

The Pennsylvania State University

The Graduate School

Department of Agricultural Economics, Sociology, and Education

**PEACE EDUCATION AS A TOOL TO ADDRESS YOUTH VIOLENCE AND
DELINQUENCY IN MOROCCO**

A Thesis in

Applied Youth, Family, and Community Education

by

Kendra A. Taylor

© 2014 Kendra A. Taylor

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Master of Education

August 2014

The thesis of Kendra A. Taylor was reviewed and approved* by the following:

Nicole Webster
Associate Professor of Agricultural Economics, Sociology and Education
Thesis Advisor

Matthew Kaplan
Professor of Agricultural Economics, Sociology and Education
Intergenerational Programs and Aging

Linda Caldwell
Professor of Recreation, Park and Tourism Management

Connie Baggett
Associate Professor of Agricultural Economics, Sociology and Education
Graduate Program Chair of Agricultural & Extension Education

*Signatures are on file in the Graduate School

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to understand how the Skills for Constructive Living peace education program influenced a particular group of participants in Ksar El Kebir, Morocco in terms of attitudes, perceptions, sense of empowerment and problem solving skills. I employed qualitative and quantitative measures in order to gain a detailed and in-depth understanding of the outcomes of this program. Individual interviews and pre-tests and post-tests were used with youth participants' in order to understand their views on the peace education program, and how they could use the knowledge and skills from this program in aspects of their day to day lives. After analyzing the interviews, I found two emerging themes, peace education as personal change and peace education as something new. The pre-tests and post-tests showed that participants did increase their sense of empowerment and problem solving skills, but that the female participants made greater gains than the male participants. Based on these findings, three key things can be implied about the program, and more broadly, about the field of peace education. First, gender must be considered when planning and implementing a peace education program. This is rarely addressed in the literature and given the findings from this and other studies, this issue demands further attention. Second, the utility of English as a foreign language in peace education is considered given the overwhelmingly positive response of participants to the use of English in this program. This is linked to the literature which discusses a need for peace education in areas of intractable conflict where I argue that EFL can play a role as a language that does not link into identity politics and collective narratives that fuel intractable conflicts. Third, this study points to the importance of evaluation for peace education efforts. Too often peace education programs consider evaluation as optional or add-on, and a lack of evaluation is one of the strongest critiques of peace education. Along with the implications of this study, several suggestions for future research are also discussed.

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	viii
Chapter 1.....	1
General Problem Statement.....	1
Specific Problem Statement.....	4
Rationale for Study.....	6
Purpose Statement.....	7
Research Objectives.....	7
Outline of Remaining Chapters.....	8
Chapter 2.....	9
Introduction.....	9
Conceptual and Theoretical Considerations.....	10
A culture of peace.....	10
Negative peace versus positive peace.....	11
Integrative theory of peace.....	13
Theory of change.....	14
Peace Education in the Twentieth and Twenty-First Centuries.....	16
Peace Education in the twentieth century.....	16
Peace education in the twenty first century.....	18
Peace Education Models.....	19
Direct and indirect models.....	21
Formal and informal peace education.....	21
Short-term and long-term peace education.....	23
Peace Education Pedagogy.....	26
Participatory learning.....	26
Connected knowing.....	28
Transformative learning.....	29
Peace Education in Varied Socio-Political Contexts.....	30
Peace education in areas of tranquility.....	30
Peace education in areas of inter-ethnic tension.....	30
Peace education in areas of intractable conflict.....	31
Trends in Current Practice.....	32

Resilience education.....	32
Conflict resolution education.....	34
Human rights education.....	36
Conclusion.....	37
Chapter 3.....	39
Overview of Research.....	39
Community Partnership.....	40
Description of partnering organization.....	40
Needs assessment.....	41
Description of Program.....	44
Curriculum.....	44
Goals and objectives.....	47
Implementation.....	48
Selection of population to be studied.....	48
Research Approach.....	51
Limitations.....	
Instrumentation and Data Collection.....	53
Attitudes and perceptions.....	53
Problem solving skills.....	55
Empowerment.....	56
Data analysis.....	57
Attitudes and perceptions.....	57
Problem solving skills.....	58
Empowerment.....	60
Summary.....	60
Chapter 4.....	61
Attitudes and Perceptions.....	63
Peace Education as Personal Change.....	63
Perceived behavior change.....	63
Changing ideas and attitudes.....	65
Finding the importance of problem solving.....	68
Gaining the ability to express oneself.....	70
Peace Education as Something New.....	72

Importance of new topics covered.....	72
Importance of sharing new knowledge.....	74
Newness of communicating in English.....	75
Sense of Empowerment.....	77
Problem Solving Skills.....	79
Chapter 5.....	83
Summary of Themes.....	84
Triangulation of the Data.....	84
Sense of empowerment.....	85
Problem solving skills.....	87
Implications for Peace Education Interventions.....	89
Gender considerations.....	89
Utility of peace education in EFL.....	92
Importance of Evaluation.....	94
Suggestions for Future Research.....	96
References.....	100
Appendix A Recruitment Materials.....	111
Appendix B Sense of Empowerment Measure.....	112
Appendix C Problem Solving Skills Measure.....	114
Appendix D Individual Interview.....	115

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Results of Teachers' SWOT Analysis.....	41-2
Table 2: Results of Students' SWOT Analysis.....	42-3
Table 3: Reported Impact of Skills for Constructive Living Peace Education Program.....	44
Table 4: Link between Needs Assessment and Skills for Constructive Living Program.....	46-7
Table 5: Schedule of Data Collection.....	53
Table 6: Summary of Program Objectives and Corresponding Measures.....	61
Table 7: Themes related to Objective 1.....	63
Table 8: Pre-tests Sense of Empowerment.....	77
Table 9: Post-tests Sense of Empowerment.....	77
Table 10: Pre-tests Sense of Empowerment Male.....	77
Table 11: Post-tests Sense of Empowerment Male.....	78
Table 12: Pre-tests Sense of Empowerment Female.....	78
Table 13: Post-tests Sense of Empowerment Female.....	78
Table 14: Pre-tests Problem Solving.....	80
Table 15: Post-tests Problem Solving.....	80
Table 16: Pre-tests Problem Solving Male.....	81
Table 17: Post-tests Problem Solving Male.....	81
Table 18: Pre-tests Problem Solving Female.....	81
Table 19: Problem Solving Female.....	81

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project would not have been possible without the committee members, colleagues, friends at the Inbiaat Association, and family members who supported me along the way. First and foremost, I would like to thank the members of my committee who provided me with invaluable advice and feedback as I made my way through this project. A special thanks goes to my advisor Dr. Webster for knowing just how much of a foundation to provide me with, and then knowing when to step back and let me figure out the rest on my own. Her support for me even extended to making a trip to Morocco to help me with my work there. Dr. Kaplan's insightful support has been instrumental in my understanding of the research process, and he has always taken the time to work with me whenever I needed it. Dr. Caldwell challenged me to not romanticize my work on peace education, and through working with her I was able to ground my work in evaluation principles, which is a skill I am thankful to have.

I would also like to thank Mohammed Loutfi for working closely with me throughout this project, without him it would have been impossible to carry out. He was a great community partner and the way he cares about Ksar El Kebir and the young people there is something I will take with me whenever I engage in development work. I also want to thank all of the young people who participated in the Skills for Constructive Living peace education program. I didn't know what to expect from you, and I am sure you did not know what to expect from me, but working together on topics like conflict resolution, violence, gender issues, equity, and problem solving was really exciting. Thank you for bringing laughter, stimulating discussion, tough questions, honesty and peace to our time together.

Most importantly, I would like to thank my parents, Alan and Kristin Taylor for always supporting the projects I am involved with. I think your adventurous spirits influenced me more than you know. I would also like to thank Anouar, because it was through meeting him that I decided to apply to graduate school, and it was through staying with him that I became connected with Morocco and the young people in Ksar El Kebir.

Chapter 1

Introduction

General Problem Statement

There has been a growing concern throughout the twentieth century about the many horrific forms of violence around the globe, including genocide, ecocide, warfare, racism, unjust social structures, intractable conflict, domestic violence and ethnic hatred (Harris, 2004). One approach taken to addressing these societal concerns about violence has come in the form of peace education. Peace education programs have been implemented in regions all over the world; from areas of relative tranquility to areas of intractable conflict, and peace education research can provide insights into ways in which to transcend violence. The purpose of peace education is to help transform the attitudes and behaviors of children, youth and adults to reject a culture of conflict and war and instead pursue a culture of peace (Ashton, 2007). The 1998 UN Resolution on the Culture of Peace defines a culture of peace as:

“an integral approach to preventing violence and violent conflicts, and an alternative to the culture of war and violence based on education for peace, the promotion of sustainable economic and social development, respect for human rights, equality between women and men, democratic participation, tolerance, the free flow of information and disarmament” (1).

What unites the field of peace education are common themes that include conceptualizing peace in both negative (the absence of violence) and positive forms (presence of well-being and justice), working towards a culture of peace, distinguishing between direct micro-level violence

and structural macro-level violence, as well as a focus on pedagogy, and creating relationships of partnership and spaces of peace (Cann, 2012).

The challenge to building a culture of peace is the dominance of a culture of violence. There is ample evidence that the majority of people in the world have conflict-oriented worldviews (Van Slyck, 1999). Children and youth learn, through both formal and informal education, that the primary purpose in life is to protect one's own survival and success in a violent and conflicted world (Danesh, 2006). Many families teach their children that the most powerful forces in life are those of competition and struggle, and in schools these conflict-based worldviews are further validated through competition, bullying, violence, and textbooks (Danesh, 2006).

Education which reflects the culture of violence exposes children and youth to “the psychological and often physical abuse required to function in the rigid hierarchies of domination that they are taught is ‘reality’” (Eisler & Miller, 2004, p.17). Through this type of education children will learn to suppress or at least compartmentalize their empathy for others while becoming more defensive-aggressive and vigilant. When children adapt to this mode of education early in life they will unconsciously replicate it throughout their lives, perpetuating relationships that are unempathetic, violent, and hold back the development of a culture of peace (Eisler & Miller, 2004). In this environment, where young people are getting these formal and informal messages, it is not surprising that children and youth learn to accept the culture of conflict and war as an inevitable part of the human experience and are far more familiar with ways of conflict and violence than ways of peace. For there to be a shift from a culture of war to a culture of peace, there is a need for a kind of education which can allow this shift in worldviews.

The formal educational systems around the globe play a powerful role in perpetuating the culture of conflict because they reach all of the younger generation, where schooling is compulsory, and they act as the major agent for the socialization of a conflict-based worldview through textbooks, authoritarian teaching methods, school ceremonies, bullying, competitive testing, and so on (Bar-Tal & Rosen, 2009). Schools today are overwhelmingly characterized by relationships of domination. Eisler and Miller (2004) claim that dominator education exposes “children to the psychological and often physical abuse required to function in the rigid hierarchies of domination that they are taught is ‘reality’” (p.17). Through this type of education children will learn to suppress or at least compartmentalize their empathy for others while becoming more defensive-aggressive and vigilant. When children adapt to this dominator model early in life they will unconsciously replicate it throughout their lives, perpetuating relationships that are unempathetic, violent, and hold back their development. Throughout students’ experiences in school, they learn how to be in dominator relationships; how to submit to authority or rebel against it, how to compete for extrinsic rewards, and to rely on superiors to determine what is best for them (Hurt, 2004).

Domination in school is perpetuated not only relationally but also through knowledge production. Historically, the dominant view of knowledge has been that knowledge is certain, factual, and objective, and is not subject to interpretation and change (Kelly, 1986). The implication of this view of knowledge is that the teacher is the giver of knowledge to the passive student, much like Friere’s Banking Theory of Education where teachers deposit knowledge into a student’s empty head (1970). There is no space in this approach to education to appreciate and give value to youths’ experiences and feelings, and no attention is given to relationships and social learning.

The global persistence of a model of education which is authoritarian is deeply embedded in schooling and highly resistant to change (Harber & Sakade, 2009). The seeds of domination, competition, and violence are being sown at schools around the globe, and therefore it is imperative to consider how to shape an education which can lead to peace. Peace education practices seek to transform the nature of education and shift the focus to creating peace at the intrapersonal, interpersonal, inter-group, national, and international levels.

Specific Problem Statement

There are two issues central to this study: one is specific to the site of study and one is specific to the field of peace education. The site of the study, Ksar El Kebir, presents important issues to be considered related to youth and community violence and how peace education programs can be implemented in such settings. Examining peace education in Ksar El Kebir can provide insights into how useful peace education programs can be to address specific forms of violence. Specific to the field of peace education, there is the problem of a lack of evaluation of peace education programs when they are implemented. It is very important to study the effects of peace education through evaluation standards in order to make the case for peace education. Thus it is the focus of this study to evaluate a particular program in Ksar El Kebir to consider both the applicability of peace education to this particular social context and the evaluation of peace education.

The site for this study, Ksar El Kebir Morocco, is a town that is experiencing high levels of youth violence, which is of major concern to many in the community. With a population of approximately 110,000, it is a marginalized town that is in decline due to unemployment, corruption, poor school system, and lack of opportunity or futures orientation. It is part of a

region in Morocco that has been historically marginalized by the government through a lack of funding for development projects that has resulted in very poor infrastructure and a perception among residents of the region that they are neglected and discriminated against by the government. In addition to these structural factors that are decreasing quality of life, there has also been a notable rise in interpersonal and community level violence, particularly perpetrated by young men. The frequency of violence in neighborhoods and schools is contributing to the deterioration of the social capital in the community. Families that can afford it will try to send their children to private schools (a recent trend, public schools in the town used to be considered a good choice). All of the students I worked with said that when they are in other parts of Morocco they lie about where they are from, and that this is a common practice.

The study presented here intended to engage with the particular aspects of Ksar El Kebir's deterioration that relate to interpersonal conflict and violence. There are many possible points of entry for activities that could address the problems the community is facing including poverty, corruption, illiteracy, etc., but due to the parameters and purposes of this study, the problem of interpersonal and youth violence was the focus. Current approaches in Ksar El Kebir to dealing with the rise in school and neighborhood violence have been punitive rather than restorative, and have not sought to foster attitudes and skills which are conducive to peaceful community living.

There is a need for a new approach to confront the challenge of rising levels of violence in Ksar El Kebir. A peace education approach has not been used before in Ksar El Kebir to address interpersonal and youth violence. Given the problems the community is facing, it is an appealing avenue for improving relationships in the community and reducing violence. Peace education is an approach that would provide young people with the skills, knowledge, and attitudes which would help them to prevent violence in their schools and neighborhoods. Additionally, it would

help youth to address the many problems facing their community through practicing creative and peaceful problem solving. Through the processes of gaining new skills and knowledge, there is a potential for increased empowerment among youth who may grow to see themselves as positive agents in their community.

In order to introduce peace education practices in Ksar El Kebir, a partnership was created with the Inbiaat Association for Education and Development in the town. This non-profit and non-governmental organization seeks to provide young people with a safe environment to learn, play and develop useful life skills. A common goal shared by both the researcher and the Inbiaat Association was to find out if a peace education approach could improve young people's real life problem-solving skills and make young people feel more engaged in a positive way in their community. Ultimately, peaceful problem-solving skills and a sense of positive agency could help youth to practice non-violence, understand and process the violence they witness and find alternatives to violence. In a community where youth violence is a growing concern, this goal is of utmost importance to the Inbiaat Association in Ksar El Kebir to improve the quality of life for young people.

It is the simultaneous interest in improving quality of life as related to interpersonal violence in a particular community and the interest in making a contribution to the field of peace education which informs this study.

Rationale for Study

Despite the increasing number of peace education programs in both informal and formal educational settings, there is a dearth of empirical studies of peace education and a general lack of systematic evaluation of peace education programs (Harber & Sakade, 2009). Many peace

education programs are designed and implemented at great expense to both governmental and non-governmental organizations, without allocations of time and resources going to evaluating the effects of these programs. It would seem therefore that there is a great need in the field for systematic evaluation of peace education programs to determine whether the resources aimed at the design and implementation of peace education programs yield measurable results. Thus, the goal of this project is to implement and evaluate the UN's Skills for Constructive Living peace education program, to examine the effects of the program on a particular group of at-risk youth.

Purpose Statement

The overall intent of this study is to enhance understanding of the effects of peace education programs to address youth violence. Although considerable research has been devoted to peace education theory and practice around the world, less attention has been given to the evaluation of peace education programs. This study will evaluate an approach to evaluating peace education programs and practices. A peace education program has not been used in Ksar El Kebir to address youth, school and community violence and thus this study will seek to determine the appropriateness of peace education to address local problems related to living in a community that has a high incidence of violence.

Research Questions

The research questions center around determining the effectiveness of the Skills for Constructive Living peace education program as related to attitudes, perceptions, problem-solving skills and empowerment among a particular group of at-risk youth:

- 1) How do peace education programs influence the attitudes and perceptions of youth towards peaceful community living in Morocco?

- 2) How do peace education programs influence Moroccan youths' sense of empowerment and problem solving skills?

Outline of Remaining Chapters

Following this chapter, I trace the previous research on peace education and detail the applicability of peace education in the location of the study presented. Chapter two provides an overview of the literature related to peace education practices and programs in various settings. Chapter three highlights the evaluation methods used and the rationale for a mixed-methods approach. Chapter four provides the results of the evaluation from the participant interviews which gave insight into participants' attitudes and perceptions towards peace education, and the pre-tests and post-tests which measured participants' sense of empowerment and problem solving skills. In conclusion, chapter five discusses my interpretations of the findings and includes recommendations for future research.

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

Introduction

Peace education practices and initiatives are meant to teach people about the dangers of violence and strategies for peace (Harris, 2003). Reardon (1988) defines the purpose of peace education as follows:

... to promote the development of authentic planetary consciousness that will enable us to function as global citizens and to transform the present human condition by changing social structures and the patterns of thought that have created it.

Today, the field of peace education seeks to address more forms and manifestations of violence than ever before. Peace education programs are implemented in many different settings- from early childhood development centers to universities to informal community settings. Currently, peace education programs that take place in informal settings and are led by community groups are the most widespread (Salomon & Cairns, 2010). For example, many of the peace education materials developed by the United Nations are for the informal community setting including the Skills for Constructive Living program which was used in this study. Children and youth are typically not given a role in peacemaking efforts, but through peace education young people are empowered to be part of peace processes (Fulcher, 2012). Peace education programs are carried out in all different sociopolitical contexts around the world, from areas of relative tranquility to areas of intractable conflict. While peace education programs and practices differ widely, at the core of peace education efforts is the desire to change the attitudes, behaviors, and skills of people so they are able to prevent all forms of violence (Shapiro, 2010). Despite the fact that

peace education has become increasingly common, programs differ in their conceptual and theoretical approaches and their program objectives (Danesh, 2006). This literature review will attempt to highlight the diversity in the field of peace education so as to demonstrate the possibilities for the practical application of peace education programs in a multitude of settings.

This chapter presents a review of the literature related to peace education and is organized into seven sections: (1) Conceptual and theoretical considerations, (2) Peace education in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, (3) Peace education program models, (4) Peace education pedagogy, (5) Peace education in varied socio-political contexts, (6) Trends in current practices around the globe and, (7) Conclusion.

Conceptual and Theoretical Considerations

A Culture of Peace

An important conceptual framework in the field of peace education is a “culture of peace”, which is in stark contrast to a culture of war (Salomon & Cairns, 2010; Eisler & Miller, 2004; Harris, 2003). At the 1995 General Conference of UNESCO, 186 member states agreed that the major challenge at the end of the twentieth century was a transition from a culture of war and violence to a culture of peace (Harris, 2002). The United Nations General Assembly declared the year 2000 the International Year for the Culture of Peace and the coming decade as the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Nonviolence for the Children of the World (Eisler & Miller, 2004).

Peace education programs seek to teach participants the values, attitudes, knowledge, and skills to foster a culture of peace in their local environment as well the global environment. The essence of a culture of peace is a culture founded on values such as “respect for life, respect for

the principles of sovereignty, promotion of human rights, commitment to peaceful resolution of conflicts, efforts to meet the developmental and environmental needs of future generations, promotion of development, and so on” (Fernandez-Dols et al., 2004, p.118). The ultimate goal of any peace education practice is to transform the attitudes of people to reject a culture of war and instead pursue a culture of peace, and to help people who have experienced violence to reach healing and reconciliation after trauma (Ashton, 2007; Reardon & Cabezudo, 2002).

The culture of war is systematically reproduced through formal and informal education. The formal educational system plays a powerful role in perpetuating the culture of conflict because it reaches the younger generation, where schooling is compulsory, and it acts as the major agent for the socialization of a conflict-based worldview through textbooks, authoritarian teaching methods, school ceremonies, bullying, competitive testing, and so on (Bar-Tal & Rosen, 2009). Messages of the inevitability of conflict and violence received at school are buoyed by informal messages received at home. Parents can sometimes provide children with the idea that survival and success in a violent, competitive, and dangerous world is the primary purpose in life, and that forces of struggle and competition are more powerful than forces of cooperation and peace (Danesh, 2006). Thus when children reach adulthood, they largely share the same beliefs and attitudes and have similar perceptions of reality. When “reality” is a world full of competition, struggle, and violence, the culture of conflict can be an obstacle to a culture of peace because it suppresses ideas that promote peaceful, equitable, and harmonious relationships, whether at the intrapersonal, interpersonal, intergroup, or international levels (Bar-Tal & Rosen, 2009).

Negative Peace versus Positive Peace

Peace is a central concept to peace education and thus how peace is conceptualized will inform peace education theory and practice. During the 1980s the idea of positive peace emerged which represented peace as more than simply the absence of war and instead conceptualized peace as the attainment of certain forms of human coexistence (Aspeslagh & Burns, 1996).

“Peace researchers understand that it is not sufficient just to strive for negative peace, the cessation of violence. To create a peaceful world, humans have to strive for positive peace, a condition brought about by establishing standards of justice, human rights, and sustainable development in beloved communities. For educators, this implies not just stopping the violence to create a positive classroom learning environment but also establishing within students' minds a commitment to peace principles.”

(Harris, 1996, p.386)

Negative peace, as the antithesis of positive peace, is simply the absence of direct, personal violence (Galtung, 1969). Positive peace is achieved with the elimination of overt forms of violence like war (physical violence) and the elimination of unjust social arrangements in society (structural violence). Positive peace is a condition where equal opportunity is present, violence is not built into social structures, and self-fulfillment and self-worth are enhanced (Brock-Unte, 1996). It also requires that individuals adopt a set of beliefs which are compatible with the peaceful resolution of conflicts and that social institutions are committed to the equal distribution of resources (Galtung, 1969). Barriers to positive peace include the dominance of conflict-oriented worldviews (Danesh, 2006) and social, racial, economic and ecological injustices which

prevent people from having their basic rights and needs met and are destructive to the environment (Christie et al., 2008).

In pursuit of positive peace, many peace education programs give due attention to issues of structural violence rather than focusing solely on physical violence. Structural violence, the inequitable denial of resources, is according to Galtung, in itself a cause of other forms of violence (1969). A study of children's and adolescents' conceptions of peace revealed that they primarily understand peace in terms of negative peace, associating peace with issues such as the absence of war, the absence of war activities (Hakvoort & Oppenheimer, 1993). Peace education helps to teach young people to recognize structural violence and to pursue positive peace. This is what Cann (2012) calls "critical peace education" where a space is created where dialog about the impact of structural violence on one's life can happen. The ultimate goal of critical peace education would be to transcend structural violence such as racism and poverty and create opportunities for liberatory actions.

Integrative Theory of Peace

The Integrative Theory of Peace (ITP) states that peace is, at once, a "psychological, social, political, ethical, and spiritual state" with many expressions in relationships at all different levels including "interpersonal, intergroup, international, and global areas of human life", and that peace as a state of being is shaped by our worldview (Danesh, 2006, p.55). Peace is multifaceted and relationships characterized by peace should be valued at whatever level they exist, interpersonal peace is no less meaningful than international peace. In fact, intimate and interpersonal relationships provide insight into the whether a culture supports peaceful relationships or relationships characterized by violence and domination, because it is in these intimate and interpersonal relationships where we learn what is normal/abnormal and

possible/impossible (Eisler & Miller, 2004). There are important implications for practice from this theory, namely 1) if peace is at once a psychological, social, political, ethical, and spiritual state, then peace education programs must take an ecological approach to teaching peace; and 2) if peace is expressed in interpersonal, intergroup, international, and global areas of human life, peace education programs must work to address peace at all of these different levels.

The ITP states that peace, as a human state of being, is shaped by our worldview which encompasses our view of reality, human nature, and the purpose of life and human relationships (Danesh, 2006). Our worldview informs what behaviors and relationships are desirable and undesirable, what can be known or done in the world and how it can be known or done, what goals can be sought and pursued in life, and provides the epistemic and ontological foundations for beliefs within a belief system (Koltko-Rivera, 2004). A conflict-oriented worldview is an impediment to realizing peace, whether at the intrapersonal, interpersonal, intergroup, or international levels. Unfortunately, most people of the world have a conflict-oriented worldview (Danesh, 2006). Peace education programs, informed by the ITP can work to change worldviews from predominantly conflict-oriented to peace-oriented.

Theory of Change

The lack of evaluation of peace education programs is one of the strongest critiques of peace education (McGlynn et al., 2009). The implicit theory behind peace education is a Theory of Change which contends that if we do a certain set of activities with participants, we can expect certain results, including significant changes in behavior, attitudes, knowledge, and skills (Ashton, 2007). Unfortunately, theory of change is underused in practice and remains only implicit in much of the literature on peace education (Bretherton, Weston & Zbar, 2005). Using a theory of change can allow practitioners to better plan and evaluate peace education programs,

and to communicate outcomes of peace education programs to their colleagues and the public in a convincing way. Using theory of change in peace education programs can also help those conducting peace education programs “to more fully document the connections among program expectations, implementation, and results achieved” (Ashton, 2007, p.43). Without using evaluation strategies such as theory of change, “peace education programmes lead to unknown results and, when they fail, it is not clear why they fail” (Salomon & Kupermintz, 2002, p. 2). Peace education, while at times based on abstract concepts, must strive to demonstrate effectiveness of its programs in order to advance the field, and gain resources and political support.

Evaluations of the effectiveness of peace education programs at producing peaceful behaviors, structures, and policies are seeking to understand a very complex phenomenon. Harris (2003) identifies a number of challenges related to the evaluation of peace education programs; namely analyzing the many different causes of violence and the complexities of strategies used to reduce violence, and conducting follow-up studies with participants in peace education programs in order to assess if they transferred their learning into real world actions that contribute to more peaceful societies (p.4). Nevo & Brem (2002) conducted a review of the literature on peace education from 1981-2000 and found 79 studies which sought to evaluate program effectiveness and found the following shortcomings; 1) “not enough attention is given to behavior”; 2) “the majority of PE programs appeal to rationality”; 3) “delayed posttest is important; nevertheless, it is very rare in PE research”; and 4) “generalizability of the program onto related individuals was hardly studied” (p.274-5). While there are clearly challenges to evaluating the effectiveness of peace education programs, that has not negated the need to demonstrate to funders, the public, and stakeholders the efficacy of peace education programs.

Peace Education in the Twentieth and Twenty-First Centuries

Harris (1988, 2003, 2004) has written extensively on the history of peace education. Throughout history people have used different strategies to resolve conflicts peacefully. Indigenous peoples have created nonviolent traditions including nonviolent dispute mechanisms and conflict resolution strategies that have been passed down from generation to generation through the millennia (Harris, 2004). These strategies essentially function as informal peace education activities because they seek to create social structures and norms which are conducive to peacemaking. Anthropologists have identified at least 47 relatively peacefully societies that use community based peace education strategies (Banta, 1993; Eisler & Miller, 2004; Harris, 2004). The earliest records of guidelines for living in peace with one another come from the world's various religions with scriptures about living in peace and prophets that espouse peace (Harris, 2004).

Peace Education in the Twentieth Century

In the early twentieth century the study of peace education reflected the urgency for finding ways to avoid large-scale interstate wars, and the increase of peace activism and the growth of international organizations that sought to promote peace. According to Betty Reardon (1988), the early era of the field was characterized by seeking to change the behavior of people and of nations. The idea behind this approach to peace education was that if people gave more consideration to peaceful alternatives, wars could be prevented. However, this early twentieth century approach lacked any implementation mechanisms that would enable peace education to become effective and expand. The field was largely theory based and at that point did not focus on peace education practices and programs. It also did not offer any changes in the status quo of

the international system at the time, nor did it address the fact that violence was all that most people have known or lived, since the generation at the time had just gone through a devastating world war which left Europe in ruins (Reardon, 1988).

During the 1960s, the reconstructive phase began (Reardon, 1988). This approach aimed at restructuring the international system and implementing institutional changes, rather than behavioral ones. It centered on ways of changing institutions and examined the notion of establishing global institutions to protect and maintain the peace. This approach lacked any implementation mechanisms and did not offer any feasible alternatives to violence. It also only explored the notion of violence between states on a massive scale, and ignored somewhat interpersonal violence between individuals.

In the post-cold war era there was a major shift in research on peace education (Aspeslagh & Burns, 1996). Following the collapse of communism and socialism in Eastern Europe, there were emerging conflicts as a product of the new European borders. There was a rise in ethnic conflict around the globe in the 80s and 90s in eastern and southeastern Europe, Iraq and Iran during the Gulf War, and in many newly independent countries in Africa. There was a notable shift from interstate wars to intrastate conflict, with the vast majority of killings happening between ethnic groups fighting to control contested territories (Niens & Cairns, 2001). In response to the rise of ethnic conflicts, research on peace education began to focus more on intergroup peace.

In the aftermath of conflicts in the 90s, there was a proliferation of non-formal peace education, meant to transform cultures around the world from cultures of war to cultures of peace. Education, as a socializing institution in society, was assigned the important role of bringing cohesion and reconstruction to broken societal relations. Conflict resolution programs,

as forms of peace education, were implemented in regions that just went through conflict.

According to Reardon, peace education in the early twenty-first century was characterized by the transformational approach to peace education with the central goal to “make violence unacceptable, not only in interactions among individuals, but also in interactions among nations.” (p.XI). Burns and Aspeslagh (1996) characterize this time by the shift from focusing on societal peace to instead focusing on achieving a culture of peace.

Peace Education in the Twenty-First Century

Like peace education in the twentieth century, peace education in the twenty-first century has a symbiotic relationship with the trends in peace research and peace activism, as well being responsive to the types of violence societies are facing. Whereas in the twentieth century, peace education traditionally focused on the causes and effects of war among states and groups, today the field has expanded to include the study of interpersonal violence, domestic violence, poverty and development, structural violence, human rights and ecological destruction (Forccy & Harris, 1999; Reardon, 1988; Stomfay-Stitz, 1993; Harris, 2003). There has also been a great deal of research on peace education in situations of ethnic violence and hatred, particularly in Israel and Palestine (Salomon, 2004; Beckerman & McGlynn, 2007; Biton, 2006; Grant, 1998).

The shift in focus in the field of peace education from interstate war to encompass the many different manifestations of violence found in the world today offers a more complete vision for the issues that the field of peace education seeks to address. A further shift in current peace education practices and futures is its implementation in informal settings. Formal school systems, due to cultural and economic pressures which valorize achievement on standardized tests and emphasize the competitiveness of the global market, have largely been unable and unwilling to implement peace education practices (Harris, 2003). In the American context, a

further challenge to implementing peace education practices in formal schools is that critics consider peace education to be “appeasement education” (Boyston, 1983) and particularly in a post-9/11 world, peace education is often perceived as “weak” and “soft” and in contradiction to government policies. Given the challenges of finding a permanent home for peace education practices in formal schools in the United States and across the globe, peace education is carried out more often in informal learning environments. This poses both benefits and challenges to the field of peace education, but there are certainly future prospects in informal community peace education.

Peace Education Models

Direct and Indirect Peace Education

Depending on the social context in which a peace education program is operating in, direct or indirect peace education will be used. Indirect peace education is a model of peace education which does not directly address the source of a particular conflict, for example its causes, history, or the parties involved. Rather, indirect peace education seeks to address very general themes relevant to peacemaking, peacebuilding, and peacekeeping such as “an array of themes and skills that do not refer to the ongoing conflict at all and may focus on a choice of themes such as identity, ecological security, violence, empathy, human rights, and conflict resolution skills” (Najjuma, 2011, p.70). If a program is implemented in the context of intractable conflict with extreme hostilities and an environment which is unfavorable to peace education, indirect peace education should be used because it can be far too challenging to introduce direct peace education when there is extreme violence. An example of this type of program is Pathways to Reconciliation which was implemented in Israel and Palestine and

because of extreme hostilities between the two sides of the conflict, the program was carried out with the Israeli and Palestinian participants remaining separate (Biton & Salomon, 2006). In contrast, when a peace education program is being implemented in a social setting where hostilities are moderate or low and thus favorable to peace education, direct peace education can be used. Direct peace education is a model of peace education which seeks to directly address the major issues of the conflict which are contributing factors to maintaining the ethos of conflict in the society, and serving as barriers to its peaceful resolution. An example of this model is the Education for Peace Project implemented in Bosnia and Herzegovina which sought to directly confront the teachers, students, and community members with the issues that caused the conflict (Clark-Habibi, 2005). These two models are based on the sociopolitical environment and how conducive it is to directly confronting the issues surrounding a particular conflict.

Indirect peace education does not directly address the current conflict that communities are experiencing. It does not discuss the history of the conflict, costs of the conflict, or the image of the rival; instead indirect peace education works to instill general themes of peacemaking and focuses on identity, empathy, human rights, ecological security, and conflict resolution skills (Bar-Tal & Rosen, 2009). In such cases, institutions within the society including those that control the educational system as well as large segments of the population, object to peace education that directly addresses the conflict being lived (Najjuma, 2011). In the above example, Pathways to Reconciliation in Israel and Palestine, it was impossible to have contact between the participants as planned because the schools were not supportive of the contact encounters between participants and thus the program was carried out but participants remained segregated based on which side of the conflict they were on. Thus in this case it is important to establish in learners knowledge, values, and skills that are conducive to peacemaking, while not touching too

directly on the ethos of the conflict (Bar-Tal & Rosen, 2009). Although the conflict will not be addressed directly, learners may transfer the themes learned about in indirect peace education to the conflict in which the society is involved, and this may come to serve as a foundation for future direct peace education and a change in the held repertoire which fuels the conflict (Van Slyck, Stern & Elbedour, 1999).

Direct peace education can be implemented when the social and political setting is appropriate for it. Additionally, the educational system must be ready for direct peace education, both pedagogically and administratively, so that a safe environment is created where students can refer directly to the themes of the societal conflict and work to change collective narratives and behavior related to the culture of war and violence (Bar-Tal & Rosen, 2009). Direct peace education includes providing unbiased information about the history of the conflict where both parties consider their own past and involvement in perpetuating the conflict, and recognize their own and the others collective narratives (Salomon, 2002, 2004). At the affective level, direct peace education strives to reduce collective fear and hatred and foster collective trust and mutual acceptance (Bar-Tal, Halperin, & De Rivera, 2007). The indirect and direct approaches to peace education are not mutually exclusive and indirect education can serve as a primer for direct peace education.

Formal and Informal Peace Education

Peace education programs are implemented both in the formal school environment (“integrative”) and in the nonformal community environment (“additive”) (Carson & Lange, 1997). Those peace educators that promote the integrative approach believe that the formal school system has the legitimacy and authority to carry out peace education and according to

Bar-Tal “schools are often the only institutions society can formally, intentionally and extensively use to achieve this mission” (2002, p.27). Other scholars are critical of the possibility of formal schools implementing peace education because of what they view as an incompatibility between the goals of formal schooling and the goals of peace education. Peace educators who follow the additive approach do so because they believe there is not a home for peace education in the formal school system.

In the case of peace education in the formal school setting, Bretherton identifies three different ways to integrate peace education into public schools: as a standalone subject in the school day, integrated into different subject areas in the usual curriculum, and as a whole school approach (2003, p.15). As a standalone subject, peace education would take the form of a class offered separately to students and would have its own curriculum. Peace education as integrated into different subject areas would take the form of content integration across the curriculum throughout the school day so that in every subject area values related to peace education are consistent with what is being taught. And finally, a whole school approach does not consider only curriculum content but also the nature of the school and all who are in it and seeks to create an environment within the school that is consistent in all ways with values of peace and partnership. Bar-Tal (2002) argues that the government must play a pivotal role in promoting peace education because the government that has the power to set the objective and standards for peace education, as well as to train teachers, determine the content of textbooks, and set guidelines for organizing the political climate in schools. The most compelling arguments for integrative peace education are that formal schooling provides the best opportunities for universal peace education because of compulsory schooling, it has the ability to reach students who may be too poor to participate in informal programs, it would give legitimacy to peace

education if it was part of the formal school day, and because of how many years children and youth spend in schools, peace education will be long term instead of in the form of short term programs.

Those who advocate for peace education outside of the formal school system do so not because they reject the idea that peace education should be universal or that on principle peace education and formal schooling are incompatible, but because they believe that in practice formal schools promote a culture of violence and conflict, normalize competition and struggle, and teach students to be a consumer in a market economy rather than a global citizen. Galtung argues that peace education in a competitive formal school environment is hypocritical, and even worse, messages of peace education in formal schools will be nullified through the much stronger messages students receive about dominance which is conveyed through the structure of public schooling itself (1975). Most schools devalue students' feelings of self-confidence and self-worth through their constant rankings of students' achievements on tests (Bjerstedt, 1986). Brock-Unte (2000) goes as far as to say that the normal school system is in fact a case study of structural violence. Due to the perceived lack of compatibility between formal schooling and peace education, many peace education programs take the form of workshops. This type of program design is very compatible with peace education because it can relatively easily be adjusted and revised in response to problems and circumstance in the community where it is taking place, whereas the formal school curriculum is less flexible (Najjuma, 2011). Consideration of the local context must be made when deciding whether to use integrative or additive peace education, and like indirect and direct peace education, they are not mutually exclusive.

Short-term and Long-term Peace Education

In the informal sector, peace education programs are most often held in workshop format (Najjuma, 2011). Another common short-term practice are “peace camps” where youth who live in areas of intractable conflict meet to participate in different activities and discussion. Both of these common peace education practices are short-term and often one time. Such short-term workshops and contact experiences are meant to change hearts and minds of participants but do not offer sufficient support for behavior change (McCauley, 2002). According to Brock-Unte (2000), the longer the education, the more likely it is that the learners will internalize the norms being taught. In the case of peace education, where norms center around the attitudes, values, and skills conducive to peace, students would benefit from long and continuous exposure to these norms, particularly to counteract norms of violence, competition, and conflict which are so prevalent in society. McCauley (2002) also argues that changing negative attitudes towards other groups requires frequent contact as well as practice and repetition of new patterns of behavior. One program that used peace education in workshop format found that there were no significant changes in attitudes and values following one workshop as measured by pre-tests and post-test, but after three workshops there were significant changes (Morrison, Austad & Cota, 2011). Supporting the importance of sustained contact, Allport’s Contact Hypothesis (1954), which states that under certain conditions contact between conflicting groups can reduce prejudice, one conditionality is that the groups in conflict have contact experiences frequently to have positive outcomes. Peace education programs that involve contact between conflicting groups should enable the building of positive personal relationships between the groups which usually requires long-term interactions and emotional modification (Yablon, 2009).

Another challenge to short-term peace education efforts is the ‘re-entry problem’ (McCauley, 2002; Tal-Or et al., 2002) which is similar to the “ripple effect” (Salomon, 2010).

Both of these terms are concerned with how participants in a peace education program bring their newly acquired knowledge, attitudes, and skills back to their community, where the old patterns of behavior still exist. With short-term programs that only target the selected or self-selected participants, it can be very hard for participants to ‘re-enter’ into the society that contradicts much of what was acquired in the program. Additionally, short-term programs with a target population are unlikely to have a ripple effect where the ideas are shared from the participants with the larger community, thus having an effect beyond the individual participants. The so called ripple effect, where people who learn new knowledge and skills through participation in a peace education program share their insights and the message spreads, is not measured as it is more of an abstract hope that it can be achieved (Harris, 2003).

Most peace educators and peace education researchers advocate for a long-term approach to peace education programs because they believe that peace education is a long-term investment that if implemented properly can help to build a more peaceful society (Salomon & Nevo, 2003). The prevalence of short-term peace education programs in the field does not reflect a preference of practitioners and researchers, but rather financial and political realities. It is far easier and cheaper for the informal educational sector, which does the bulk of peace education programs, to implement workshops than to strategically plan a long-term peace education program which requires secured funding and experts from different fields. However, Bush & Saltarelli (2000) point out that for peace education to gain legitimacy, “national and international actors need to commit themselves to peace education initiatives for a longer period in order to make the programs sustainable and thus effective” (p.27). Proving program effectiveness is vital to the future of peace education, and Salomon (2010) considers demonstrating the long term endurance

of the effects of peace education to be one of the four major challenges facing peace education in areas of conflict.

Peace Education Pedagogy

Although there is much debate in the field of peace education about theories, conceptual frameworks and content of peace education programs, there is a general consensus among peace education researchers and practitioners on the pedagogy that should be used to teach peace. Perhaps the consensus is the reason why peace education pedagogy is not discussed extensively in the literature. From the available literature on this aspect of peace education, we find the following three principles: learning should be participatory, democratic, and cooperative (Ashton, 2007; Brock-Unte, 2000; Harris, 2002; Galtung, 2008), promote connected knowing (Eisler & Miller, 2004; Kessler, 2004), and be transformative (Friere, 1970; Harris, 2002; Fetherston & Kelly, 2007). The guiding principle behind peace education pedagogy is that merely teaching about peace is not enough; teaching by peaceful means is the way to peace (Najjuma, 2011).

Participatory Learning

Children learn from educational institutions not only what is taught; the school and educational system as institutions also send strong messages to students (Guttman, 1987). When these institutions are characterized by competition, discipline and punishment, violence, and domination, what messages are we sending students? Peace educators promote a pedagogy where the classroom models a peaceful participatory democratic environment, with tolerance, kindness, and cooperation (Harris, 2002). This implies an environment where teachers and administrators treat students as equals and value student participation in shaping the school. It is

difficult to teach young people about equality between states big and small, between religions, or between different cultures when there is so little equality between teachers and students (Brock-Unte, 2000). Eisler claims that education typically follows a pattern of social domination which expose “children to the psychological and often physical abuse required to function in the rigid hierarchies of domination they are taught is ‘reality’” (Eisler & Miller, 2004, p.17). There is a need for a shift in teaching and management methods to include students, families, and community members in school decision making so as to make structural or systemic changes towards a more collaborative school system (Ashton, 2007).

Even though many schools state goals compatible with participatory learning such as cooperation and self-confidence, the structures of grading and individual achievement do not promote these values (Brock-Unte, 2000). Power and status distinctions between youth and adults in schools demonstrate a dramatic form of asymmetry whereby youth are taught deference to adult authority and there is a separation of youth and adults in schools (Mitra, 2009). Throughout students’ experiences in school, they learn how to be in dominator relationships; how to submit to authority or rebel against it, how to compete for extrinsic rewards, and to rely on superiors to determine what is best for them (Hurt, 2004). Students learn about power *over* rather than power *with*. According to Harber & Sakade, “power over is what is taught and learned, how it is taught and learned” and power rests predominantly with teachers, administrators and officials, not with students (2009, p.172). Creating a truly participatory school environment will lead to cooperation between students, as well as between teachers, administrators, families, and the community. This would require reshaping the relationships in schools to be characterized by cooperation and partnership, or power *with*, rather than power *over*. Research demonstrates that learners who cooperate well in groups have more positive

interpersonal relationships, make greater efforts to achieve learning, and have better psychological health (Johnson & Johnson, 1999; Frydenberg et al. 2009). Getting students to cooperate in groups involves a method of teaching/learning whereby learners engage with a content area while at the same time practicing prosocial skills through group work exercises (Brock-Unte, 2000).

Connected Knowing

In most countries much of the time in school is spent learning the disciplines of knowledge (i.e. rationalist view of knowing based on the idea that knowledge is factual and certain rather than contentious and subject to change). These disciplines do not exist in a vacuum; they endorse certain understandings and worldviews ;“traditional disciplinary methods employ a kind of abstract theoretical knowing, divorced from the real world, and their advocates pride themselves in that distance” (Eisler & Miller, 2004, p.137). This approach to knowing advocates removing oneself from the subject of study because it is thought that this will allow people to be “objective”. Further, using traditional analytical methods found in formal schooling, moral and emotional aspects of a problem are considered not just irrelevant, but an unacceptable basis for rational problem solving. By gaining distance from our object of study we “can also become more removed from our feelings and the pain and suffering of real human beings, much to our collective human detriment” (Eisler & Miller, 2004, p.137).

An alternative approach to knowing the world has been identified by feminists and other scholars as ‘connected knowing’ (Kessler, 2004). This approach seeks to educate people for peace and partnership and encourages learners to understand an issue through using our empathy. The approach of connected teaches students to make emotional connections with the subjects of

study, and think morally within the disciplines learned in school. Connected knowing does not mean discarding the scientific method and analytical tools; rather it claims that while these are important ways of studying the world, they will not solve the world's problems alone, they must be integrated into a method that also allows for empathy and emotional connections. Einstein claimed that "the world we have created is a product of our thinking; it cannot be changed without changing our thinking" (Shapiro 2010, p.1). Disciplinary knowledge in schools must be complimented with empathetic understanding. Through using connected knowing, there are new possibilities for problem solving that can promote a more partnership oriented society and a culture of peace.

Transformative Learning

As Brock-Unte (2000) pointed out, schools are a case study in structural violence, and thus peace education pedagogy and practices must work to transform educational institutions, as well as social institutions. Transformative learning emerged as a response to the perceived structural violence in society and schools. It calls for the realization of the emancipatory potential of education where learning is an instrumental part of transforming unjust structures in society (Kester & Booth, 2010). Transformational learning draws from Friere's educational methodology which helps people to recognize and address the sources of their oppression. For people to be truly free, they must understand how to overcome oppressive conditions by analyzing sources of violence in daily life and learning nonviolent ways to address those forms of violence so that meaningful action can be taken to reduce violence in all forms (Friere, 1970). Harris (2002) notes that although Friere is not considered a peace educator per say, Friere saw that education could liberate people from structural violence which is a central tenant of peace education. Teaching for transformational learning to address structural violence requires teachers

and students to critically question dominant discourses and frameworks of meaning so as to problematize existing ways of seeing and doing (Brock-Unte, 2000). Through understanding social conditions of structural violence and questioning long held assumptions, problems are redefined by learners and thus individual as well as societal transformations become possible.

Peace Education in Varied Socio-Political Contexts

Peace Education in Areas of Tranquility

Programs designed for settings which experience relative societal harmony are meant to foster conflict resolution skills and nonviolent behaviors of individual students. These programs are appropriate for areas where there are not high levels of intergroup conflict and help students to develop a tool set to deal with interpersonal conflicts (Salomon, 2010). Some strategies that can be employed in this category are education for citizenship, resilience education, education for character and conflict resolution education. An example of these programs can be seen in the Quaker Friends Schools in the United States where conflict resolution skills are a central part of the curriculum (Hakvoort, 2010).

Peace Education in Areas of Inter-Ethnic Tension

Areas of inter-ethnic tension are often found in multicultural societies where there is conflict surrounding minority and majority groups that are formed along religious, ethnic, and social lines (Yablon, 2009). Peace education programs in this context are designed to teach coexistence, give a general overview of conflicts and causes of conflicts, and to arouse positive attitudes towards non-violence. This type of program seeks to foster empathy in students so that they can understand how war causes human suffering, and it attempts to cultivate general values, beliefs, and dispositions towards peace, not towards a particular adversary (Salomon, 2010).

Peace education programs in this context may involve education for citizenship and democracy, diversity education, human rights education, and education on the destruction of the environment. An example of this type of program can be seen in the education for citizenship peace education initiatives in Northern Ireland following the conflict there where program goals included facilitating the development of knowledge and dispositions that would help citizens to build peace in their societies (Carter, 2004). These programs focus on teaching inclusion and would be appropriate for many different contexts; particularly social contexts where there is tension around different groups in society (Salomon, 2007).

Peace Education in Areas of Intractable Conflict

Intractable conflicts are those characterized as “lasting at least 25 years and as being fought over goals that are perceived as existential; they are violent, perceived as unsolvable, of a zero-sum nature, and preoccupying society members greatly; and the parties involved invest much in their continuation” (Bar-Tal & Rosen, 2009, p.557). Some conflicts that fit this description would be the Israeli/Palestinian conflict, the civil war in Sri Lanka, and the Protestant/Catholic conflict in Northern Ireland. Peace Education programs in areas of intractable conflict are designed to change the way that conflicting parties relate to each other so as to demystify the enemies identity/image in order to foster empathy towards its culture, point of view and very importantly, it’s humanity (Salomon, 2010). They are also designed to change participants’ misperceptions of the ‘other’ and to help participants develop a sense of responsibility towards ‘other’ (Yablon, 2009). Peace education in areas of intractable conflict applies to situations where there is a real adversarial relationship between groups and when the ‘other’ is viewed as a threatening collective enemy. In this context of strong intergroup tension the goals of a peace education program should be focused on addressing the relationships

between collectives, not individuals. Conflicts such as these are not between individuals but rather between national/religious/political groups and governments (Salomon, 2007).

Trends in Current Practice

While there is great interest in research involving peace education initiatives in areas of extreme conflict surrounding national, political, religious and ethnic issues, there is also a great need to use peace education as a tool to transform violent behaviors and violent structures found in communities which are not experiencing armed conflict. Of particular interest today are peace education programs meant to teach youth the values, skills, and behaviors conducive to peaceful community living. In many communities around the world there are substantial risk factors that lead youth to violent behaviors such as poverty, violent social environments, dysfunctional family relationships, easy access to drugs and weapons, and negative cultural models (Brown, D'Emidio-Caston, & Bernard, 2001). Violence prevention strategies as peace education in this context are most powerful in teaching youth to avoid drug use, weapons, crime, and bullying (Harris, 2002). Below, three current trends in peace education practice which specifically target youth; resilience education, conflict resolution education, and education for human rights are discussed.

Resilience Education

At the close of the twentieth century, peace educators became more concerned about domestic, civil, and cultural forms of violence and how to heal the wounds of students who grew up in violent cultures (Harris, 2002). Brown, D'Emidio-Caston & Benard (2001) claim that in the context of seeking to prevent violent behavior among youth, “resilience education” whose goals are “to develop decision-making and affective skills within each person and connectedness

between people in the context of a healthy, democratic learning community” (p.27). Resilience education as a variation of peace education attempts to foster resilience skills in young people so that they can avoid violence in interpersonal relationships, drugs, and risky sexual behavior (Brown, D'Emido-Caston, & Bernard, 2001). The approach of resilience education seeks to give youth a safe place, whether at school or nonformal settings, to express their emotions and fears surrounding the adversity that they face, rather than treating at-risk youth as future offenders who must be controlled.

Knight (2007) suggests a three dimensional approach for resilience education; resilience as a state (“what is resilience and what does a resilient youth look like?”), resilience as a condition (“what can I do to promote resilience as an educator?”) and resilience as a practice (“how will I as an educator go about facilitating resiliency among youth?”). In order to implement a successful resilience education initiative there must be all three dimensions in operation. Within the dimension of resilience as a condition, connectedness is emphasized. Connectedness has been examined in the context of the school environment in order to understand what leads to ‘school connectedness’. School connectedness refers to an “academic environment where students believe that adults in the school care about their learning and about them as individuals” (Blum, 2005, p.16) and where students’ perceive themselves to be accepted by the school and as being a part of the school (Frydenberg et al., 2009). Teachers cannot create school connectedness on their own, administrators and staff also play a vital role, as well as the community’s support for the school and positive youth/adult partnerships. According to Blum (2005), there are three characteristics of schools which can create meaningful connections between students and adults: 1) supportive teachers with high academic standards; 2) a social environment where adult and student relationships are positive and respectful; and 3) a school environment which is

emotionally and physically safe (p.17). There are many aspects of contemporary schools that do not allow for these connections, namely environments that are unsafe due to hierarchies of power, student and adult relationships which are authoritarian in nature, and teachers who are unable to provide enough support to students for many reasons, one of which is inadequate resources. Working to increase school connectedness is important in order to create new patterns of relationships in schools and resilience among students.

Conflict Resolution Education

Conflict Resolution Education teaches youth skills in communication, empathy, anger management, emotional awareness and problem solving and is one of the fastest growing and widely accepted school reforms in the west (Gentry & Benenson, 1992; Harris, 2002). These skills can serve youth and educators well in creating a safer school environment and if practiced with other community members could also work to strengthen the community environment. Studies conducted in the United States on CRE have shown promising results including a positive impact on school climate, and a decrease of negative behaviors such as aggressiveness, school dropout, violence, and suspensions. Further, the studies showed that there was an increase in positive behaviors including increased cooperation, positive attitudes towards school and better academic performance (Bodine & Crawford, 1997).

Conflict resolution education typically fits into one of three categories: CRE embedded in curriculum, direct skills instruction or peer mediation (Lane-Garon, Yergat & Kralowec, 2012). The available delivery formats make it possible to use CRE in a formal educational setting as well as an informal educational setting, and to use CRE with children, youth and adults. A principle of CRE is that the skills acquired through conflict resolution training are valuable at all

educational levels and that the skills gained are essential for life (Jones, 2004). Further, research shows that children and youth who learn conflict resolution techniques in school often take these skills and their knowledge back into their community and help friends and family resolve conflicts nonviolently (Stichter, 1986).

Increasingly practitioners and trainers of CRE are seeking to take their practice to other counties and cultures (Lodge, 2011). This demands an examination of the cross-cultural dimensions of CRE to understand it's applicability to non-western contexts. Conflict across cultures can be very different; the ways in which conflict is perceived, and the behaviors that are expressed and considered appropriate in a conflict situation. Further, ways of resolving conflicts can be very different across cultures and can be steeped in tradition and custom. Culture influences intergroup relations in a society; it helps to categorize the in-group and out-group and can create identities (Arai, 2006). Like any other educational endeavor in a cross-cultural context, conflict resolution educators risk using practices and processes that fit their worldview but not that of their participants. This can lead to feelings of coercion among participants and even for them to adopt conflict resolution practices that are not sensitive and responsive to the local context. Needless to say, this can actually be a source of conflict in the community rather than a tool for solving conflicts. Thus, a model of prescriptive training which transfers expert knowledge cross-culturally is at best inappropriate and at worst harmful, and follows a domination orientation rather than a partnership orientation (Lodge, 2011). Lodge argues that to overcome the challenge of teaching CRE across cultures, the Elicitive model should be used. This approach gives value to cognition rather than knowledge transfer and aligns with Freire's "problem-posing education" where the experiences and knowledge of the participants are valued and used to shape the learning (Freire, 2009). This approach gives value to indigenous

knowledge and customs and thus more likely to be sustainable. The elicitive model has clear steps that Lederach (1995) outlines: (1) discovery of what participants in their setting do when conflict arises; (2) participants develop their own terms, language and categories for the conflict resolution activities they have identified; (3) participants evaluate what works and does not work in their given context and adapt and recreate processes accordingly; and (4) the new or recreated processes are applied in practice through role plays or through application to real conflict situations.

Human Rights Education

Human Rights Education (HRE) is normally viewed as a subfield of peace education (Brock-Unte, 2000). The United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which is a statement of values that must be pursued in order to achieve social, economic, and political justice, guides peace educators who teach human rights (Harris, 2003). Amnesty International defines human rights education (HRE) as follows:

Human rights education is a deliberate, participatory practice aimed at empowering individuals, groups, and communities through fostering knowledge, skills, and attitudes consistent with internationally recognized principles. . . . Its goal is to build a culture of respect for and action in the defence and promotion of human rights for all.

In order to accomplish these goals, there is a dual focus in HRE on both content and process related to human rights (Bajaj, 2011). Tibbitts (2005) notes that process is extremely important to human rights education and that nearly all the literature on HRE concludes that using participatory methods in a HRE classroom is essential for program success. Related to content,

goals of HRE usually include creating attitudes, knowledge, and skills in students so that they can take action in their communities to respect and promote human rights (Bajaj, 2011).

HRE generally falls into three categories of programs; HRE for Global Citizenship, HRE for Coexistence, and HRE for Transformative Action (Dembour, 2010). HRE for Global Citizenship gives students an opportunity to learn about being a part of an international community through encouraging knowledge and skills related to universal values and standards (Bajaj, 2011). The second approach, HRE for Coexistence, fosters in learners a multicultural understanding of the world which aims to reduce stereotypes and hostilities between groups (Reardon, 1997). The goal of HRE for coexistence is to help students respect the inherent humanity in all humans, including the group they are in conflict with, and adopt a disposition to care people who belong to different social, political, racial, ethnic, or economic groups Harris, 2002). HRE for coexistence often involves contact experiences based on Allport's Contact Hypothesis (1954), where people from different groups meet in order to transform ethnic, religious, and racial hatred and to challenge stereotypes by breaking down enemy images (Salomon, 2002). The third approach to HRE, HRE for Transformative Action, seeks to engage with learners who are economically or politically marginalized in their own society and to help them understand their own realities (Bajaj, 2011). This strand of HRE works to protect the human rights of oppressed people and build solidarity in communities through different peace movements (Boulding, 2000) and is similar to Freire's process of developing a critical consciousness (1970). Practitioners can determine which strand of HRE is appropriate for their audience and use one approach or a combination of approaches to teaching HRE.

Conclusion

This chapter presented literature related to the state of the field of peace education both in theory and in practice. The literature reviewed highlighted the conceptual and theoretical approaches being applied in the field, as well as the roots and development of the field throughout the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The various models that are used to inform programs were also considered alongside the pedagogies that are used in the classroom to deliver peace education curriculum. Also included was the attention found in the literature to the varying socio-political contexts in which peace education occurs, as this will impact the type of goals and parameters of peace education interventions. And finally, the current trends in practice were discussed which showed the diversity in the field of peace education today.

Chapter 3

Methods and Procedures

Overview of Research

The purpose of this study was to contribute to the body of knowledge on ways to address school and community violence through peace education by testing the viability of a specific peace education program in a community that is experiencing increasing levels of violence. The curriculum used in this study, Skills for Constructive Living, is summarized below. The research questions were: (1) how do peace education programs influence the attitudes and perceptions of youth towards peaceful community living in Morocco?; and (2) how do peace education programs influence Moroccan youths' sense of empowerment and problem solving skills? This study utilized a non-experimental research design with one sample group of youth who participated in the Skills for Constructive Living peace education program. Because of the dearth of research on peace education programs in Morocco, this research design offered valuable descriptive data on the applicability of peace education in this type of environment. Skills for Constructive Living was developed by the United Nations and piloted in Kenya, and has been implemented in other countries in Africa, Asia and the Baltic region. The Skills for Constructive Living program has not been implemented in Morocco and thus the researcher piloted the six-week program to introduce peace education practices for youth in Ksar El Kebir, Morocco.

The pilot study of the Skills for Constructive Living program took form in eight phases: (1) selection of partnering organization; (2) completion of needs assessment; (3) selection of curriculum; (4) administering the pre-tests; (5) implementing the Skills for Constructive Living program; (6) administering the post-tests; (7) administering post-program interviews; and (8) data analysis. The remainder of this chapter discusses the partnering organization and needs

assessment, objectives and content of the curriculum, describes the participants who took part in the study, summarizes the research instruments used, and describes the data collection and data analysis procedures.

Community Partnership

Description of Partnering Organization

In order to successfully pilot a community-based peace education program in Ksar El Kebir, it was necessary to partner with a local organization. The ideal organization was one that served the target population so the researcher could gain access to the population and valuable local knowledge about the needs of that particular population. For the purposes of this study, a partnership was created between the researcher and the Inbiaat Association for Education and Development in Ksar El Kebir Morocco. The vice-president of the Inbiaat Association, Mohammed Loutfi, served as the project coordinator throughout the duration of this research and was very important for the viability of this project. He was key to gaining access to the participants, acting as a cultural interpreter, translating materials from Arabic to English, organizing the field trip, and in gaining support for the program from the community. He was part of the program planning process as well as being part of the program implementation. The organization which he represents, the Inbiaat Association, serves youth between the ages of five and nineteen, with a focus on recruiting at-risk youth into their programs. Opportunities for children, youth, and adolescents at the Inbiaat Association include classes in language, math, music, and art. Additionally there are opportunities to participate in sports and field trips with the organization.

The Inbiaat Association was able to provide a classroom space for the Skills for Constructive Living program. This setting was ideal for the program because it was familiar and convenient for participants and provided adequate space for group work. Additionally, holding the program at the Inbiaat Association allowed the staff there to observe training sessions. This was particularly important because the staff at the Inbiaat Association will have the option of continuing the Skills for Constructive Living program in the future at their site if they find value in the program.

Needs Assessment

The partnering organization was vital in determining the needs of the community, and thus guiding the researcher in choosing an ideal curriculum to address the stated needs. A need is defined as a situation when what is actually occurring is below that which is expected (Cornell, 1970). A needs assessment is a process through which the felt needs of the community are documented so as to inform program design, implementation, and evaluation. In order to determine a peace education curriculum that would best meet the needs of the youth in Ksar El Kebir, and to determine what the evaluation goals should be, a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) assessment was conducted by Mohammed with teachers and students in Ksar El Kebir. This analysis is a useful planning tool for situation analysis, program planning, and program evaluation, and allows the researcher to collect valuable information about the SWOT of a community (Camden et al., 2009). Mohammed held a focus group with fifteen high school teachers who together came up with a number of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats which exist in their community. Approximately fifty high school youth also participated in a focus group with Mohammed in order to gain valuable input from the target population.

Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
- Solidarity - Open-mindedness - Tolerance - Homogeneous identity - Cultural diversity - Political stability - Young human resources - Religion - Determination - Historical background - Awareness of the competitive position in the broader economy - Reinforcing the role of civic society - Natural resources are available	- Illiteracy - Inability to carry out law - Some laws are outdated - Corruption - Absence of equal opportunities - Debt - Bureaucracy - Economy depends basically on agriculture - No equitable distribution of wealth - Infrastructure is not enough - Education and Health care still lagging behind - Overcrowded classes as an example	- Need for deep and complete reform of education - Partnerships with other countries - Bettering human rights and political institutions - Possibility of developing economy thanks to foreign investments - Future job opportunities as there is interest in economy progress - The strategic position of Morocco: North Africa and close to Europe - Excellent platform and access point to international markets - New constitution - The Arab spring - Seeking development means the need to qualified and well-trained human resources	- Weather changes - Illiteracy is high - Corruption - No clear vision concerning education - Terrorism - Low rank of Morocco in the international reports - Insecurity

Table 1: Results of Teachers' SWOT Analysis

Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
-----------	------------	---------------	---------

- Solidarity - Tolerance - Cultural diversity - Cultural values: - Religious values - Strategic position of Morocco: close to Europe - Civic society - Awareness of the importance of education - Human resources are young - Natural diversity - Respect	- Unemployment - Poverty - Illiteracy - Discrimination and racism - Weak infrastructure - No equal opportunities concerning education, healthcare, employment ... - Brain drain - Corruption	- Providing jobs - The new constitution should be practiced - Good management of natural resources - Giving importance to education and empowering women and youth - Creating Youth Centers and School Clubs - Reducing the number of students in classes - Listening to young people and helping them solve their problems - Foreign investments	- The family is losing its role - Drugs addiction - Corruption - Feeling hopeless - Low level of the working population - Absence of coordination between the school/university and the job market - Population growth rate - Illiteracy - Feeling insecure - Terrorism
---	---	--	--

Table 2: Results of Students' SWOT Analysis

The SWOT analysis, combined with existing data on school and community violence in the town, was the basis for choosing the Skills for Constructive Living curriculum. The focus in this curriculum on gaining skills in problem-solving and gaining values associated with peaceful living in a community made it an appropriate choice. Also very important was choosing a curriculum that had been successfully implemented across the globe and across cultures. The Skills for Constructive Living program was developed by UNESCO and implemented in the international context; in countries in Africa, in Sri Lanka, Kosovo and Pakistan. Implementing this program in Morocco, a predominantly Muslim country, much consideration was given to respecting cultural and religious norms. The Skills for Constructive Living program has been implemented in both Sudan and Pakistan with Muslim participants and built into the curriculum are adaptations that can be used when working with Muslim participants. The global lens of this program made it an appropriate choice for this study in Ksar El Kebir Morocco. A summary of

the available findings from sites where the Skills for Constructive Living program was implemented are in the table below.

Kenya (1998-2005, 2008)	Ghana (2007)	Timor-Leste (2007-2009)	Sudan (2003-2006)
1. external evaluation found the following positive impacts: a. conflict prevention b. resolution of small disputes c. conflict escalation prevention d. improved camp security and less crime e. daily demonstration in schools of nonviolent, supportive teacher/pupil relations	1. participants felt more trust towards other people 2. enhanced knowledge in peaceful conflict resolution 3. enhanced readiness for reconciliation and more positive view of other ethnic groups 4. during an eleven-month follow up participants reported applying skills from the PEP to their everyday life	1. trained teachers now teaching peace education to 12,000 pre-secondary students 2. the program has been successful and eagerly accepted by teachers and students 3. challenges included language translation and cultural relevancy	1. impact measured qualitatively through participant feedback 2. “we are not only conducting community workshops but also involved in community problem solving” -Dobuoul Wang, local Peace Education Facilitator

Table 3: Reported Impact of Skills for Constructive Living Program

Description of Program

Curriculum

The Skills for Constructive Living program is designed to teach participants the skills and values which are associated with peaceful behaviors and peaceful living. It is also meant to enable people to think constructively about issues in their community and to develop attitudes towards living together and solving problems which arise in their communities, through peaceful means (UNESCO, 2005). The program is designed in such a way that through practicing new skills, participants discover the benefits of these skills themselves so they psychologically “own” these new skills and behaviors. The power of experiential learning and discovery is seen throughout the program.

This program has three training components: 1) formal education program 2) non-formal community program and 3) teacher training. For the purposes and parameters of this study, the non-formal community program was used with youth participants. The youth non-formal community program is designed for youth outside of the formal school context. Here the program works with youth who meet regularly outside of school at youth clubs or centers or with recreational or educational training programs. The setting for this study was a local youth development organization (Inbiaat Association for Education and Development) where youth regularly meet to participate in recreational, educational and developmental initiatives. According to UNESCO, the non-formal component of the Skills for Constructive Living program is best implemented as a ‘stand-alone’ program, especially during the initial implementation of the program (2005). The non-formal youth component is appropriate to use in the setting of Ksar El Kebir where there has not been research conducted on peace education programs previously, and thus this program was in the initial stages. In this early stage of the program it is also more feasible to implement a stand-alone program rather than a program that is integrated into the formal school setting.

The curriculum was implemented over 12 sessions at the Inbiaat Association in Ksar El Kebir. Each session lasted approximately 90 minutes and with two sessions a week, the program was implemented over six weeks. The full community non-formal education component of the Skills for Constructive Living program consists of 12 sessions that last 180 minutes. This was considered too long by the project coordinator because of the youths’ other commitments and the availability of classroom space in the Inbiaat Association, and thus the curriculum was adapted to only include those sessions that were most relevant to the needs stated by the youth and

teachers in the SWOT assessment. In this way, the curriculum was modified to only include lessons which related most directly to the needs of the community.

Need from SWOT	Lesson from curriculum to address the need
Absence of equal opportunity	-Session 1 & 2 (Who are you? Similarities and differences and Inclusion and Exclusion) -Learning aims of session: - understanding how differences allow exclusion and similarities allow inclusion - recognize how inclusion and exclusion are usually based on compulsory groupings and these groupings are used as a basis for stereotyping and discrimination
Discrimination and Racism	-Session 3 & 4 (Bias, Prejudice, Discrimination) -Learning aims of session: - Notice how bias is reflected in many things that we say - Understanding that discrimination is often justified by apportioning blame. Blame is destructive, not constructive, and it allows us to avoid taking responsibility for finding solutions to problems
Pressing social issues identified by students and teachers which require problem-solving skills (poverty, illiteracy, corruption, lack of sufficient infrastructure, lack of clear vision for education, brain drain)	-Session 5 & 6 (Emotional honesty and Problem-solving) -Learning aims of session: - Understand that some problems have multiple solutions or multiple methods - Recognize that complex problems may lead to more complications or a 'no solution' if they are 'worked through' and that there may be creative (or lateral thinking ways) of getting to a desired solution - Understand that problems involving human beings and their emotions are open to bias, and perceptions and assumptions dictated by our bias
Pressing social issues identified by students	-Session 7 & 8 (Problem-solving cont. and

and teachers which require problem-solving skills (poverty, illiteracy, corruption, lack of sufficient infrastructure, lack of clear vision for education, brain drain)	Negotiation) -Learning aims of session: a. Learn the six steps of problem-solving b. Learn the rules of negotiation
Giving importance to educating and empowering women and youth	-Session 9& 10 (Human rights) -Learning aims of session: a. Learn about physical, emotional, mental and spiritual needs b. Students read and discuss the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and discuss which rights are protected in their community and why that might be
Pressing social issues identified by students and teachers which require problem-solving skills (poverty, illiteracy, corruption, lack of sufficient infrastructure, lack of clear vision for education, brain drain)	-Session 11 & 12 (Real-life problems and conflict resolution) -Learning aims of session: a. students identify different local problems and apply the problem-solving techniques they learned to the real-life problems b. students share their solutions to local problems with community members

Table 4: Link between Needs Assessment and Curriculum

Goals and Objectives

The program has two broad goals as stated in the UNESCO facilitator's manual: 1) to create constructive behaviors for dealing with problems so as to minimize or eliminate conflict and 2) to reduce conflict and negative behavior that may contribute to conflict. The researcher translated these broad goals into more specific and measurable objectives that relate closely to the stated needs of the community, including:

- 1) Participants will express attitudes and perceptions that are conducive to peaceful community living by the completion of the program.
- 2) Participants will improve their problem-solving skills by the completion of the program.

- 3) Participants will increase their sense of empowerment by the completion of the program.

Implementation

The start date for The Skills for Constructive Living program was May 31st, 2013. There were three sessions and then a week-long break for the participants to focus on their end of year exams. The following nine sessions were held from June 18th through July 14th. The lessons outlined in the facilitator's manual for the Skills for Constructive Living program were followed closely, and there was a similar format for each lesson. The only adaptations made were choosing those activities within the lesson which were considered most culturally appropriate by the project coordinator and contextually relevant for the participants (for example, when an activity would involve physical contact, the group would be divided by gender). Each lesson would begin with the participants recalling material and activities from the last session, and then the new topic would be introduced. There were two to three activities per session including at least one role-play per session. There was a strong focus on group work and partner work in every session in order to support collaborative work and problem-solving among participants.

Selection of Population to be Studied

The study was open to all youth between the ages of 15 and 19 in Ksar El Kebir regardless of gender, race, religion or other demographic characteristics. Participants were recruited by the project coordinator, Mohammed, who is an English teacher at a local high school and the vice-president of the partnering organization, the Inbiaat Association for Education and Development. The project coordinator asked teachers to recommend students who they considered at-risk and those students were given information about participation in the Skills for Constructive Living peace education program.

Participants in the peace education training were purposefully selected based on three criteria: 1) sufficient oral and written communication skills in English 2) between the ages of 15 and 19 and 3) identification by their teachers as being at-risk youth. The indicators for an at-risk youth in Ksar El Kebir as determined by local educators were: 1) getting into fights at school; 2) smoking pot; 3) threatening teachers; 4) skipping school; and 5) lack of engagement in school and the community. However, these initial indicators were amended slightly when it was found that participants who had the English skills required for participation in the program were not necessarily the students who were exhibiting problem-behaviors. The focus then shifted to a broader understanding of being at-risk to include those students who: 1) witness violence at school and in the community; 2) have problems with aggression; and 3) struggle with peer relationships. It was further argued by the partnering organization that youth from this town are all at risk due to poverty rates, a poor educational system, prevalence of criminal activity, and gender discrimination.

The most at-risk participants were not possible to recruit into the program based on their lack of language proficiency in English, as well as the group dynamics of those participants that did complete the program. The participants were all members of the Inbiaat Association and had previous relationships with each other from the Inbiaat as well as their high school classes. For that reason, they were a fairly cohesive group of students who felt comfortable around each other. The other students who the project coordinator attempted to recruit who fit the original criteria of being at-risk, were outsiders at the Inbiaat setting. Literally they were outsiders because they weren't members of the Association, and socially they were outsiders because they didn't have prior relationships with the participants who completed the program. Four highly at-risk students came to the program orientation, and two came the first day of the program and

completed the pre-tests. However, they chose not to continue to participate in the program. The project coordinator believed that this was due to the challenges of fitting into the core group of participants who largely fit into the second amended category of being at-risk.

The project coordinator, Mohammed, was an ideal partner in recruiting participants because of his role in the Inbiaat Association which connected him with many youth who are at-risk, and because of his local knowledge of the problems which youth face in Ksar El Kebir. An information session was held for potential participants, led by the researcher and project coordinator, on May 23rd, 2013 in order to provide the potential participants with the information necessary in order to make an informed choice about their participation.



Photo 1: Orientation for students



Photo 2: Orientation for students

Research Approach

There are many possible definitions of evaluation, but at the core of them all is determining the worth or effectiveness of an intervention (Scriven, 2003). Program evaluation is defined as the systematic collection of information about the activities and outcomes of a program in order to make judgments about the program, and/or to help make informed decisions about the future of the program (Patton, 2002). In order to determine the effectiveness of the Skills for Constructive Living program, a goal-achievement evaluation approach was used. This model is considered a discrepancy evaluation because it seeks to find the difference between the stated goals of the program and the actual program achievements (Provus, 1971). In order to measure this difference, specific and measurable program objectives were determined and then

instruments that were able to measure whether or not the objectives had been achieved were decided upon. This approach was most appropriate for evaluating this study because: 1) it was important to stakeholders to determine whether the goals of the program were met with these participants; and 2) there is a need for greater accountability and understanding of whether peace education programs meet their stated goals.

The research design consisted of two methodological approaches: pre-and post-tests and structured interviews. Using both qualitative and quantitative data in a study can minimize the weaknesses and maximize the strengths of both types of data (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2004). Qualitative and quantitative methods are compatible and share some similarities in social science; both “describe their data, construct explanatory arguments from their data, and speculate about why the outcomes they observed happened as they did” (Sechresta & Sidani, 1995, p. 78). Collecting both qualitative and quantitative data was consistent with the goal-achievement evaluation approach because it is pragmatic in nature; the most useful methods to answer the evaluative questions were chosen. Some research questions and combinations of research questions are most fully answered through mixed research solutions (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). In the case of the study presented here, the best methods included qualitative data to evaluate if the program objective related to attitudes and perceptions was met, and quantitative data to evaluate if the program objectives related to problem solving skills and sense of empowerment were met.

Collecting both qualitative and quantitative data can also provide stronger evidence for the findings of a study through corroboration and convergence of results (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004).

Session 1	Session 12	Week Following Session 12
Problem-solving pre-test	Problem-solving post-test	Post-program Interviews
Empowerment pre-test	Empowerment post-test	

Table 5: Schedule of Data Collection

* Two participants took the pre-tests during session 2 because they did not attend session 1

Limitations

Limitations to this study came from having a small sample size and no control group with which to compare the experiment group with. There were also language barriers that participants faced in this program because the curriculum was in English but they were non-native English speakers. Additionally, many participants chose to complete a pre-test or post-test in English, or the post-program interview in English despite the challenges of writing and speaking in English.

Another limitation of the study related to the timing of the program. The Skills for Constructive living program overlapped with the end of year exam for students which made it challenging for students to devote their full energy to the training. It also coincided with the start of Ramadan which presented another challenge for students because they were fasting for the duration of the program and when they took the post-tests and post-program interview.

Instrumentation and Data Collection

Attitudes and Perceptions

In order to measure changes in participants' attitudes and perceptions, the evaluation instrument that is included in the Skills for Constructive Living facilitator's manual was used. This instrument was developed by UNESCO specifically for evaluating the non-formal

community education component. The structured oral interview was given to participants during the week following the completion of the program. The interview consists of 14 open-ended questions and took no more than 30 minutes for each participant to complete. Questions addressed participants' attitudes about the course, "was the course interesting?", as well as their perceptions about the usefulness of what they learned, "how can you integrate peace education into your job?". The participants had the option of completing the interview in Arabic with the project coordinator or in English with the researcher.

The UNESCO interview uses elicitive methods in order to understand participants' attitudes and perceptions related to the Skills for Constructive Living program. The rationale for using elicitive methods is that "the essence of elicitive or open-ended questioning is to get people to speak spontaneously and thus to show 'what is on their mind' and the values and attitudes they hold" (Sinclair, 2008, p.97). This method is in contrast to asking participants narrow questions which reflect the worldview of the researcher. This instrument provided valuable insight into the overall perceptions that the participants' had towards the program and their attitudes towards peace education.

The participant interview was the only instrument provided by UNESCO to evaluate the Skills for Constructive Living program. Though this interview can give valuable insight, the researcher decided that on its own it was not sufficient to capture the effects of the program. Additionally, there is a need to use both qualitative and quantitative data to evaluate peace education programs. Therefore, a problem-solving measure and empowerment measure were included in the evaluation of the Skills for Constructive Living program. Because the only instrument provided with the program was the interview, it was necessary to find outside instruments that had not before been used with the Skills for Constructive Living program.

Problem Solving Skills

There is a strong focus in the Skills for Constructive Living program on resolving interpersonal conflict peacefully, and stated needs from the SWOT assessment that outlined a number of community issues related to problem solving, and thus it was necessary to use a measure to determine program outcomes related to problem solving. The instrument used in this study to measure problem solving skills was the Problem Solving Inventory developed by Conrad & Hedin (1981). This written measure involves 5 steps: 1) the facilitator provides a problem scenario to participants; 2) participants state their initial response to the problem; 3) participants state their ideas for different possible solutions to the problem; 4) participants choose the best and worst of the solutions they stated; and 5) participants state what they think the root of the problem is. On the first day of the program the participants completed this inventory as a pre-test, and on the last day of the program the participants again completed the inventory as a post-test. The inventory was translated to Arabic in order to avoid any confusion due to language barriers, and the participants were encouraged to answer the questions in Arabic, though many chose to write their answers in English.

This instrument was designed specifically to test for changes in problem solving ability. Specifically, the Problem Solving Inventory measures a person's inclination and ability to perform four tasks that are central to solving problems associated with interpersonal conflict (Conrad & Hedin, 1981). These four tasks are informed by the work of John Dewey (1910) and consist of: 1) generating multiple alternative solutions to the problem; 2) seeking to resolve the problem and accepting responsibility for its resolutions; 3) considering the merits of alternative solutions in terms of their consequences; and 4) comprehending the complexity of the problem and orienting to the growth of both self and others (Conrad & Hedin, 1981). This instrument

measures important outcomes in peace education programs including taking responsibility for solving problems, using creativity to think of many possible solutions to problems, and focusing on the growth of self and others. The Problem Solving Inventory was chosen because of its approach to problem solving, which related very closely to the sessions on problem solving in the Skills for Constructive Living program.

Empowerment

The instrument used in this study to measure empowerment was the Sibthorp empowerment survey which consists of 15 questions related to perceptions of empowerment (Sibthorp, 2007). Participants answered questions related to empowerment such as “I contributed to my groups’ success” and “I made important decisions”. All of the questions corresponded with a five-level Likert scale rating (Likert, 1967). For each statement related to perception of empowerment, there were five possible answers: “almost never”, “rarely”, “sometimes”, “often”, and “almost always”. The Sibthorp empowerment survey was given to students as a pre-test on the first day of the program and as a post-test on the last day of the program in order to measure changes in participants’ perception of empowerment. This instrument was also translated into Arabic.

The Sibthorp empowerment survey measures five aspects of empowerment: 1) personal empowerment; 2) group support; 3) instructor support; 4) group empowerment; and 5) learning relevance. This broad approach to understanding empowerment seeks to capture the experience of participants in the program. In a multi-program study over multiple years, Conrad & Hedin (1981) found that the most important determining factor related to developmental outcomes of youth participants in the programs studied were characteristics of the youths’ experience (e.g.,

autonomy, positive relationships with adults) rather than program variables (e.g., length of program) and youth characteristics (e.g., socioeconomic status, grade point average) (Sibthorp, 2007). The Sibthorp empowerment survey draws from Conrad & Hedin's research in order to capture the experience of participants a program, as it relates to sense of empowerment. This particular empowerment instrument was chosen because of its holistic view of empowerment which relates closely to the goals of the curriculum. The Skills for Constructive Living program works to empower individuals and groups, as well as foster positive relationships between the adult trainer and the youth participants. The Sibthorp empowerment survey was able to capture these varied aspects of empowerment.

The Human Subject Institutional Review Board at the Pennsylvania State University approved all study procedures (see Appendix for IRB approval letter).

Data Analysis

Only data from those participants who completed both the pre-test and post-test were used for this analysis.

Attitudes and Perceptions

The interview was given to participants individually at the completion of the Skills for Constructive Living program. The interviews were transcribed word for word, and the interviews that were conducted in Arabic were translated word for word. Although the participants had the option of completing the interviews in their native language, most of them (13 out of 16) chose to complete the interview in English because they wanted to practice their English. While this was a great opportunity for the students, it led to the interviews being rather short and choppy because the students struggled at times with communicating in English. Their meaning though

remained clear; it was simply that the form their language took may not have always been the most sophisticated or accurate. Additionally, some students felt at times shy or simply not very interested in giving long answers which led to short replies to the interview questions. The interview transcripts therefore were not lengthy conversations between interviewer and interviewee but rather highly structured questions and answers between interviewer and interviewee based off of the UNESCO interview.

Once the interviews were completed and transcribed, the researcher first read through the interviews several times in order to gain an understanding of the main ideas of the content in the text and to find patterns (Stake, 1995). Then, keeping in mind that the interview was being used to determine participants' attitudes and perceptions towards peaceful community living, open coding was used (Corbin & Strauss, 2007). Examples of the codes developed included: problem solving, practicing English, learning something new, role playing, the trip, changes, and bad timing. Throughout the process of creating codes, memoing was used to document how and why these choices were made. Once these broad codes were created, the codes were organized into related families or themes, peace education as personal change and peace education as something new. These were broad enough to encompass the codes that were created but distinct enough to categorize the codes under one or the other in a way that could be easily justified. Under the themes peace education as something new and peace education as personal change, seven sub-categories were created in order to fully encompass the participant responses.

Problem Solving Skills

Identical pre-tests and post-tests of the Problem Solving Inventory were given to participants before and after the Skills for Constructive Living program. The Problem Solving

Inventory measured skills in problem solving as related to four important aspects of the problem solving process: 1) generating multiple alternative solutions to the problem; 2) seeking to resolve the problem and accepting responsibility for its resolutions; 3) considering the merits of alternative solutions in terms of their consequences; and 4) comprehending the complexity of the problem and orienting to the growth of both self and others. Guidelines for scoring these four aspects of problem solving are outlined by the authors of the instrument.

The generation of alternatives index (related to aspect 1) was used to score questions 1 and 2. One point is given for each different and relevant solution suggested. The action-responsibility index (related to aspect 2) was used to score question 3, which asks participants to choose the best solution from the multiple solutions they listed. The scoring focuses on who retains responsibility for the final decision and how directly one deals with the problem. A score from 1 to 4 was given to participants for question 3: 1=complete avoidance of problem; 2=giving up responsibility to another person; 3=some action taken but unclear about who will make the final decision, or action taken which doesn't address the issue; and 4=clearly retains responsibility for taking action. The consequence index (related to aspect 3) was used to score questions 3 and 4, which ask participants to choose the best and worst solutions and explain why. The consequence index assigns scores based on whether participants cite relevant reasons for action taken and if participants do so in terms of consequences ("if...then"). Responses were given a score between 1 and 3: 1=non-explanation or one explanation and no other information; 2=one consequence with no other information or one consequence and one explanation; and 3=consequences clearly stated. The empathy-cognitive complexity index (related to aspect 4) was used to score question 5. The seven-point index measures both the complexity of thought process the participant uses and the degree of empathetic concern that they express for the person/persons in the problem

scenario. The scores were as follows: 1=impulsive action; 2=impulsive-judgmental; 3=self-protective; 4=formalistic-selfish concern; 5=relational concern; 6=responsible concern; and 7=principled concern-beyond self and other. The scores were compiled for each participants' pre-test and post-test to determine the differences between the two tests.

Empowerment

Participants were given identical Sibthorp empowerment surveys as a pre-test and post-test. This measure accounts for participants' sense of empowerment as related to five aspects of empowerment: 1) personal empowerment; 2) group support; 3) instructor support; 4) group empowerment; and 5) learning relevance. There were three statements related to each of these aspects. The participants ranked 15 statements on a Likert scale and guidelines for scoring the empowerment survey were provided by the author. For ten of the statements which reflected a positive sense of empowerment, participants scores were added together based on their Likert rating (e.g., "I made important decisions."). Five of the statements were reverse coded (indicated by an asterisk) and the numbers which participants rated those statements were subtracted from their overall score. This was done for statements which demonstrate a lack of empowerment (e.g., "We did things that had little purpose."). The scores from participants' pre-tests and post-tests were compared.

Summary

This chapter discussed the different phases of the study and detailed the logic behind the decisions made related to the program and the methods. The next chapter will discuss the results of the qualitative and quantitative data that was collected.

Objective 1:	Objective 2:	Objective 3:
--------------	--------------	--------------

Participants will express attitudes and perceptions that are conducive to peaceful community living by the completion of the program.	Participants will improve their problem-solving skills by the completion of the program.	Participants will increase their sense of empowerment by the completion of the program.
Qualitative	Quantitative	Quantitative
UNESCO Interview	Problem Solving Inventory	Sibthorp Empowerment Survey

Table 6: Summary of program objectives and corresponding measures

Chapter 4

Results

Chapter four presents the major findings from this study. From the qualitative data collected, participants expressed attitudes and perceptions that are conducive to peaceful community living. The quantitative data collected show an increase of sense of empowerment and problem solving skills among participants.

The emergent themes and the pre and post test results provide insight into whether the Skills for Constructive Living program met the intended objectives: 1) participants will express attitudes and perceptions that are conducive to peaceful community living by the completion of the program; 2) participants will improve their problem-solving skills by the completion of the program and; 3) participants will increase their sense of empowerment by the completion of the program. The results for each of these three objectives will be addressed in this chapter beginning with the results from the qualitative data collected followed by the results from the quantitative data collected.

Description of the Sample

The results reported in this chapter were collected from the group of participants that completed the program from start to finish with only minimal absences. There were a total of 16 participants including 7 males and 9 females. All participants were in their final year of high school at Mohamediyaa High School in Ksar El Kebir and between the ages of 17 and 19 years old. Individual biographical data was not collected on the participants so more detailed information on the backgrounds of participants is unknown.

Attitudes and Perceptions

Table 7: Themes related to Objective 1: participants' attitudes and perceptions towards the peace education program

Themes	Categories
Peace education as personal change	Perceived behavior change
	Changing ideas and attitudes
	Finding the importance of problem solving
	Gaining ability to express oneself
Peace education as something new	Importance of new topics covered
	Importance of sharing new knowledge
	Newness of communicating in English

Peace Education as Personal Change

Participating in the Skills for Constructive Living peace education program led to participants experiencing different kinds of personal change. The first theme, perceived personal change through participating in a peace education program, was divided into four categories based on participants' perceived personal changes after participating in the Skills for Constructive Living program: perceived behavior change, changing ideas and attitudes, the new found importance of problem solving, and the ability to express oneself in new ways. The personal changes discussed demonstrate attitudes and perceptions conducive to peaceful community living.

Perceived behavior change

Based on their experiences participating in the Skills for Constructive Living peace education program, participants expressed in their interviews that they thought they would behave differently after going through the program. Some hoped that there would be changes for them while others expressed that they are already experiencing changes as a result of the program. A teacher who observed the training sessions reflected on her hopes for changes in the students following the program:

I hope that the students adopt peace education in their life and work. They should be helpful and understanding, and they should put themselves in the place of the other. They should adopt this course in their life. They should be leaders.

Many students made statements in their interviews that demonstrated that they had done as the teacher hoped and adopted peace education in their life. Male students seemed to find it empowering that they now felt they had alternatives to violence; one said “if you are in a situation of violence you can control yourself...we learned to use different things instead of violence”. The changes in perceptions of violence influenced how participants treated their friends; “it [the program] changed how I treat my friends, I treat them more kindly. I want to be a good friend to my friends. I stop thinking about fighting”. Another student expressed a similar sentiment when he said, “it [the program] was useful for me because now I can come into contact with a person without being aggressive”. Similarly, another student reflected on his new views of power and violence:

I won't make others afraid of me. I don't need to show my power to make others respect me or do what I want. I must say to others not to use violence.

The feedback that the program made participants consider their own physically violent behavior was limited to male participants only. Females did not express that they had the problem of being physically violent with others, and therefore that issue did not come up in their interviews when

asking about what has changed for them through participating in the program. It is interesting how many males focused on their own aggression and fighting behaviors, and that they saw a value in changing those behaviors, and even encouraging others to change those behaviors.

Participants also reflected on how their way of communicating has changed since participating in the Skills for Constructive Living program:

I change my way of speaking and expressing, how we can take from others their information and develop it to myself. I am very better at working in groups. I get help more from my group.

Other students echoed this sentiment, one saying “I would try to understand people and give them a chance to express their opinions, listen to them and try to get a good communication with them. The most thing is respect each other”. Another student linked a change in communication to a change in resolving conflicts noticing, “I can communicate better with others. I can resolve the conflict easier. I have a sense of human rights”. Improved communication seemed to be linked to better interpersonal interactions, respect, and better working relations within a group.

Changing ideas and attitudes

As well as expressing that they experienced behavior changes, participants also discussed in their interviews changes in their ideas and attitudes as a result of participating in the program. Many students expressed ideas that demonstrated they saw a utility in peace, and expressed attitudes conducive to peaceful community living. They also reflected on biases and stereotypes in their own thinking, for example certain biases and stereotypes about gender, and talked about how they want to move beyond thinking in these limiting categories. Many talked about how important it is to think of others rather than only oneself; or to feel empathy for the other.

Expressing ideas of peaceful community living, one student said:

I hope that all the world be peaceful, based on peace, act peaceful. Even in our little society we think we see a lot of aggressive things which comes from ignorance, but if they get the opportunity I get, they might change.

Within this statement there is a focus on peace at both the global level and the local level, and a sense of agency with the idea of a capacity to affect change. A teacher who observed the training sessions also reflected on the importance of changing ideas and attitudes in order to create peaceful community living:

Changing people's minds is very important for environmental change. Students were becoming used to violence in Ksar, this program changed their minds towards peaceful discourse and conflict resolution. The "I feel..." statements were very useful.

The program seemed to provide participants with the opportunity to question the status quo that they experienced in their community, and provided them with tools that they could employ to generate new ideas. One student expressed, "I used to have bad ideas and the class helped me to change my ideas. I had ideas about fighting with my friends". Similarly, another student affirmed changes they experienced; "it [peace education] changes ideas, talking about danger and violence, and finding solutions to our problems".

Changes in ideas and attitudes were perceived as being positive changes for the participants. "I think it made me a better person, it changed my point of view and way of seeing life" said one student. Peace education helped students to question the biases and stereotypes that exist in their thinking, and expressed positive results. The field trip that the students went on to a rural village helped students to explore some of their ideas about people who they perceive as different from them. One student noted, "my idea about people of the countryside has changed. My ideas about stereotypes changed. Cooperating with others, I understand it".



Photo 3: Program participants talking with young people in the countryside

Similarly, another student said, “I won’t use bias in my thinking. I will exchange ideas with other people. I will try to remove violence from my life”. One student explicitly mentioned two identity markers upon which people often stereotype others, race and religion:

Peace education can help me be more democratic with others. Accepting others in spite of her colors and religion. Because of peace education I become more relaxing and calm, I don’t have conflicts.

Tied into the idea of critically examining one’s own propensity to stereotype others, participants expressed that they would use more empathetic thinking in their lives. For one student this means, “I feel more for the ‘other’, I am learning to think beyond my point of view and to feel the other. I won’t base ideas on stereotypes”. Another student thought, “I will not be thinking of

only my opinion, I will think of others”. The ideas and attitudes expressed in the interviews demonstrated a positive perception of peace, an interest in reducing stereotypical and biased thinking, and an increased sense of empathy, all of which can contribute to more peaceful community living.

Finding the importance of problem solving

One major focus of the Skills for Constructive Living program was helping participants to use peaceful problem solving in their lives. Many students responded positively to the lessons about problem solving in their interviews and talked about how they wanted to use these skills in their lives. Students found the steps outlined in the training sessions to be helpful and hoped to use them in their lives; “I want to use the steps for problem solving, I want to follow and respect these. I will share this class with others and I will understand people and not judge them quickly” said one student. Another student reflected, “I like to be able to use problem solving techniques in my life. I hope to be able to work in groups more”. Participants seemed to view the problem solving techniques learned in the training sessions as something that has utility in their lives.



Photo 4: Using role play to practice problem solving techniques

Within the problem solving training sessions, there was one session where the focus was on how to communicate when there is a problem. One technique taught was to use “I feel...” statements followed by an explanation of how the problem makes one feel, rather than to use “You...” statements which accuse the other/s of their role in the problem. Many students mentioned this in their interviews:

To not use “you...” statements (instead use “I feel...” statements) because a lot of people in our society talk this way, and talking this way causes problems.

Other students reflected on the importance of two-way communication and dialogue when trying to resolve problems with others. “I will try to have dialogue more in conflicts with other people. I will try not to judge people fast” said one student. Another reflected:

I want to use two-way communication. You shouldn’t get angry when someone has a different opinion. If I face a problem, I should think that this is an opportunity to solve the problem.

Students also noted the links between violence and communication and saw communication as being a possible route to reducing violence. One mentioned an alternative to violence; “there are other ways to solve problems than violence. I can stop violence by exchanging ideas and convincing people not to use violence”. Similarly, one student put it succinctly when asked about what they will take away from the course; “use more dialogue and try hard to avoid violence”. Another student also saw a link between peace and exchanging ideas when he said, “when taking a decision, I will be more peaceful. If there is a problem I can help others to overcome it; I will be more helpful and understanding. I will be more collaborative”. Many important links were made by students between communication, problem solving, and reducing violence. Participants had very positive attitudes and perceptions of peaceful problem solving and expressed a desire to use skills acquired in the training. This was echoed by one participant who stated “we should solve problems like we learned in class”.

Gaining the ability to express oneself

Overwhelmingly this aspect of personal change, the ability to express oneself, was reflected on by female participants. In the Skills for Constructive Living program, many of the training sessions included activities related to expressing oneself and being open and honest about one’s emotions. Role play was used to practice expressing feelings and students were encouraged often to try to practice expressing themselves in this way outside of the training

sessions as well. Many spoke to the importance of being aware of their emotions and being able to share them with others; “I should express my emotions and not keep them inside of me”.

Another said, “I will try [to be] honest about my feelings. I will understand others. I will use my emotions”.

Also important was the ability to express one’s opinions about different topics. Within the Skills for Constructive Living curriculum, there were a number of topics that were covered which students may not typically encounter in school or at home (for example conflict resolution, gender discrimination, emotions, etc.). For some students, the training helped them to be able to talk more about their ideas and opinions. When asked what changes she could expect as a result of the program, one participant said:

Maybe become more talkative. Become more aware of why I did that particular thing. Try to talk more and explain things. Talk more about feelings and be honest. Gaining more confidence in talking in public.

Another student reflected, “we learn different opinions of different people and we express our opinion about different subjects. We talked about subjects we know and are in our life”. There was ample room in the curriculum to shape the activities to fit the specific issues facing the participants in their local community. This allowed the trainer and the students to cover topics that were especially relevant to Ksar El Kebir and provided a space for participants to express their opinions about these issues which affect their lives. Female participants had a particularly positive attitude towards expressing their opinions and their emotions in the training sessions.



Photo 5: Students sharing their work with each other

Peace Education as Something New

For the participants in the Skills for Constructive Living peace education program, the topics covered in the training helped them to learn something new. The second theme, peace education as learning something new, was divided into three categories; the importance of new topics covered, the importance of sharing their new knowledge, and the experience of communicating in English.

Importance of new topics covered

The teachers who observed the training sessions as well as the participants noted that the topics covered in the training session were something new for the students. The topics in the training included; 1) inclusion and exclusion; 2) bias, stereotypes, prejudice; 3) emotional honesty and problem solving; 4) problem solving and negotiation; 5) human rights and; 6) real life problem solving and conflict resolution. When commenting on the newness of the topics in the training, participants also gave feedback that the teaching methods in this training were different from what they typically encounter at school. A teacher who regularly observed reflected:

There were new ideas for the students in Ksar El Kebir. The group work was new and very good for the students. The themes were interesting. Acting and role plays teach a lot better than lectures.

Similarly, a participant notes both the newness of the topics and the newness of the methods:

I think I will remember all the activities because this is the first time that someone shares with us these topics, other kids don't do what we do. There is nothing like this in our school, there are no activities, it is sometimes boring.

It was important in the planning stages that the topics not only offer students something new, but also offer students something which is very relevant to their lives. Throughout the interviews student affirmed that what they learned in the Skills for Constructive Living program was useful in their lives and discussed their hopes for how they would improve their lives and their community environment through their new ideas, ways of thinking, and skills. One student said "all the topics were important. The problems we study are found in high schools and around Ksar El Kebir". "All the topics were interesting; we face them all in our life" noted another student. The participants' perceptions that what they were working on in the peace education program was new and was relevant to their lives contributed to their overall positive perceptions and attitudes towards peace education.

Importance of sharing new knowledge

One way that students demonstrated positive attitudes and perceptions towards peace education was the eagerness that they expressed in their interviews to share what they had learned in the training with others. Some students discussed how they could share the knowledge and skills they gained in the program with their peers:

I will try to communicate better with people, and listen more than talk. [What else?] Being more equal, try to help other people solve their problems, and pass on what I learned to others.

Another student mentioned sharing what they learned with their family. Family is a very important structure in the Moroccan culture, and one student thought ahead to when he will have his own family and what he would like to teach them:

We are all 17, 18 and soon we will have families so our children will now be educated about violence, stereotypes, aggressive, and peace, which is a good thing.

Another student thought that others, through seeing how he handles situations, may change themselves; “I will not get aggressive or physical conflict, I will just use a little conversation to resolve the problems I had. Others may change when they see my way, I can teach”. Similarly, one student thought, “when taking a decision, I will be more peaceful. If there is a problem I can help others to overcome it; I will be more helpful and understanding. I will be more collaborative”. There was a clear tendency for the participants to view themselves as potential leaders with some of the new skills and knowledge they had, and a clear interest in sharing what they thought they might have to offer with others.

A concern in the community of Ksar El Kebir is drug use among young people, and one student brought up that issue when talking about sharing new knowledge with others and said, “we go out to school and ask teachers about violence. Help other students who use drugs and

cigarettes”. Throughout the training students would talk about how it was distressing that there was a rise in drug use around school and their neighborhoods. Along with this there was associated violence and criminal activity which affected their perceptions of their own safety in Ksar El Kebir, particularly in the evenings and at night. When the Skills for Constructive Living program began it was being held in the evening because school was still in session, which some students raised as a safety concern; “when it was the time of studying for the Bac the evening was bad because it was night and the girls couldn’t get home safe”. The male participants were concerned about the need to protect the female participants at night time, and were concerned about their own tendencies to get themselves into trouble at night time. In order to help ensure that participants were safe, the teachers and the researcher helped to arrange for participants to walk home together or ride in cars together when the trainings were held in the evening.

Students were able to talk openly and honestly about their fears associated with these problems related to drugs and violence in Ksar El Kebir; according to one student, “it changes ideas, talking about danger and violence, and finding solutions to our problems”. The responses related to sharing new knowledge with others and thus affecting change beyond themselves demonstrates a sense of empowerment. Students seemed to believe that the knowledge and skills they had gained from the peace education program were worth sharing with others, and they seemed to think that if they shared their knowledge and skills with others, there would be changes in others behavior.

Newness of Communicating in English

Many of the participants expressed in their interviews that one aspect of the program that related to its perceived newness was that it was conducted in English. This finding, though

unintended, has some possible implications for peace education practices. A teacher who observed the training sessions said that they thought that the peace education program was better to conduct in English than in the students' native language because of the freedom of experimentation in English. He thought that it would have been hard for student to try out these new ways of communicating ("I feel..." statements, conflict resolutions, emotional honesty, etc.) in their native language because it would make them feel more vulnerable. Instead English provided the students a medium through which trying out new ways of expressing themselves felt safer and less personally revealing. In Morocco English is increasingly seen as a language which can provide opportunities for people, and many young people are eager to learn English. The students seemed to feel that there was an additional incentive to participate in the program because it was in English.

Many students talked about how they enjoyed English, "I love the communication, fun and practice English" and "it gave me the chance to develop my English, meeting classmates" commented students. Another said "speaking English was great!". Students were eager to improve on their English skills, one saying "I make my English better" and another wishing, "I hope I can be good in English pronunciation". English was not always seen as a positive medium though, one student said "sometimes English was difficult". A teacher who observed many of the training session commented on the code switching from English to Arabic at times, "It was good to shift to Arabic from time to time. Using English kept them on topic". From the feedback of the teachers who observed the training and the participants, using English seemed to serve a number of purposes which made the overall experience of the peace education program better. It provided a safe medium for new kinds of self-expression and discussion, gave an additional

incentive for students to participate in the peace education program, and provided an opportunity for participants to practice their English.

Sense of Empowerment

The Sibthorp empowerment measure was used as a pre and post test in order to determine participants' perceptions of their empowerment before and after participating in the peace education program. Mean was used to measure central tendency, and standard deviation and range were used to determine variance.

Table 8 and 9 show the scores from the pre-tests and the post-tests for all 16 participants.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t	Sig.
Pre-test	16	60.50	6.37	15	-2.154	.048

Table 8: Pre-tests Sense of Empowerment

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t	Sig.
Post-test	16	64.13	4.30	15	-2.154	.048

Table 9: Post-tests Sense of Empowerment

From comparing the pre-tests and the post-tests, it is clear that there was improvement in the scores following completion of the program (from a mean score of 60.50 to a mean score of 64.13). The minimum score also increased from the pre-test to the post-test from a low score of 50 to a low score of 56. Additionally, there was a decrease in the variance of scores with a standard deviation of 6.37 on the pre-test to a standard deviation of 4.30310 on the post-test. A paired sample t-test was performed with the pre-tests and post-tests resulting in $t=-2.15$ and $\text{sig}=.048$.

There was a difference between scores of males and females on the empowerment pre-test and post-test, both in terms of changes between the pre and post test and changes in range of scores. Below are the scores of male participants only:

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t	Sig.
Pre-test	7	60.14	4.98	6	.91	.398

Table 10: Pre-tests Sense of Empowerment Male

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t	Sig.
Post-test	7	62.00	5.07	6	.91	.398

Table 11: Post-tests Sense of Empowerment Male

Table 12 and 13 show the results from the female participants only:

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t	Sig.
Pre-test	9	60.78	7.56	8	-1.965	.085

Table 12: Pre-tests Sense of Empowerment Female

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t	Sig.
Post-test	9	65.78	2.91	8	-1.965	.085

Table 13: Post-tests Sense of Empowerment Female

There was a greater change in the mean scores between the pre-test and post-test for female participants than for male participants (60.78 to 65.78 for females and 60.14 to 62 for males).

There was also a greater decrease in variation from the pre-test to the post-test for females with a standard deviation of 7.56 on the pre-test and a standard deviation of 2.91 on the post-test, whereas males showed only a very small change in standard deviation from pre-test to post-test.

Another difference between the male and female participants is their minimum scores; the females started out with a minimum score of 50 and increased that to 62 on the post-test while the males started out with a minimum score of 55 and only increased that to 56 on the post-test. A paired sample t-test was performed for the males and the females separately. The results for the males were $t=.91$ and $\text{sig}=.398$ and the results for the females were $t=-1.97$ and $\text{sig}=.085$.

The scores from the empowerment pre-tests and post-tests indicate that the participants increased their sense of empowerment following participation in the Skills for Constructive Living program. The significance when all participants were considered was .048 which indicates that the change between the pre-tests and post-tests was significant. The results showed a difference between males and females, both in raw scores of empowerment and changes in empowerment following participation in the program. The female participants appear to have experienced greater changes in empowerment through participation in the program than the male participants. When a paired sample t-test was performed with only the scores from female participants the significance was .088 which is close to the cut-off for significance considering the very small sample size indicating that it is close to being a significant finding.

Problem Solving Skills

Changes in problem solving skills were measured by a pre and post test which sought to evaluate the changes in problem solving skills by giving students a scenario of a problem task which they were asked to solve. The same exact test was given to students before and after the Skills for Constructive Living program in order to measure changes in problem solving skills. Mean was used to measure central tendency, and standard deviation and range were used to determine variance.

The below charts show the scores of the pre-tests and post-tests of all of the participants:

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t	Sig.
Pre-test	16	11.38	3.78	15	-2.35	.033

Table 14: Pre-tests Problem Solving

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t	Sig.
Post-test	16	13.56	3.86	15	-2.35	.033

Table 15: Post-tests Problem Solving

The mean score for all participants increased from the pre-test to the post-test, from 11.38 to 13.56 while the standard deviation changed very little between the pre-test and the post-test. The minimum score actually decreased on the post test which may be attributed to the poor timing of the post test; the post test was given during the holy month of Ramadan when the participants were fasting. It was also during the summer months so the combination of extreme heat with no food or water might have made it hard for some students to perform to the best of their abilities on the post test. This test was more demanding than the empowerment test as it was not on a Likert scale and they were required to write in answers in short sentence form requiring more thought and energy. Students had the choice to write in Arabic or English; whichever they felt more comfortable in. Some students wanted to practice their English on the pre-test and post-test even though it is their weaker language which may have accounted for lower scores on the problem solving test. A paired sample t-test was also performed for this measure and the results showed there was significance; $t=-2.35$ and $\text{sig}=.033$.

Like the results from the empowerment pre and post tests, the results from the problem solving pre and post tests show that there were differences between the genders. Below are the findings from the male participants:

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t	Sig.
Pre-test	7	12.00	3.87	6	-3.47	.740

Table 16: Pre-tests Problem Solving Male

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t	Sig.
Post-test	7	12.57	4.96	6	-3.47	.740

Table 17: Post-tests Problem Solving Male

One male participant had a low score of 5 on the post test, coupled with the mean from the pre-test to the post test caused a rise in scores by .57. The variation in the scores was greater for the male participants in the post test than it was in the pre test. A paired sample t-test was performed for the male participants only resulting in $t=-.35$ and $\text{sig}=.740$.

Table 18 and 19 show the results from the female participants:

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t	Sig.
Pre-test	9	10.89	3.86	8	-3.71	.006

Table 18: Pre-tests Problem Solving Female

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t	Sig.
Post-test	9	14.33	2.83	8	-3.71	.006

Table 19: Post-tests Problem Solving Female

The mean score for the female participants increased from a 10.89 on the pre-test to a 14.33 on the post-test, which was a greater increase than the male participants. The minimum score

increased from a 7 on the pre test to a 10 on the post-test, and the maximum score increased from a 17 on the pre-test to a 19 on the post test showing a raising of both the lowest scores and highest scores. Additionally, the variance in scores decreased from the pre test to the post-test for the female participants with the standard deviation decreasing from a 3.86 to a 2.83. The paired sample t-test showed that there was significance; $t=-3.71$ and $\text{sig}=.006$.

The scores from the problem solving pre-tests and post-tests indicate that there was a significant change ($\text{sig}=.033$) increase in scores following participation in the Skills for Constructive Living peace education program. The scores from the female participants helped to raise the overall group scores on the problem solving measure; as a group on the post test they had lower minimum scores, lower variance, and a higher mean. The females also had changes from the pre-tests to the post-tests that were statistically significant ($\text{sig}=.006$) whereas the male participants did not ($\text{sig}=.740$). In the next chapter the implications and conclusions of these findings will be discussed.

Chapter 5

Conclusion, Discussion and Implications

The purpose of this study was to understand how participation in the Skills for Constructive Living peace education program influenced a particular group of participants in Ksar El Kebir, Morocco as measured by perceived changes in empowerment, attitudes and perceptions, and problem solving skills. To determine if changes had occurred through participation in this particular peace education program, two pre-tests and post-tests were used to measure changes in empowerment and problem solving skills. The results from the quantitative data, which were presented in chapter four, showed that there was a statistically significant increase in the scores from the pre-tests to the post-tests on the sense of empowerment measure and the problem solving measure. This indicates that it can be cautiously concluded that the participants did increase their sense of empowerment through participation in the Skills for Constructive Living program as well as their problem solving skills. There was however a difference between male and female participants with female participants having greater gains from the pre-test to the post-test and less variability among the scores in the post-tests. The post-program interviews were conducted in order to determine participants' attitudes and perceptions towards peace education and towards peaceful community living, as well as clarify the quantitative findings. Two major themes emerged from the qualitative data and were presented in chapter four: peace education as personal change and peace education as something new in participants' lives. Chapter five provides a discussion of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations for future research.

The conclusion section consists of two areas; the first will discuss the results of the different sources of data alongside each other in order to draw conclusions about the study. The second section will consider the implications of this study for intervention work being done in the field of peace education. The implications discussed will include: 1) the importance of evaluation; 2) gender considerations; 3) the utility of peace education in English as a non-native language; and 4) suggestions for future research.

Summary of Themes

The qualitative data collected resulted in two themes; peace education as personal change and peace education as something new. Under the theme of peace education as personal change there were four categories discussed; 1) perceived behavior change; 2) changing ideas and attitudes; 3) finding the importance of problem solving; and 4) gaining ability to express oneself. Under the theme of peace education as something new there were three categories discussed; 1) importance of new topics covered; 2) importance of sharing new knowledge; and 3) newness of communicating in English. These themes will now be considered along with the quantitative data in order to draw conclusions from this study.

Triangulation of the Data

The joint use of qualitative and quantitative methods in a single study is used for a number of purposes including triangulation, which is defined by Maxwell as involving “using different methods as a check on one another, seeing if methods with different strengths and limitations all support a single conclusion” (Maxwell, 2013, p.102). For Creswell, triangulation is a process where evidence from different sources is brought together to shed light or corroborate a theme or perspective (2013, p.251). In order to better support the findings from this

study, and to check the different methods against each other, both qualitative and quantitative data was collected. In this section the results from the interviews will be discussed alongside the results from the pre-tests and post-tests in order to corroborate the conclusions of this study. Below the pre-test and post-test results will be discussed with considerations from the participant interviews in order to better understand the changes in sense of empowerment and problem solving skills.

Sense of empowerment

The findings presented in chapter four showed that there was a significant change in participant scores from the pre-tests to the post-tests. The significance was .048, overall the participants scores increased, the low score increased, and the variance in scores decreased from the pre-test to the post-test. There was a difference between the male and female participants with the females improving their scores more (sig.=.085 versus sig.=.398) and having less variance than the males. The information provided by the quantitative measure alone does not necessarily help to explain how the participants understood, conceptualize or process any changes in empowerment that they experienced from participating in the Skills for Constructive Living peace education program, and therefore the interviews will be considered to help address this, particularly given that there was a difference in outcomes for males and females.

In Ksar El Kebir, as well as in the rest of Morocco, there are gender roles and expectations that the participants are subject to that influence how they processed the material in the Skills for Constructive Living curriculum. Culture cannot be separated from a discussion of gender and empowerment when considering the outcomes for these students. There were a number of sessions in the Skills for Constructive Living program that focused on different ways

to express oneself in order to solve problems and facilitate peaceful community living (i.e. interpersonal communication skills, the difference between aggressive, submissive, and assertive behaviors, conflict resolution, emotional honesty, etc.). The female participants focused in their interviews on how they gained the ability to express themselves in new ways through their participation in the program and seemed to find these new modes of self-expression to be empowering in some way. This could be seen when they talked about trying to speak up more and being more honest with themselves. A number of them mentioned the distinction between submissive, assertive, and aggressive and that learning about these differences was helpful. The interviews showed that the females conceptualized any empowerment gained from the program in terms of new ways of self expression, whether it be through being honest with oneself, being assertive rather than submissive, learning to talk more about one's opinions, or working well in a group. The female participants seemed to really connect with the content of the curriculum in these interpersonally-focused areas and to find that the opportunity to practice new forms of self-expression, at least in the training, provided a sense of empowerment. The curriculum provided ample opportunities for activities that promoted growth in these areas which could help to explain why the females improved their scores greatly from the pre-test to the post-test.

The male participants did improve their scores on the empowerment measure from the pre-test to the post-test, but not by as much as the female participants. In the interviews, many of the males discussed that they now felt that they did not feel as aggressive as they used to, and notably none of the females said anything to this effect. The issue of aggression, fighting, and violence with this particular group was only articulated in the interviews by the male participants. They talked about how they had fewer thoughts about violence and fighting after going through the training and how they no longer wanted to revert to these behaviors when they

had a problem. Some of the topics covered in the training sought to teach alternatives to aggressive and violent behaviors (i.e. peaceful conflict resolution, problem solving, negotiation, etc.). It appears that the male participants conceptualized any empowerment from the program coming from a sense that they learned some alternatives to aggressive and violent behaviors that they could use. This response, though encouraging, raised some questions and may provide some explanation as to why the males did not have as much of a change from the pre-test to the post-test. The Skills for Constructive Living curriculum did provide some content that dealt with alternatives to violent and aggressive behaviors, but it was not extensive in this regard. It did not for example include anger management or coping skills which may be necessary for adolescent males who are dealing with problems of aggressive behaviors. The curriculum did include extensive content on interpersonal problem solving, which the females seemed to connect very well to, but perhaps did not include enough content related to violence and aggression, issues which the males were struggling with. Though the males made some progress in these areas and seemed to feel empowered by knowing alternatives, perhaps there should have been more alternatives presented to them.

Problem solving skills

The results from the quantitative measure showed that there was a significant improvement in test scores from the pre-tests to the post-tests. Like with the empowerment measure, the female participants showed greater changes from the pre-tests to the post-tests than the male participants (sig.=.006 versus sig.=.740). In order to help explain how participants experienced the problem solving training they received in the Skills for Constructive Living training, the interviews will also be considered alongside the quantitative results. The males and

females will be considered separately given that there was a difference in how they performed as a group as far as changes from the pre-test to the post-test.

The female participants gave a lot of attention in their interviews to alternative ways of communicating through problems that they learned through participating in the Skills for Constructive Living program. They said that whereas before they might have escalated a situation using “you...” statements which are accusatory in nature (i.e. “you did this...” or “why are you acting like this...”), many female participants noted that they now tried to instead use “I feel...” statements which can help to resolve conflicts peacefully. Some observed that they use “you” statements themselves too often and they would like to change this behavior, and others said that they notice that their peers and neighbors use these statements too often and would like to see their society change. Many female participants also discussed empathy, though not necessary using that word. They discussed; “to be flexible”, “not only stick to my opinions”, “feel more for the other”, “listen more than talk”, “try to help other people solve their problems”, etc. Learning to feel empathy for others and consider problems from many points of view is a critical skill in problem solving peacefully and was important for doing well on the problem solving measure used. Scores were driven by the ability to generate many different solutions to an interpersonal problem, and to consider which solutions were better than others. Both the use of “I feel...” statements and empathetic thinking reflected a change in critical thinking and problem solving skills that could have contributed to the female participant’s relative success on the problem solving measure.

The male participants did not have as high of a mean score on the problem solving measure on the post-test as the female participants. They were generally not able to generate as many solutions to the interpersonal problem scenario, and some of the responses from the

interviews can help to clarify why this may have been the case. As a group, the males tended to focus on problems from the perspective of physical violence and aggression, rather than problems from an interpersonal perspective. This included experiences being in fights at school and with friends, sometimes physical fights. Additionally, in the interviews only the male participants said that they liked the class on negotiation which discussed the political side of problem solving and simulated solving a political conflict. This can be compared to the female participants who provided feedback in the interviews that they did not like the negotiation exercise that was political in nature because they felt that politics did not benefit their lives. Perhaps one explanation for the difference in scores between the males and females on the problem solving measure is that they viewed the problem scenario differently. The scenario was representative of an interpersonal problem that a student was experiencing at school and the female participants may have viewed this differently than the males. Given that the females emphasized the importance of communication styles and empathy in their interviews, it would make sense that they would find an interpersonal problem very important and be able to generate many solutions for it. In their interviews the males focused on the importance of not using physical violence and aggression and were interested in political negotiation, which was not as applicable to the scenario used in this problem solving measure.

Implications for Peace Education Interventions

Gender considerations

The findings from this study showed that there were differences between how the male and female participants scored on the quantitative measures which were meant to determine if participants gained skills in problem solving and increased their sense of empowerment. The

findings also showed differences from the qualitative portion of this study along gender lines when it came to participants' attitudes and perceptions related to peaceful community living. Triangulating the quantitative and qualitative data helped to better understand how the males and females conceptualized empowerment, problems related to peacefully community living, and pathways to problem solving. It was clear from the data collected that there were a number of key differences, which perhaps led to the females relating better to the curriculum content than the male participants.

When designing a program or curriculum for a peace education intervention, consideration must be given to gender, however there is a lack of literature in this area. The literature on peace education largely remains silent on how to handle gender role differences, particularly in cultures where there are very rigid gender roles that cannot be expected to be left at the door when a participant enters a classroom. In the cultural context of a place like Morocco where the males typically have a very different public and private role than the females, the effects of these roles on the outcomes of peace education program need further investigation. Many international organizations have noted the critical role that females must play in leadership roles in reconciliation programs, peace education programs, and peace building activities (Yablon, 2009). The United Nation's Security Council Resolution 1325 (2000) emphasizes women's contributions to sustainable peace. While some studies of peace education programs have shown that females and males respond differently to peace education (Yablon, 2009; Biton & Salomon, 2006), this has not been translated into a theoretical model that can be used by peace education practitioners in order to support better outcomes for both genders. The most common explanation used to address the differences between male and female participants' conceptions of peace in peace education programs is the women and peace hypothesis which points to

differences between men and women when it comes to peace. It states that women are systematically less supportive of the use of force to resolve conflicts than men are, and that they are more dovish in their views on war and peace (Fite, Genest & Wilcox, 1990). This hypothesis has been used to explain why males and females respond differently to peace education programs as measured qualitatively and quantitatively. Despite the use of this hypothesis to explain the findings of peace education programs, it has not been used to address differential curricular or pedagogical considerations for males and females given that there are gender differences when it comes to peace. To better address the concerns that both genders have related to peace and violence, a more complete understanding is needed of the complex interaction of gender and culture which can then be translated into a theoretical framework to guide practice.

A key implication from this finding is the importance of gender is how gender is considered when developing a peace education curriculum, and when developing peace education pedagogy. Gender can be understood here as a construct of the cultural context in which the peace education program is taking place. In Ksar El Kebir Morocco there was a tendency for the males to have concerns about peace and violence related directly to physical violence and aggression and they voiced and interest in learning ways to control issues they had related to these areas. It would have been useful for them to receive training that would address these aspects of peaceful community living; however there was not enough of a focus on skill building in these areas in the Skills for Constructive Living curriculum. Pedagogical tools that would be helpful in honing these skills were engaged, such as role play, brainstorming, and real life problem solving. Others could also be considered that are used specifically to help young males manage their aggression or to teach alternatives to physical violence. The female participants from Ksar El Kebir emphasized the importance of positive communication skills for

peaceful community living and did not feel that they needed to learn about how to manage physical aggression because that was not something that they reported using in their daily lives. An ideal curriculum from the perspective of this audience would then be designed in a way that helps participants to learn and practice communication skills that can help them to resolve problems and conflicts without violence. It appears that the curriculum chosen for this study perhaps better met the needs of the female participants than the male participants, given the results of the evaluation. The findings are not to imply that the gender difference is so great and the curriculums so divergent that males and females should have entirely different peace education programs in order to meet their needs. Rather it is to compel practitioners to consider how best to balance a curriculum so that it can as equitably as possible meet the needs of both genders so as to ensure the optimal outcomes for all participants.

Utility of peace education in EFL

The choice to conduct the Skills for Constructive Living peace education program in English was made because the curriculum was not offered in Arabic, the interest from the project coordinator in conducting the program in English as he is an English teacher, and because the researcher is not fluent in Arabic. In this way, English as the language of choice for the program was chosen more out of necessity than intention, but ended up receiving interesting responses from the students in the interviews. Many of the participants, though not asked in the interview about how they felt about the program being conducted in English, brought it up as being one of the aspects of the program that they really liked. They clearly felt that there was a utility in learning English and thought that the fact that the Skills for Constructive Living program was being conducted in English provided an additional incentive for attending the training. In Morocco currently, as in other developing countries, English has a high currency and just

conducting a program in English can help to get a community interested in a program. It is also relevant to consider how English might be used in peace education programs in other socio-political contexts to enhance outcomes for participants.

In the literature reviewed, peace education programs were discussed in varied socio-political contexts including areas of relative tranquility, areas of inter-ethnic tension, and areas of intractable conflict (Salomon, 2007, 2010). Ksar El Kebir may be best classified as an area of relative tranquility because ethnicity was not discussed by participants as being a source of tension, violence, or conflict. Although there is street violence and school violence there that concerns people, it cannot be classified as being ethnic in nature. Participants seemed to attribute it more to issues related to poverty and lack of education and respect. However, there are many areas where peace education interventions are used where ethnicity, of which language is a part, is very contentious. In areas of intractable conflict, of great importance to those involved are the psychological aspects of the conflict which include the “collision of collective narratives that entail each side’s collective memories, collective identities, and shared beliefs” (Salomon, 2006). In this context, it is clear that choosing which language to conduct a peace education program can represent favoring one ethnic group over another, or show which group holds more power. Thus choosing a language that is native to neither group could prove to be a more neutral choice. Further, if reconciliation efforts are involved, having a language that could be neutral to each side may be more equitable than to use a language that is native to one group and not the other. In the literature reviewed, two models of peace education were discussed; direct peace education and indirect peace education (Bar-Tal & Rosen, 2009). Indirect peace education avoids directly addressing the sources or roots of the conflict because that may be too difficult for participants in the program, or may even insight hostilities among participants. Complimenting the indirect

model may be making a choice of a language that would be neutral and non-controversial to all participants involved in the peace education program. English, though not free from its own biases, may be an option for a language for peace education programs to be conducted in for areas of ethnic conflict.

Intractable conflicts are characterized by a deep sense of mistrust between the sides (Yablon, 2009), and thus any way that a feeling of safety can be created for participants in a peace education program may help to create better results for the program. Along with providing a degree of neutrality, a non-native language in an area on inter-ethnic tension or intractable conflict may provide what the project coordinator in Ksar El Kebir considered a “safe” language to experiment with new topics and new ways of self-expression. Many of the participants discussed that this program provided them with the opportunity to express themselves in new ways and that they felt that this was a benefit of the Skills for Constructive Living program. Given that peace education programs are challenging for participants, even in areas of relative tranquility, participants in areas of conflict could benefit from a language which felt safe for them to engage with challenging topics. Interventionists considering peace education programs in areas of conflict may want to consider using English or a non-native language in order to provide a language which is feels safer for experimenting in and expressing oneself in.

Importance of evaluation

“Although findings may also be used to contribute to larger studies, program evaluation first serves its target program and the program’s stakeholders” (Ashton, 2007, p.45). It is important to give due attention to those participants and community stakeholders for which the program is intended to serve, while also finding ways that the evaluation can contribute to a larger body of

knowledge. Peace education programs have not often demonstrated the ability to meet both criteria of evaluation; benefiting a target population and contributing to a larger study. Both of these aspects of evaluation are important for demonstrating the effectiveness of peace education in reducing different forms of violence and contributing to creating more peaceful societies, and for offering explanations for the processes of how this is possible through changing knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors. Because peace education often takes the form of programs, both in the formal and non-formal contexts, program evaluation is a useful but often underutilized tool for peace education. Evaluations may be underutilized because there can be various challenges associated with implementing evaluations of peace education programs. Harris (2003) identifies a number of challenges related to the evaluation of peace education programs including; 1) the need for pre-tests and post-tests which requires getting permission from parents, teachers, and minors; 2) keeping track of research subjects to gather follow-up data; 3) comparison groups are hard to control and although two sample groups may appear to be similar, their participation in peace education learning can be impacted by a number of factors; and 4) such evaluations are costly and there is little money available for peace education research, and such obstacles makes it hard to satisfy the expectations of policy makers (p.13). Despite these challenges, evaluation offers the possibility of demonstrating peace education's effectiveness which is essential to the field's viability.

It is important that the field of peace education use principles of evaluation as a component of determining the worth and effectiveness of peace education programs. When reviewing the literature on peace education it was very unusual to find a study that incorporated principles of program evaluation, although many studies discussed specific peace education programs. Evaluation provides a specific lens through which to understand the effectiveness of a

program that is very valuable, particularly for a field that struggles to gain legitimacy. Using principles of program evaluation is not incompatible with other methods of inquiry favored by researchers in peace education, and perhaps an ideal approach is a pragmatic mixed-methods approach which allows the researcher the flexibility to choose the methods which will best answer the research questions that are most important to the stakeholders, and which address the most pressing questions in the field of peace education.

Suggestions for future research

The findings from this study show that there is a need for greater attention in peace education research to gender constructs and how those interact with curricular materials and pedagogies in order to enhance optimal outcomes for both males and females. The findings from this study supported the conclusion that there were differences between the female and male participants when it came to how they conceptualized empowerment, violence, peaceful community living, and how they approached problem solving. One result of this difference was that it appeared that the Skills for Constructive Living program was able to address more of the concerns that the female participants had and did not adequately address some topics that the males were concerned with. Of the literature reviewed other studies also showed differential results for male and female participants, which in combination with this study supports the conclusion that further research is necessary into how to support optimal outcomes for both genders in peace education programs. This requires assessing the needs of each gender and determining the curriculum and pedagogies that would best meet these needs, keeping in mind there will likely be variation from culture to culture. This recommendation is not to be confused with advocating for separation between the genders when it comes to peace education, rather for

a heightened awareness for the specific needs for the genders so that a program can encompass fully the needs of both genders.

From the results of this study, there is also a need to further explore potential benefits to using non-native languages in peace education programs to achieve a variety of goals from experimenting with new forms of self-expression to choosing a language that is viewed by conflicting parties as more politically neutral. This point may have particular relevance for peace education programs in areas experiencing intractable ethnic conflict, but also should be considered in contexts where participants may struggle with self-expression in their native language. However, this is largely unexplored and requires research in various socio-political contexts to establish how and why using a non-native language as a medium in peace education programs may benefit participants. This topic demands that researchers explore the power dynamics that are inherent in the processes of peace education and the effect that this has on participants. Specifically, when peace education programs are not carried out in participant's native languages, how does this impact participants? And does this vary based on the reason why the program was not conducted in their native language (i.e., for political reasons versus pragmatic reasons)? Another related consideration is how peace education programs are negotiated in a multilingual classroom when some participants may be using their native language and others a non-native language. That this study was conducted in the researcher's native language and the participant's non-native language gave attention to the issue of language choice in peace education. Since peace education materials and curriculum are often in English, but used around the world, more research is needed into the impacts of language choices in peace education programs.

Finally, the results from this study also support the need for more rigorous evaluations of peace education programs in order to benefit local stakeholders as well as to demonstrate the effectiveness of peace education as a tool to reduce physical and structural violence and promote more peaceful societies. In order to do this there are a number of important considerations. There need to be instruments developed which can adequately measure change that can be attributed to peace education. When new programs are developed or old programs revised, evaluation instruments should be included. It was clear when trying to choose instruments for this study that there is a lack of instruments available to evaluate peace education programs and without program evaluation instruments it is very difficult to perform a rigorous evaluation which can demonstrate to stakeholders that the program is effective. UNESCO's Skills for Constructive Living program only included a structured interview to evaluate the program which is insufficient to determine whether or not it met its intended goals which is why it was necessary to search for other instruments to measure sense of empowerment and problem solving skills. The findings from this study also support the use of both qualitative and quantitative methods for evaluating peace education programs. The quantitative measures caught a gender divide in the participant's performances on the problem solving measure and sense of empowerment scale which would not have shown up as explicitly in the interviews; but it was the interviews which helped to explain these results. Similarly, the interviews revealed that the participants found great utility in the EFL component of the program which would not necessarily have been revealed in a quantitative measure because of its highly structural nature. Too often peace education programs are evaluated based only on qualitative or quantitative methods of inquiry and this can limit the findings of particular studies as well as the overall body of research on peace education. In order to move the field of peace education forward and provide stakeholders

with necessary information about particular programs, rigorous evaluations which include both qualitative and quantitative data are needed.

References

- Allport, G.W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Arai, T. (2006). When the waters of conflict and culture meet. In M. LeBaron & V. Pillay (Eds.), *Conflict Across Cultures: A unique experience of bridging differences* (203-224). Boston, MA: Intercultural Press.
- Ashton, C.V. (2007). Using Theory of Change to Enhance Peace Education Evaluation. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 25(1), 39-53.
- Aspeshlagh, R. & Burns, R. J. (1996). *Three decades of peace education around the world: an anthology*. New York: Garland.
- Bajaj, M. (2011). Human rights education: Ideology, location, and approaches. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 33(2), 481-508.
- Banta, B. (1993). *Peaceful Peoples: An Annotated Bibliography*. Metuchen, N.J: Scarecrow Press.
- Bar-Tal, D. (2002). The elusive nature of peace education. In Salomon, G. & Nevo, B. (Eds.) *Peace Education: The Concepts, Principles and Practices Around the World*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bar-Tal, D., Halperin, E., & De Rivera, J. (2007). Collective emotions in conflict: Societal implications. *Journal of Social Issues*, 63(2), 441-460.
- Bar-Tal, D. & Rosen, Y. (2009). Peace Education in Societies Involved in Intractable Conflicts: Direct and Indirect Models. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(2), 557-575.
- Bekerman, Z. & McGlynn, C. (2007) *Addressing Ethnic Conflict Through Peace Education*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Biton, Y. & Salomon, G. (2006). Peace in the Eyes of Israeli and Palestinian Youths: Effects of Collective Narratives and Peace Education Program. *Journal of Peace Research*, 43(2), 167-180.
- Bjerstedt, A. (1986). Learning for the future. Stockholm: Liber Utbildningsförlaget.
- Billow, S.H. (1988). Democratic Education. *Educational Theory*, 38(2), 275.
- Blum, R.W. (2005). A Case for School Connectedness. *Educational Leadership*, 62(7), 16-20
- Bodine, R., & Crawford, D. (1999). *The handbook of conflict resolution: A guide to building quality programs in schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Boulding, E. (2000). *Cultures of peace: The hidden side of history*. Syracuse, NY: University Press.
- Boyston, R. (1983). The bomb in the classroom. *The Times*, February 28.
- Bretherton, D., Weston, J. & Zbar, V. (2003). Peace education in a post-conflict environment: The case of Sierra-Leone. *Prospects*, 33(2), 219-230.
- Brock-Unte, B. (1996). Peace education in postcolonial Africa. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 71(3), 170-190.
- Brock-Unte, B. (2000). Peace education in an era of globalization. *Peace Review*, 12(1), 131-138.
- Brown, J. H. ,D'Emido-Caston, & Bernard, B. (2001). *Resilience education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Burstyn, J. (2001). *Preventing violence in schools: A challenge to American democracy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bush, K. D. & Saltarelli, D. (2000). *The Two Faces of Education in Ethnic Conflict*:

- Towards a Peacebuilding Education for Children*. Florence: Innocenti Research Centre.
- Camden, C., Swaine, B., Tétreault, S., & Bergeron, S. (2009). SWOT analysis of pediatric rehabilitation programme: A participatory evaluation fostering quality improvement. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 31(16), 1373-1381.
- Cann, C.N. (2012). Harvesting Social Change: A Peace Education Program in Three Acts. *Journal of Peace Education*, 9(3), 211-223.
- Carson, T. & Lange, E. A. (Eds.) (1997). *Peace education in social studies*. Vancouver, BC: Pacific Educational Press.
- Carter, C. (2004). Education for Peace in Northern Ireland and the USA. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 32(1), 24-38.
- Christie, D.J, Tint, B.S., Wagner, R.V & DuNann, D. (2008). Peace Psychology for a Peaceful World. *American Psychological Association*, 63(6), 540-552.
- Clarke-Habibi, S. (2005). Transforming worldviews: The case of education for peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 3(1), 33-56.
- Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. (2007). Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cornell, T.D. (1970). A systematic approach to needs assessment. Tucson, AZ: EPIC Evaluation Center.
- Creswell, J.W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Danesh, H.B. (2006). Towards an Integrative Theory of Peace Education. *Journal of Peace Education, 3*(1), 55-78.
- Dembour, M.B. (2010). What are human rights? Four schools of thought. *Human Rights Quarterly, 32*(1), 1-20.
- Dewey, J. (1910). *How we think*. Boston, MA: DC Health & co.
- Eisler, R., Miller, M. (2004). *Educating for a culture of peace*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Fernández-Dols, J.M., Hurtado-de-Mendoza, A. & Jiménez-de-Lucas, A. (2004). Culture of Peace: An alternative definition and its measurement. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 10*(2), 117–124.
- Fetherston, B. & Kelly, R. (2007). Conflict resolution and transformative pedagogy: A grounded theory research project on learning in higher education. *Journal of Transformative Education, 5*(3), 262-285.
- Fite, David, Marc Genest, and Clyde Wilcox. 1990. Gender differences in foreign policy attitudes. *American Political Quarterly* 18: 492–513.
- Forccy, L. & Harris, I. (1999). *Peace building for adolescents: Strategies for educators and community leaders*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishers.
- Friere, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York, NY: Seabury.
- Freire, P. (2009). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed: 30th Anniversary Edition*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Frydenberg, E., Care, E., Freeman, E., & Chan, E. (2009). Interrelationships between Coping, School Connectedness and Wellbeing. *Australian Journal of Education, 53*(3), 261-272.

- Fulcher, J. (2012). Learning peace: Progressive impacts of peace education in peacebuilding. *Social Alternatives*, 31(4), 40-43.
- Furnell, S.C. & Rogers, P.J. (2011). *Purposeful Program Theory*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6(3), 167-191.
- Galtung, J. (1975). Peace Education: Problems and Conflicts. In M. Haavelsrud (ed.), *Education for Peace, Reaction and Action*. Guilford, NY: IPC Science & Technology Press.
- Galtung, J. (Ed.).(2008). *Form and Content of Peace Education*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Gentry, B. G., & Benenson, W. A. (1992). School-age peer mediators transfer knowledge and skills to home setting. *Mediation Quarterly*, 10, 101-109.
- Grant, T. (1998). The utility of Allport's conditions of intergroup contact for predicting perceptions of improved racial attitudes and beliefs. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54 (4), 795-812.
- Guttman, A. (1987). *Democratic education*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Hakvoort, I. & Oppenheimer, L.(1993) Children and Adolescents' Conceptions of Peace, War, and Strategies to Attain Peace: A Dutch Case Study. *Journal of Peace Research*, 30(1), 65-77.
- Hakvoort, I. (2010). Peace Education in Regions of Tranquility. In G. Salomon & E. Cains (Eds.), *Handbook on Peace Education* (287-301). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.

- Harber, C., & Sakade, N. (2009). Schooling for Violence and Peace: How does Peace Education Differ from 'Normal' Schooling?, *Journal of Peace Education*, 6(2), 171-187.
- Harris, I. (1996). From world peace to peace in the 'hood: Peace education in a postmodern world. *Journal for a Just and Caring Education*. (2) 3, 378-395.
- Harris, I. (1996). Peace Education in an Urban School District in the United States. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 71(3), 63-83.
- Harris, I. (2002) Conceptual underpinnings of peace education. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo (Eds.), *Peace education: the concept, principles, and practices around the world* (15-26). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Harris, I. (2003, April 21-25). *Peace Education Evaluation*. Paper presented at The Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL: ERIC.
- Harris, I. (2004). Peace Education Theory. *Journal of Peace Education*, 1(1), 5-20.
- Hurt, S. (2004). Creating a culture of peace with nonviolent communication. In R. Eisler & M. Miller Eds., *Educating for a Culture of Peace* (113-126). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- 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, 459-507.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1999). *Learning together and alone: Cooperative, competitive and individualistic learning*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Johnson, R. & Onwuegbuzie, A.J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), 14-26.
- Jones, T. S. (2004). Conflict resolution education: The field, the findings, and the future. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 22 (1-2), 233-267.

- Kelly, A.V. (1986). *Knowledge and Curriculum Planning*. London: Harper and Row.
- Kessler, R. (2004). Education for Integrity, Connection, Compassion and Character (R. Eisler & R. Miller Eds.), in *Educating for a Culture of Peace* (pp.57-79). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Kester, K., & Booth, A. (2010). Education, peace and Freire: A dialogue. *Development*, 53(4), 498-503.
- Knight, C. (2007). A resilience framework: A perspective for educators. *Health Education*, 107(6), 543-555.
- Koltko-Rivera, M.E. (2004). The Psychology of Worldviews. *Review of General Psychology*, 8(1), 3-58.
- Lane-Garon, P., Yergat, J.& Kralowec, C. (2012). Conflict resolution education and positive behavioral support: A climate of safety for all learners. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 30(2), 197-217 .
- Lederach, J. P. (1995) *Preparing for peace: Conflict transformation across cultures*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Likert, R. (1967). *The human organization: Its management and value*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- McCauley, C. (2002). Head first versus feet first in peace education. In: Salomon, G. & Nevo, B. (Eds.) *Peace Education: The Concept, Principles, and Practices around the World*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- McGlynn, C., Zembylas, M., Bekerman, Z. & Gallagher, T. (2009). *Peace Education in Conflict and Post-conflict Societies*. NewYork, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Maxwell, J.A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mitra, D.L. (2009). Collaborating with Students: Building Youth-Adult Partnerships in Schools. *American Journal of Education*, 115(3), 407-436.
- Morrison, M.L., Austad, C.S., & Cota, K. (2011). Help Increase the Peace: A Youth-Focused Program in Peace Education. *Journal of Peace Education*, 8(2), 177-191.
- Najjuma, R. (2011). Peace education in the context of post-conflict formal schooling: The effectiveness of the revitalizing education participation and learning in conflict affected areas-peace education programme in northern Uganda (unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Birmingham, Birmingham.
- 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.
- Niens, U. & Cairns, E. (2001). Intrastate violence. In D. Christie, R. Wagner, & D. DuNann (Eds.) *Peace, Contact, and Violence* (39-48). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Leech, N. L. (2004). *Enhancing the interpretation of significant findings: The role of mixed methods research*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Clearwater, FL.
- Oshofsky, J. (1995). The effects of exposure to violence on young children. *American Psychologist*, 50 (9), 782-803.
- Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Provus, M. (1971). *Discrepancy Evaluation*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

- Reardon, B.A. (1988). *Educating for global responsibility*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Reardon, B.A. (1989). *Comprehensive Peace Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Reardon, B.A. (1997). Human rights as education for peace. In G. J. Andreopoulos & R. P. Claude (Eds.), *Human rights education for the twenty-first century* (21-34). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Reardon, B. A. & Cabezudo, A. (2002). *Rationale for and Approaches to Peace Education, Book 1*. New York, NY: Hague Appeal for Peace.
- Salomon, G. (2002) The nature of peace education: not all programs are equal. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo (Eds.) *Peace education: the concept, principles, and practices around the world* (3-14). New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Salomon, G. & Kupermintz, H.(2002). *The Evaluation of Peace Education Programmes: Main Considerations and Criteria*. The Centre for Research on Peace Education: University of Haifa, Israel.
- Salomon, G. & Nevo, B. (2003). The dilemmas of peace education in intractable conflicts. *Palestine-Israel Journal*, 8(3), 33-50.
- Salomon, G. (2004). Does peace education make a difference in the context of an intractable conflict? *Journal of Peace Psychology*, 10(3), 257-274.
- Salomon, G. (2004). A narrative-based view of coexistence education. *Journal of Social Issues*, 60(2), 273-287.
- Salomon, G. (2007). Peace education: It's nature, nurture and the challenges it faces. In D. Rivera (Ed.) *Handbook on Building Cultures of Peace* (107-121). New York, NY: Springer.

- Salomon, G. & Cairns E. (2010). *Handbook on Peace Education*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Scriven, M. (2003). Evaluation Theory and Metatheory. In Kellaghan, T. & Stufflebeam, D.L. (Eds.) *International Handbook of Educational Evaluation-Part One: Perspectives* (15-31). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Sechrest, L., & Sidana, S. (1995). Quantitative and qualitative methods: Is there an alternative? *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 18(1), 77-87.
- Shapiro, S. H. (2010). *Educating youth for a world beyond violence: A pedagogy for peace*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sinclair, M. (2008). Learning to live together. In Bajaj, M. (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of peace education* (53-70). New York, NY: Columbia University.
- Singer, M. (1995). Adolescents' exposure to violence and associated symptoms of psychological trauma. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 273(6), 477-482.
- Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. SAGE.
- Stichter, C. (1986). When tempers flare, let trained student mediators put out the flames. *American School Board Journal*, 1(73), 41-42.
- Stomfay-Stitz, A. M. (1993). *Peace education in America, 1828–1990: Sourcebook for education and research*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.
- Tal-Or, N., Boninger, D. & Gleicher, F. (2002). Understanding the conditions and processes necessary for intergroup contact to reduce prejudice. In Salomon, G. & Nevo, B. (Eds.) *Peace education: The concept, principles, and practices around the world*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Tibbitts, F. (2005). Transformative Learning and Human Rights Education: Taking a Closer Look. *Intercultural Education*, 16(2), 107-113.

United Nations' Security Council. 2000. *Resolution 1325*. http://www.un.org/events/res_1325e (accessed May 27, 2014).

Van Slyck, M. R., Stern, M. & Elbedour, S. (1999) Adolescents' beliefs about their conflict behavior. In: A. Raviv, L. Oppenheimer & D. Bar-Tal (Eds.) *How children understand war and peace* (208-230). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Will, G. (1993). Medicine for 724 children. *Newsweek*, March 22, 48.

Yablon, Y.B. (2009). Gender differences in peace education programmes. *Gender and Education*, 21(6), 689-701.

Appendix A
Recruitment Materials

The following is a verbal script that will be used to recruit participants for the six week peace education training:

There is a study taking place this summer for research purposes in Ksar El Kebir about peace education and community violence. As part of this study, there will be a six week peace education training offered for youth where there will be lessons and activities for them to participate in. This research is affiliated with The Pennsylvania State University in the United States. The researchers conducting this study are from The Pennsylvania State University in the United States and a local researcher who teaches in Ksar El Kebir.

The location of the study is the Inbiaat Association for Education and Development in Ksar El Kebir. The study will last for six weeks and participants will be asked to come for training twice a week for one and a half hour training sessions. There are three criteria for participants: (1) participants must be between the ages of 15 and 19 and (2) participants will have exhibited some delinquent or violent behaviors in the past and (3) must have proficiency in English. In order to participate in the six week training we will need your consent and if you are under the age of 18 and would like to participate we will also need your parents' consent.

If you would like to contact someone about this study or have any questions or concerns please contact:

Mohammed Loutfi:

Quartier Al-Andalousse

#4 Group A

Ksar El Kebir 92150 Morocco

medloutfi18@yahoo.fr

011 212539906742

Kendra Taylor

009 Ferguson Building

University Park, PA 16802

Kat5123@psu.edu

814-470-2354

Appendix B

Empowerment Measure

Please circle the number that best describes your experience during your last (duration of program) with (name of organization or program)

<i>During the Skills for Constructive Living Program</i>	Almost Never	<i>Rarely</i>	Some- times	Often	Almost Always
I had important responsibilities	1	2	3	4	5
My group worked well together	1	2	3	4	5
My instructors did <u>not</u> relate well to me *	1	2	3	4	5
The instructors made decisions without my group's input*	1	2	3	4	5
I felt that what I was learning was relevant to my life	1	2	3	4	5
I made important decisions	1	2	3	4	5
Other students helped me when I had problems	1	2	3	4	5
I felt I had a close relationship with at least one instructor	1	2	3	4	5
Our group had <u>no</u> control over what we did*	1	2	3	4	5
I was interested in learning	1	2	3	4	5
I contributed to my group's successes	1	2	3	4	5
There was a lot of conflict in my group*	1	2	3	4	5
I felt appreciated by at least one of my instructors	1	2	3	4	5
I felt that my group, not just my instructor, was able to determine what we did	1	2	3	4	5
We did things that had little purpose*	1	2	3	4	5

To Score:

Reverse code the 5 items with negative stems (* above)

Total subscales.

- Personal Empowerment (sum items 1, 6, 11)
- Group Support (sum items 2, 7, 12)

- Instructor Support (sum items 3, 8, 13)
- Group Empowerment (sum items 4, 9, 14)
- Learning Relevance (sum items 5, 10, 15)

Appendix C

1. What's the first thing you would think of to do or say?

a.

2. What other things could you do or say--try to list as many as you can.

b.

c.

d.

e.

f.

3. Look back at what you wrote in No. 1 and 2 and list the letter of the one you think is best

____. Please explain why you chose it.

4. Choose one you rejected and list the letter of the item _____. Please explain why you rejected it.

5. Explain what you think is the "real" problem behind the incident?

6. Have you ever had to handle a problem like this before? ____

yes no

Appendix D

Individual Interview

UNESCO Peace Education Community Workshop Evaluation **Content**

1. Was the course interesting?

2. Was the course useful?

3. What aspects of the course do you think you will use?

4. What improvements to the course content can you suggest?

Methodology

5. Which activities did you like best?

6. Which activities do you think you will remember?

7. Which activities did you like least? Why?

8. Was the facilitator's manner appropriate?

9. What improvements can you suggest for the methods used?

Environment

10. Was the Course the right length of time? Too short? Too long?

40

11. Was the venue appropriate?

Outcome

12. What changes do you expect as a result of this course?

13. What changes do you hope for yourself as a result of this course?

14. How do you think you can integrate Peace Education into your job?

Other comments: