whiteness of communication studies. *Communication and critical/cultural studies*, 17(2), 202–209. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14791420.2020.1770823>
- Chakravartty, P., Kuo, R., Grubbs, V., & McIlwain, C. (2018). #CommunicationSoWhite. *Journal of Communication*, 68(2), 254–266. <https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/jqy003>
- Chubbuck, S. M., & Zembylas, M. (2011). Toward a critical pedagogy for nonviolence in urban school contexts. *Journal of Peace Education*, 8(3), 259–275. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17400201.2011.621362>
- Cremin, H., & Guilherme, A. (2016). Violence in schools: Perspectives (and hope) from Galtung and Buber. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 48(11), 1123–1137. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2015.1102038>
- Danielson, M. A. (2018). Communication pedagogy and the scholarship of teaching and learning: A natural match and a promising future. *Journal of Communication Pedagogy*, 1, 20–23. <https://doi.org/10.31446/JCP.2018.06>
- Dartmouth Institute for Writing and Rhetoric. (n.d.). *Writing 5 learning outcomes*. <https://writing-speech.dartmouth.edu/curriculum/writing-courses/writing-5/writing-5-learning-outcomes>
- Davies, L. (2010). The difference faces of education in conflict. *Development*, 53(4), 491–497. <https://doi.org/10.1057/dev.2010.69>
- Davis, L., & Fry, R. (2019). College faculty have become more racially and ethnically diverse, but remain far less so than students. *PEW Research Center*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/07/31/us-college-faculty-student-diversity/>

- Diab, R., Godbee, B., Ferrel, T., & Simpkins, N. (2012). A multi-dimensional pedagogy for racial justice in writing centers. *Praxis (Austin, Tex.)*, 10(1), 1–8.
- Duckworth, C. (2011). Restorative classrooms: Critical peace education in a juvenile detention home. *Peace and Conflict Studies*, 18(2), 234–262. <https://doi.org/10.46743/1082-7307/2011.1129>
- Ellis, D., & Warshel, Y. (2011). The contributions of communication and media studies to peace education. In G. Salomon & E. Cairns (Eds.), *Handbook on peace education* (pp. 135–153). Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203837993-16>
- Epp, J. R., & Watkinson, A. M. (1997). *Systemic violence in education: Promise broken*. SUNY Press.
- Ezarik, M. (2021, May 6). More discussion than action: Racial justice on campus. *Inside HigherEd*. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2021/05/06/what-students-think-about-racial-justice-efforts-campus>
- Flaherty, C. (2019a, June 4). Undue burden. *Inside Higher Ed*. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2019/06/04/whos-doing-heavy-lifting-terms-diversity-and-inclusion-work>
- Flaherty, C. (2019b, June 13). When White scholars pick White scholars. *Inside HigherEd*. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2019/06/13/communication-scholars-debate-how-fields-distinguished-scholars-should-be-picked>
- Fotsch, P. (2008). Race and resistance in the communication classroom. *Basic Communication Course Annual*, 20, Article 12. <https://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca/vol20/iss1/12>
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Fry, T. (1986). Communication education and peace education: A beginning. *Communication Education*, 35(1), 75–80.
- Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6(3), 167–191.
- Galtung, J. (1990). Cultural violence. *Journal of Peace Research*, 27(3), 291–305. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/423472?origin=JSTOR-pdf>
- GLSEN. (n.d.). Who we are. <https://www.glsen.org/>
- Goodboy, A. K. (2018). Instructional communication scholarship: Complementing communication pedagogy. *Journal of Communication Pedagogy*, 1, 9–11. <https://doi.org/10.31446/JCP.2018.03>
- Greenfield, L. (2011). The ‘standard English’ fairy tale: A rhetorical analysis of racist pedagogies and commonplace assumptions about language diversity. In L. Greenfield & K. Rowan (Eds.), *Writing centers and the new racism: A call for sustainable change and dialogue* (pp. 33–60). Utah State Press.
- Greenfield, L., & Rowan, K. (2011). Introduction: A call to action. In L. Greenfield & K. Rowan (Eds.), *Writing centers and the new racism: A call for sustainable dialogue and change* (pp. 1–14). Utah State Press.
- Grimm, N. (2011). Rethorizing writing center work to transform a system of advantage based on race. In L. Greenfield & K. Rowan (Eds.), *Writing centers and the new racism: A call for sustainable change and dialogue* (pp. 75–99). Utah State Press.
- Hantzopoulos, M., & Bajaj, M. (2021). *Educating for peace and human rights: An introduction*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Hantzopoulos, M., & Williams, H. (2017). Peace education as a field. *Encyclopedia of Educational Philosophy and Theory (Online)*. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-532-7\\_590-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-532-7_590-1)
- Hardee, J. (n.d.). Code-meshing and code-switching. *American University*. <https://subjectguides.library.american.edu/c.php?g=1025915&p=7749939>
- Harris, I. M. (2007). Peace education theory. *Journal of Peace Education*, 1(1), 5–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1740020032000178276>
- Harris, I. M. (2008). History of peace education. In M. Bajaj (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of peace education* (pp. 15–24). Information Age Publishing, Inc.



- Henchy, A. (2013). The perceived benefits of participating in campus recreation programs and facilities: A comparison between undergraduate and graduate students. *Recreational Sports Journal*, 37(2), 97–105.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. Routledge.
- hooks, b. (2003). *Teaching community: A pedagogy of hope*. Routledge.
- Inoue, A. B. (2016). Afterword: Narratives that determine writers and social justice writing center work. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, 14(1). <https://www.praxisuwc.com/inoue-141>
- Kaomea, J. (2005). Indigenous studies in the elementary curriculum: A cautionary Hawaiian example. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 36(1), 24–42.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465–491. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1163320?origin=JSTOR-pdf>
- Ladva, N. (2020). Is the communication center racist? An inquiry into Black linguistic justice, anti-racism, and assimilation. *Communication Center Journal*, 6(1), 3–17. <http://libjournal.ucg.edu/ccj/article/view/2077/pdf>
- Lum, J. B. (2021). *Peace education: Past, present, and future*. Routledge.
- Manning, J. (2020). Examining Whiteness in interpersonal communication textbooks. *Communication, Culture, and Critique*, 13(2), 254–258. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ccc/tcaa010>
- Martin, D. B., Price, P. G., & Moore, R. (2019). Refusing systemic violence against Black children: Toward a Black liberatory mathematics education. In J. Davis, & C. C. Jett (Eds.), *Critical race theory in mathematics education* (pp. 32–55). Routledge.
- May, A., & McDermott, V. (2021). Invisibility as modern racism: Redressing the experience of Indigenous learners in higher education. *Journal of Communication Pedagogy*, 4, 27–33. <https://doi.org/10.31446/JCP.2021.2.09>
- McConnell, J., Liu T., Brown, E. M., Fort, C. J., Azcuna, D. R., Tabiolo, C. A. M., Kibble, C. D. M., & Winslow, A. B. (2021). Multicultural peace and justice collaborative: Critical peace education in a research training environment. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 27(2), 191–202. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pac0000539>
- McLaren, P. (2002). Critical pedagogy: A look at the major concepts. In A. Darder, A. Baltodano, & R. D. Torres (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (pp. 69–96). Routledge.
- McLaren, P. (2005). *Capitalists & conquerors: A critical pedagogy against empire*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Miller, R. J. (2008). *Native America, discovered and conquered: Thomas Jefferson, Lewis and Clark, and Manifest Destiny*. Praeger Publishers.
- Murthy, D. (2020). From hashtag activism to inclusion and diversity in a discipline. *Communication, Culture & Critique*, 13(2), 259–264. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ccc/tcaa014>
- Pihama L., & Lee-Morgan J. (2019). Colonization, education, and Indigenous Peoples. In E. McKinley & L. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of Indigenous education* (pp. 19–27). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-3899-0\\_67](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-3899-0_67)
- Rutherford, A., Zwi, A. B., Grove, N. J., & Butchart, A. (2007). Violence: A glossary. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 61(8), 676–680. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.2005.043711>
- Sangaramoorthy & Richardson. (2020). ‘Black Lives Matter’ without Black people? *Inside HigherEd*. <https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2020/10/16/many-people-deny-how-pervasive-racism-higher-ed-and-how-its-often-reproduced>
- Simmons, J., & Wahl, S. T. (2016). Rethinking inclusion and diversity in communication education research. *Communication Education*, 65(2), 232–235. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2015.1098711>



- Strada-Gallup. (2017). Crisis of confidence: Current college students do not feel prepared for the workforce. *Gallup*. <https://news.gallup.com/reports/225161/2017-strada-gallup-college-student-survey.aspx>
- the<sup>2</sup> American Indian College Fund. (2019). Creating visibility and healthy learning environments for Native Americans in higher education. [https://collegefund.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Creating-Visibility-and-Healthy-Learning-Environments-for-Natives-in-Higher-Education\\_web.pdf](https://collegefund.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Creating-Visibility-and-Healthy-Learning-Environments-for-Natives-in-Higher-Education_web.pdf)
- Trepte, S., & Loths, L. (2020). National and gender diversity in communication: A content analysis of journals between 2006–2016. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 44(4), 289–311. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2020.1804434>
- Winter, Y. (2012). Violence and visibility. *New Political Science*, 34(2), 195–202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07393148.2012.714959>
- Yook, E. L., & Atkins-Sayre, W. (2012). *Communication center sand oral communication programs in higher education: Advantages, challenges, and new directions*. Lexington Books.
- Young, V. A. (2014). Code-meshing: The new way to do English. In V. A. Young, R. Barrett, Y. Young-Rivera, & K. B. Lovejoy (Eds.), *Other people's English: Code-switching, code-meshing, and African American literacy* (pp. 76–83).
- Zwi, A., Garfield, R., & Loretta, A. (2002). Collective violence. In E. Krug, L. Dahlberg, J. Mercy, A. B. Zwi, & R. Lozano (Eds.), *World report on violence and health* (pp. 213–240). World Health Organization. [https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/42495/9241545615\\_eng.pdf](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/42495/9241545615_eng.pdf)

---

2. Intentionally lowercase as per the official name of the organization on the published document.

---