EVALUATING THE LINK BETWEEN CONFLICT AND EDUCATION

LYNN DAVIES

Abstract

This paper examines two areas of important evaluation: the impact of education on peace and the impact of education on conflict, and argues that they are not necessarily the same type of evaluation. The paper first outlines the possible ways in which education contributes to greater conflict rather than to peace. It next explores issues in impact assessment. Then it details evaluation possibilities in three domains: international comparisons and linkages; long-term individual and group evaluation or tracer studies; and short-term or immediate evaluations. It finally argues for a focus on structures and processes within schools, looking at democratic versus authoritarian schooling, the impact of violent schools, how schools teach about conflict and the need to promote citizen research and evaluation.

Introduction

At a time of the intensification of terrorism, but also at a time of extreme ambiguity as to who in the world are the greater terrorists in causing civilian deaths, the need for a critical evaluation of the role of education in conflict, violence and terrorism has never been more apparent. The article explores (and stresses the need for) two areas of focus on evaluation: the impact of education on peace and the impact of education on conflict. They do not necessarily involve the same types of evaluation, yet both face the problems involved in judging short-term (or immediate) effects versus long-term effects, and of assessing a narrow impact on particular individuals versus a broad effect on 'society'. The article seeks to map possibilities in a number of these fields, while acknowledging the problem of the 'attribution gap' – that the deeper one goes in trying to determine impact, the less easy it becomes to attribute a phenomenon solely to education (Warner 2004). It is nevertheless an urgent task to try to demonstrate the real effects of education on peace and conflict – and to challenge the assumption that education is generally benign – if we are to convince governments to change their priorities in education systems. Peace is not just the absence of conflict. If no violent conflict occurs in a society, then schools are judged to be succeeding on this score; yet this ignores latent conflict and the possibility that an internally stable country will wage war on another country. All countries, not just those labelled 'conflict societies', need evaluation of the contribution of their education system to national and international security.

This article begins by examining the possible negative contributions of education – specifically how education contributes to degenerative processes of various sorts of conflict. It proceeds to outline the issues in attribution of impact, and then explores research and evaluation possibilities in three domains: at societal level, long-term tracer studies and short-term programme evaluation. While much has been written on evaluation of peace education and of programmes for 'learning to live together', the article asserts the need for a constant parallelism of evaluating both peace *and* war education, and for a methodology for evaluating schooling as a whole, rather than only deliberate peace interventions.

42

Examining the relationship between education and conflict, there are three basic possibilities: that education (or some aspects of it) contributes to conflict; that education is neutral; that education (or some aspects of it) contributes to peace. While all three are simultaneously possible, my position is that education contributes more to conflict than it does to peace (Davies 2004). The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation has four pillars of education for the world in the 21st Century: 'learning to know, learning to do, learning to be and learning to live together' (UNESCO 1996). The reality in schools in many countries, however, is better described as:

> **Learning to be different:** through selective and stratified education – reflecting 'ability', social class and language – which produces and reproduces the diverse pathways into further education and jobs;

> **Learning to mistrust**: through ethnically and religiously segregated schools, and through various constructions of 'we' and 'others';

> **Learning to accept aggression:** through militaristic or 'defence' education, through the experience of mental or physical violence from teachers and peers, from punishment regimes which uphold an ethos of revenge rather than reparation, and from a masculine ethos which celebrates toughness;

> **Learning to fear:** through competitive, individualistic and examination-oriented education which feeds a culture of anxiety.

If one is evaluating the impact of specific peace education programmes, it is important to take into account the context of 'normal' educational systems within which such programmes take place, to see whether the programmes are central or whether they are marginalised in the face of dominant selective, individualised and competitive systems obsessed with academic 'standards'. The concern should be less the internal 'good practice' in peace education programmes and more the surrounding 'bad practice' of whole education systems.

The concern should be less the internal 'good practice' in peace education programmes and more the surrounding 'bad practice' of whole education systems.

The link between poverty and conflict is well known; poorer countries in particular cannot afford education systems that work against their stability. Studies by economists demonstrate that education *can* lift a country out of poverty (McMahon 2003), and that education can contribute to a stronger middle class, civil society and rule of law; hence, one would assume, a more peaceful society. However, these features apply to the internal workings of a society and say nothing about that society's stance towards other societies. The United States' (and British) invasion of Iraq was fuelled partly by a culture of fear and a fundamentalist Christian right which stereotyped Islamic countries as 'evil'. Similarly, moves towards stronger anti-terrorist laws in Britain today are strengthening suspicion towards Muslims and increasing anti-Muslim sentiments. The role of education in a society's acceptance of external aggression is less easy to delineate than the impact of education on internally divided societies (such as Sri Lanka, Northern Ireland, Kosovo and Bosnia), where segregated schools have sometimes overtly taught mistrust or vilification of other groups. In such divided nations, it is not difficult to examine their textbooks and see how enemies are portrayed, heroes identified and histories written, and to imagine the consequent effect on learners.[1] Yet in 'stable' societies, rich or poor, textbooks may also glorify war through greater attention and analytic detail compared to that given to peace. War and conflict are presented as the *normality*. This assumption, combined with increasing marketisation of education and yet more support for the idea

that competition is 'healthy', effectively sidelines any educational effort and time spent on issues of mutual respect, collaboration and peaceful conflict resolution.

Can these hypotheses about the negative effects of much that happens in education be substantiated? The article argues that it is crucial to move evaluation of effects of education on conflict further up the research agenda. 'Education for All' discourses seem to accept that education is generally benign and therefore that providing more education and greater access to schooling will be even more benign. I am less sure. It seems imperative that we analyse what type and ethos of education we are promoting before we become complacent if full attendance at school is being achieved and the problem of equity within or across countries seems to have been solved.

> **It seems imperative that we analyse what type and ethos of education we are promoting before we become complacent if full attendance at school is being achieved and the problem of equity within or across countries seems to have been solved.**

If, as I and others hypothesise (Bush & Saltarelli 2000; Smith & Vaux 2003), formal education systems can contribute more to world disorder than to world peace, then it is urgent to find ways at least to investigate this systematically. If various peace education initiatives or attempts at democratic, collaborative education are successful, then these need to be built on, and support needs to be given to the resistance to divisive or examination- or standards-driven systems – particularly in societies that can ill afford them.

The next section examines challenges facing those assessing the impact of education before moving into various approaches in researching and evaluating peace education programmes and education systems in general. Finally, I make recommendations for advancing research on the impact of education on peace.

Issues in Assessing Impact

The peace educationist, Lennart Vriens, arrives at a sobering conclusion about education since the genesis of the nation-state:

> Together with the army it was the most successful instrument for the propagation of a national identity and for the dissemination of militarism… From this point of view we must be suspicious when people claim that education is a necessary instrument for peace. Until now we have little historical evidence for this statement, and in fact history points more to the contrary (Vriens 2003:71)

An obvious enigma is the role of 'educated' people in violence and genocide. Their role been debated at least since the Holocaust,[2] and continues to draw attention in examinations of Iraq today and the Balkans. Aguilar and Richmond (1998:122) provide an example of this phenomenon in a passage about Rwanda:

> The role of well-educated persons in the conception, planning and execution of the genocide requires explanation; an attempt at explanation must consider how it was possible that their education did not render genocide unthinkable. The active involvement of children and young people in carrying out acts of violence, sometimes against their teachers and fellow pupils, raises further questions about the kind of education they had received.

This is the key question for today: not just how can we evaluate peace education, but *how is it that education does not render genocide (or terrorism) unthinkable?* An answer to the

'thinkables' is that schooling is not just relatively silent on the big social and security issues – preferring to focus on maths, science and (un)critical literacy; but also that it actively models two things: physically or mentally violent solutions to conflict in its discipline regimes, and labelling and classifying 'others' as a central activity. When pupils have experienced violence and 'othering' for many years, it is not difficult to turn this familiarity into the dehumanisation required to label enemies as 'cockroaches' and seek to exterminate them. It is difficult to think of evaluating peace education programmes in schools without seeing them in the context of what schooling does to pupils – even the successful ones.

Yet the difficulties in convincingly evaluating peace education (still less war education) are well known. Seitz conducted an extensive literature search on education and peace/conflict, including impact assessment, and found 'it was not possible to detect any extensive and elaborated analysis and indicator concepts which would meet the demands placed on an extensive set of instruments for conflict impact assessment in education assistance' (2004:73). There were some useful tried-and-tested evaluation grids for use in conflict-based emergencies, but there could be 'no talk of the elaboration of a standard set of instruments for a comprehensive peace and conflict impact assessment (PCIA) in the education sector'. PCIA is not a conventional instrument which simply measures the extent to which goals have been attained by a project; it also records the unintended effects of a project on the conflict dynamic and peace potential in the entire environment of a crises-endangered region. But Seitz claims that in peace education practice, systematic project monitoring and accompanying efficacy control are 'generally non-existent', and again confirms that finding measures for the impact of programming must begin before peace education takes place. The complex interplay between macro and micro level 'has also proved to be largely unexplained, especially when it is a question of the extent to which the established impact of a project on the micro level is also able to have a sustainable impact on the macro-structural roots of ethno-political conflict and violence' (2004:75). Should one then give up on the macro level, the bigger picture, and simply focus on immediate processes? In discussing the difficulties of the evaluation of the effects of peace education, Harris (2004:1) argues:

> **PCIA is not a conventional instrument which simply measures the extent to which goals have been attained by a project; it also records the unintended effects of a project on the conflict dynamic and peace potential in the entire environment of a crises-endangered region**

> Even if peace educators persuade students about the dangers of violence and instil in them a desire to do something about those threats, students may have neither the will, the capacity, the knowledge, the skills, nor the power to take action that would result in a more peaceful world.

As he points out, in spite of the efforts of millions of people who have joined and actively supported peace movements for 100 years, the world has grown more violent through ethnic and religious conflict. Sadly, 'many well-meaning individuals who turn to peace education sense an increasing reliance on peace-through-strength strategies to manage human affairs', and, feeling that their efforts to stem militarism have been in vain, become burned out and cynical about the prospects.

Anderson (2004:6) relates from the findings of the 'Reflecting on Peace Practice' (RPP) project : 'Many people do things "for peace", assuming that, some day, "they will add up". The evidence gathered through RPP suggests that this assumption is not true. Many good actions do not add up to peace.

As Harris (2004:2) underlines, policy makers want to know whether peace education is an effective way to address problems of violence, particularly when levels of ethnic hatred and civil strife rise:

> Whereas international peace education might be controversial because it challenges war-enhancing policies of government, peace education that attempts to reduce conflict within civil society seems attractive to a wide spectrum of school personnel, government officials and civic leaders who want to know that it works before they pour precious resources into educating children about alternatives to violence. Such demands can be an obstacle to the growth of peace education because policy makers do not have hard data to support claims that it reduces violence.

And, as always, there is the problem of attribution: if street crime decreases (perhaps, partly, because of more effective community policing), how much can be attributed to the schools' violence prevention programmes? Comparison studies between students receiving programmes and those who do not are notoriously difficult to carry out, because it is challenging to control for other variables and challenging to find and follow up with students for long-term data. Nonetheless, Harris quotes from meta-studies of peace education effectiveness that could demonstrate effectiveness and some positive results in conflict resolution programmes that decrease aggression among children, reduce bullying in schools and motivate pupils to achieve. However, we do not know the long-term effects, or whether students become active outside the classroom to promote peace and affect other students who have not been in the programme. If a student is drafted into the military, which learning prevails?

The question of the impact on policy makers then becomes a pressing one. If the effect on violence *and achievement* within the school is so obvious, why is this not a curriculum priority? One returns to the inertia of the existing curriculum and the unquestioned objectives of formal education systems, together with their assessment machinery. A prime function of schools is to select and sort. If peace education is the priority, how could schools then decide who goes to university? It would not be expedient to fail people on the peace education (or citizenship) course, as they might then accept a label of 'not very good at peace', with inevitable consequences. All we can do, perhaps, is to try to move peace, citizenship and human rights up the curriculum agenda while downgrading those aspects of formal education which might contribute to conflict. But for this we need sustained evidence of both good and harm.

Evaluation Possibilities

This section examines evaluation possibilities in three domains: international or societal comparisons; long-term or lateral tracing; and short-term programme evaluation.

International Comparisons and Linkages

Correlations

First is the exercise of finding correlations – or the lack of them. There are many untested assumptions about the connections between education and national development. Benavot (cited in Avalos-Bevan 1996) investigated the variations in annual instructional time in eight subject areas at primary level in 60 countries, and linked these to changes in GDP over a 25-year period. There was a positive economic impact of total yearly hours of instruction, but contrary to popular wisdom, no effect on economic growth was noted of instructional time allocated to maths and language. In the case of the less developed nations,

the finding was of a positive impact of hours devoted to the arts and music. Science had a positive impact; time spent on vocational education a negative effect. Clearly one is cautious about taking correlations at face value for immediate policy; yet they do raise questions about why we historically and routinely put certain efforts into certain subjects, and how we need much more of this type of research when looking at national goals for education. If high levels of maths attainment do not seem to be associated with economic growth, for example, then one may as well turn to peace education and see where that leads. The longitudinal international studies of citizenship education are and will be helpful in this regard (Kerr 2003).

There are also interesting puzzles to be found in international rankings of countries on various dimensions, as published at the back of the development reports of the United Nations Development Programme and the World Bank. If high levels of formal education spending and school attendance were associated with less conflict, then one would expect to find lower crime levels in the countries with higher education spending. However, there seems to be no such connection. The *Human Development Reports* (UNDP 2000, 2002) note that the cities with high total crime rates (for example, Bogota, Kingston, New York City, Rio de Janeiro, Ulan Bator, Tallin, Kampala, Buenos Aires and Johannesburg) all have great variation in their education spending as a proportion of GDP. Clearly, crime is linked to many factors, and correlations exist between crime and poverty as well as with the type of political regime. But all that is being asked for in this article is a more nuanced demand for 'Education for All', in that *what* is learned in this universal education is going to be critical for national survival, not just being at school.

This requirement leads me to demand alternative PISA or IEA (International Evaluation of Education Achievement) studies which would prioritise learning outcomes in peace and human rights education as key areas to compare countries, and even 'name and shame' the major under-achievers. It is not just time spent on various areas, but 'achievements' in these areas that will make interesting comparisons, and can be linked to wider social differences as mentioned above. Is effort spent on human rights education negatively correlated with human rights abuses, as we would hope? Can the countries that come 'top' at student achievement in peace education claim that this is associated with less juvenile delinquency or less violent crime? One is aware that with any correlations, there are problems of cause and effect, and of 'which came first': peaceful countries may simply spend less on the military and be more likely to spend time on peace education in their schools and police forces. At the very least, the variables are interactive. I simply argue for equal emphasis, at least, to the international studies of maths achievement, so that assumptions can be questioned about national impact of 'performance' on curriculum, and the debate can be started.

Can the countries that come 'top' at student achievement in peace education claim that this is associated with less juvenile delinquency or less violent crime?

Segregated schools

Second, at the national or international level, more assessment is needed of the relationship between types of conflict or violence in (or between) societies and the patterns of student distribution among institutions in a society (for example, schools segregated by ethnicity, religion or gender). There are interesting studies which show that societies with a high level of interpersonal violence are characterised by extreme gender segregation in education and in political life (Kimmel 2000). The effects of ethnic segregation in schooling in divided societies are also being examined (Gallagher 2004). Some countries have schools segregated

by language and culture (Belgium and Canada, for instance) without any obvious denigration of other language speakers. But would there be a difference when it comes to religion? While in a unilingual school, students will also learn the 'other' language, students in single-faith schools will not learn about the 'other' faith as an equally viable medium of communication and living. If they do learn about other faiths at all, this has to be as a poor substitute for the 'real' faith. The message to students from such segregation is that religion is so important that people must be educated separately – even within a relatively secular society such as the United Kingdom. It is difficult to believe the claims by faith schools that they teach acceptance of all faiths and value systems when they appear to want to protect their pupils from such systems. The real message is that one faith or value system is to be promoted; otherwise why bother to segregate or 'badge' the school? The impact on attitudes of students needs more research.

Long-term Individual and Group Evaluation

Individual tracer studies

While most peace education evaluations take place after the event and look to the future, it is useful to evaluate in the other direction. We need 'backwards mapping' of individuals currently engaged in various social groups: what in their educational experience might have been 'triggers' for active citizenship, volunteering, or activism in peace movements? Conversely, what in their educational experience had predisposed people to join fundamentalist groups that have hatred or suspicion of other groups? Research into young people's positive behaviour has been relatively rare in the UK (Roker *et al* 1999), but there is evidence of growing involvement in community and campaigning activities (e.g. membership of Greenpeace and Amnesty). In case studies of 14-to-16-year-olds, Roker found that one in 10 were members of a group or organisation that was campaigning for a given cause, and the majority had in the last year signed a petition, given money to charity, staged a boycott and campaigned against a school rule they wanted changed. A significant proportion had helped others in school, participated in school councils, or engaged in volunteer work outside. Similarly, Yates & Youniss (1999) discuss various studies in the United States of factors that determine contemporary adults' participation in democratic processes such as voting, working in political campaigns and joining social movements. The most potent predictor of adult participation was involvement in student government during high school. A study of adults who had participated in the U.S. civil rights movement in their youth found that, 25 years later, they were significantly more active in local political activities. Such studies provide strong evidence that political practices acquired during youth can effectively result in identity-forming political habits that become part of the individual's self-definition and shape the individual's relationship to society.

Research reveals the 'triggers' for civic engagement, and the importance of mentors, influential teachers and peer support.

Research reveals the 'triggers' for civic engagement, and the importance of mentors, influential teachers and peer support. The 'careers' of young activists appear to follow a similar trajectory – supportive parents, high achievement, 'precocious' development of social consciousness and the early onset of a 'dogged curiosity about how the world works' (Foster & Naidoo 2001:5).

Yet what of the educational 'careers' of suicide bombers (and of aggressive world leaders)? The Press routinely profiles individual terrorists, seeking patterns in their experience, but educational patterns are hard to establish. Certainly the individuals are not uneducated, and many have degrees. Not all have been to terrorist training camps in Afghanistan or

Pakistan and received their 'education' there. Not all have been intensively taught in a radicalised mosque; at least one seems to have been recruited on the Internet. One of the bombers responsible for a fatal explosion on the London transport system in July 2005 was a teaching assistant in a school. Such 'careers' seem typically to combine three things: wanting to make one's mark, absolute certainty about a single truth or cause, and absolute certainty about the means to achieve this. While this might be true of any activist, the fourth component is the acceptance of violence and the need for revenge or retribution. Was there something in the formal educational experience that predisposed a person to this worldview? Or can it only be said that formal education did not provide the solid basis to question such attitudes? The need for an education which insists on examining alternatives, that does not promote one right answer or truth, that constantly asks for critical thinking – in short, an education that 'makes your head hurt' – has never been more urgent. And research or evaluation of such critical education is equally important, forwards and backwards.

Programme tracer studies

At the programme level, mapping can include identification of what sustainable peace initiatives have arisen that can be traced back directly to specific educational 'whole-school' programmes or activities. In our global review of the UNESCO Associated Schools Network, or ASPnet (Davies, Harber & Schweisfurth: 2003), we expressed concern that while it was possible to locate all sorts of exciting initiatives that the schools were doing in terms of peace, sustainable development and the environment, there were no long-term data to show whether ASPnet graduates had indeed turned into leaders or participants in these areas, and whether the schools had a sustained impact on surrounding schools or on political culture. The teachers in the survey did claim that ASPnet schools influenced surrounding schools, and gave examples of joint activities, but UNESCO does not have the mechanisms for investigating such an impact systematically and empirically. Tracer studies are difficult to conduct, and isolating variables that would attribute action of groups to particular school types or ideologies are equally problematic, but there should at least be an attempt at analysis. It is remarkable that we have a mass of data on academic achievement and value-added statistics, yet there is little research analysing the crucial impact of schools in their locality or nation.

> **It is remarkable that we have a mass of data on academic achievement and value-added statistics, yet there is little research analysing the crucial impact of schools in their locality or nation.**

This evaluation of what might become a 'beacon school' has links to research on the wider impact of those peace education programmes that seek to work 'across the divide' (Davies 2004). Such programmes relate closely to 'the encounter', bringing people from 'opposing' groups together to surface their values, attitudes, and experiences of pain. A classic case is of the village of Neve Shalom (Arabic: Wahat al-Salam, or 'oasis of peace') documented in Grace Feuerverger's *Oasis of Dreams*. The village school is unique in its commitment to educating its students in a fully Arabic-Hebrew bilingual, bicultural and binational setting. Illustrating my demand for an education for alternatives, each class has an Arab and a Jewish teacher, and the children are routinely exposed to two points of view. Critical pedagogy is emphasised not just in the use of both languages, but also in reflecting on language practice in the school. A Palestinian teacher explained, 'Let's face it; learning the history of Israel in Hebrew is totally different from learning it in Arabic! Learning its history in both languages is the beginning of a whole new future' (Feuerverger 2001:61). Yet as the study points out:

> There has been very little work on the specific consequences of bilingual/bicultural programmes in which children from majority and minority groups learn together against a larger backdrop of inter-group conflict (Feuerverger 2001:18)

A different example, but perhaps with a similar philosophy, comes from the *Let's Talk* project, which brings together young people from various countries and cultural divides. Two ex-paramilitary soldiers belonging to opposing sides of the Northern Ireland conflict were invited to a session in Belfast. One participant recounted:

> … the amount of emotion generated in the room was incredible… the fact that two men with such differing opinions, to the point where they had taken lives to highlight these, agreed to talk together to the group and encourage reconciliation efforts was a very positive beginning… and a personally inspiring event (Let's Talk 2001:9).

While schools may invite the army to talk to pupils about careers, it is less likely that they will invite the armies of two opposing sides. Yet it could be argued that such encounters would be far more likely to lead to learning about the need for peace than bland lessons about 'tolerance'.

A remarkable finding from the RPP analysis is that work that stays only at the individual or personal level, without translation into institutional impacts at the socio-political level, has no discernible impact on peace.

A remarkable finding from the RPP analysis (Anderson 2004) is that work that stays only at the individual or personal level, without translation into institutional impacts at the socio-political level, has no discernible impact on peace. It may be good and useful work (participants may gain from it individually), but its effectiveness in reducing conflict or in contributing to a sustainable peace is not traceable. A change in people's attitudes has no effect on peace unless they also act differently in the public sphere. Such work becomes effective only if it is linked to, and engaged with, work also at the socio-political level.

In *War Prevention Works*, Mathews (2001:8) describes 50 case studies of communities participating in transforming conflicts in different parts of the world and in different scenarios of conflict – 'what ordinary people are doing to stop war and killing, armed only with integrity, stamina and courage'. It is significant that only one of the 50 studies identifies the formal state school sector as an agent (among the work of religious organisations, NGO peace organisations, government task forces, women's groups, 'Western organisations' or charities, business leaders and university sector student groups). Among the lessons that Mathews derives is that to meet and talk can be an act of extreme bravery rather than a 'wimpish' alternative to violence. The interventions were 'extraordinarily cost-effective'. While NATO's bombing of Serbia in 1999 cost approximately $4 billion in addition to the $20-$30 billion that was needed to rebuild what had been destroyed, the interventions cost as little as $2,700 for community-level conflict resolution bringing about peace in an area of Sierra Leone (Mathews 2001:112).

While Mathews is able to demonstrate concrete outcomes and a decrease in violence or conflict for each of the projects, he admits that far more evaluation needs to be done for this work to be extended. Even the better-funded organisations do not write up what they do. He quotes an organisation admitting that 'we are much better at doing it than documenting what we have done', and the official of another saying, 'My dreams of writing are put on the back burner to make way for income-generating work.' Mathews recommends therefore 'that grant-makers explicitly build evaluation, or at least write-up costs, into grants' (2001:111).

Cynics might demand a parallel 50 accounts of failure, or instances where impact has been difficult to demonstrate. Yet what one never knows is whether a project, while failing to improve something, at least prevents it from getting worse. In Tanada's study of Mindanao, this was certainly felt when the carefully built trust between Christians, Muslims and Lumads was eroded in just a few weeks of all-out war, reopening old wounds; yet it was felt that the conflict was not so costly in terms of human lives, nor as widespread, 'partly because of seeds of understanding sown in the dialogues' (Tanada 2001:29). How one demonstrates this in any systematic or empirical way is a nightmare, but it is an important point about containment, not just dramatic effects, in a write-up of a peace project.

Short-term/Immediate Evaluations

At the short-term level, there are already studies (such as pre- and post-test designs) of the impact of peace-related education programmes on students' knowledge and espoused values, as well as teachers' perceptions and interview data (Tibbitts 2004). This is in contrast to the World Bank claim in 2005 that 'few evaluations of peace education programmes exist' (World Bank 2005:60) This may refer to the long-term evaluations, as peace education initiatives normally try to evaluate whether particular outcomes have been reached.

The West Africa Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP), for example, reported that outputs from its 2003 programme included completion of training workshops and manuals, formation of country teams, training of students to be peer mediators, establishment of peace clubs in 60 schools in seven countries, and 'an increased awareness among students of non-violent means of dealing with conflicts' (WANEP 2005). Indirect outputs included partnerships with the UN Office in Cote d'Ivoire to train peer mediators from both urban centres and from rebel-controlled territories, and links with ministries of education, national civic education programmes and NGOs, all of which help sustainability and wider coverage. The report noted, however, that the lack of incentives for teachers to conduct extra-curricular activities was beginning to reduce the enthusiasm of some of the teachers involved in the programme. It also noted the need to involve the media for maximum impact (this media publicity was recommended in our review of UNESCO-associated schools).WANEP in 2003 was planning research to gather empirical evidence on impact, although to date this is not yet on its website.

The Afghanistan Peace Education Programme (2005), which provided training to 'key Afghans' in politics, tribal leaders and clergy, teachers and journalists, was also to organise a peace impact evaluation workshop in 2003, but again this was not on its website. This may be a difficult exercise, particularly when training 'key' people who may move on quickly in a fluid post-conflict society. More normal, in scouring the web for examples of impact of peace education programmes, is the 'Education for Peace' site for the Balkans (EFP 2005) which confines itself to quotations from participants in programmes about how they felt empowered and how their vision and worldview had changed. Useful contacts had been made with other schools in other cities which used to be 'aggressors'.

In *Reshaping the Future: Education and Post-conflict Reconstruction,* the World Bank (2005:60) summarises the lessons learned from case studies of peace education initiatives, which lend support to the argument that peace education can never be seen in isolation from the wider picture of education. It is worth quoting these lessons in full:

- Ill-conceived, stand-alone initiatives emanating from well-meaning outsiders have little positive impact, tend to crowd an already overcrowded curriculum, and collapse as soon as external funding does;

51

- Peace education initiatives and attempts at forced school integration in alienated communities have limited chances of success;

- Peace education in schools that is linked to wider peacebuilding in the community is more likely to make an impact on student behaviour;

- Programs should focus on a wider range of issues than 'peace' – such as life skills, citizenship, human rights and HIV and AIDS prevention;

- Attempts at integration of peace education messages 'across the curriculum' have been less successful than programmes that have a dedicated slot in the curriculum.

A key point in my analysis is a final lesson: 'all curricula should be scrutinised for messages, explicit and implicit, that militate against the inculcation of attitudes of tolerance and acceptance of cultural, ethnic, or religious differences'. The World Bank team sees this as a necessary precursor to peace education programmes, which have been shown to be more successful where they combine specific targeted classroom activities with a concern for ensuring that the entire curriculum, formal and hidden, helps to support the messages of peace education activities.

It is clear that there needs to be some consistency of messages in a learning environment if peace education is to have any impact; yet the notions of 'tolerance' and 'respect' as unquestioned goods also need consideration. Are all versions of religious faiths to be tolerated and respected, including dogma, fundamentalism and fanaticism? What criteria are to be used to make judgments about what to tolerate? Do teachers have to be 'neutral' about suicide bombing and female genital mutilation? If there is to be consistency, it is perhaps in the call for critical thinking across the curriculum.

Structures and Processes in Schools

This leads to yet another agenda for research and evaluation, which tries to bring together the macro and micro environments and give further clues about the connections. PCIA offers methodologies for evaluation of specific peace programmes, but how does one evaluate silence? The contribution of schooling to conflict is rarely done through a specific 'programme' with 'success criteria'. Nor is the 'Project Cycle Management' used by donor evaluations appropriate. For formal schooling we need a broader set of tools for evaluation of impact.

OECD/DAC argued in 1999 that humanitarian evaluation methodology should move beyond a narrow 'project only' focus and develop a wider, policy-oriented approach. This would focus not just on the rationale and objectives of individual projects, but also on the mandates, underlying beliefs, assumptions and ideologies that have led evaluators to deem them worthwhile in the first place. For Hoffman (2005:6), in shifting away from a narrow, linear focus on cause-and-effect relationships to one that puts forward 'textured narrative accounts of events, processes and structure', an evaluation would aim at validation rather than verification.

To reiterate an obvious point, there is a difference between evaluating the impact of peace education and evaluating the impact of education on peace. Some might argue that the latter activity would not be evaluation at all (by conventional definitions), but research. Bush (1998:7), however, defines PCIA as:

> A means of evaluating (*ex post facto*) and anticipating (*ex ante*, as far as possible) the impacts of proposed and completed development projects on: i. those structures

and processes which strengthen the prospects for peaceful coexistence and decrease the likelihood of the outbreak, reoccurrence or continuation of violent conflict; and ii. those structures and processes that increase the likelihood that conflict will be dealt with through violent means.

If one replaces 'development projects' with 'curriculum and organisation', then one has the basis for an evaluation framework and analytical tools for formal schooling – one that looks at structures and processes. Four openings are outlined here:

The impact of democratic versus authoritarian school structures on students' attitudes, values and behaviour, and on the school's ability to handle conflict: A study of 233 internal conflicts in the world found that democracies had a far better record of handling internal conflicts peacefully than alternative systems (Reychler 2001). One needs the same research at the micro (school) level, but in a systematic way that could lead to making international comparisons. There are a few studies of democratic schools and their effects on pupils' orientations towards others or to their future citizenship (Harber & Davies 2002; Harber 2004), but a bigger programme is needed. Schools that model democratic values and practices, and encourage students to discuss issues in the classroom and take an active role in the life of the school, are most effective in promoting civic knowledge and engagement (Gearon 2003). At the Centre for International Education and Research in Birmingham we are exploring further the impact of school councils in schools in the United Kingdom, and a question to be raised is about the impact on bullying and other violence within the school, to build on previous work on the impact of school councils on pupil exclusions (Davies 1999). We are also trying to develop instruments to assess the impact or benefits of young people's participation in decision-making in school and community. While there is a mass of descriptive and prescriptive work on youth participation, systematic impact studies are much more rare.

> Schools that model democratic values and practices, and encourage students to discuss issues in the classroom and take an active role in the life of the school, are most effective in promoting civic knowledge and engagement.

Research on the impact of violent schools (possibly within violent societies) on students' attitudes towards violence: Harber's conclusion from studying violence in a range of forms and countries is that there is a direct link between schools as violent places and societies which condone or even celebrate aggression. 'Which came first?' is always the rejoinder, but there is at best a continuation of violence in schools in terms of corporal punishment long after this has been officially outlawed and countries have signed the declaration on the rights of the child (Harber 2004). Recent collections on education and conflict show graphically how schools are 'militarised' or used for 'enforcement' in the United States and Israel (Saltman & Gabbard 2003) and how all forms of violence, including terrorism, are reproduced through education (Nelles 2004). In Nelles' collection, the contributions about Northern Ireland and Sierra Leone show a complex and contradictory relationship between education, violence and conflict, with formal education contributing to the deterioration of 'human security' and promoting group difference, while being relied upon for reconstructing society after conflict. The latter attempt seems less likely given the continuation of the former position. Harber's book brings together a mass of research that convincingly demonstrates the role of schooling in violence; what is now needed is a way to convey this message to policy makers and break their silence about the role of education in promoting violence.

Comparative studies of how schools in conflict societies teach about conflict: Kumar (1996) talks of a 'silence' about the Hindu-Muslim conflict in Indian schools, for example, with schools instructed that they should not discuss the riots that followed the assassination of Indira Gandhi. This was in spite of the fact that children might be members of the families attacked by the mobs, had witnessed scenes of brutal killings, or at the very least had seen the columns of smoke on Delhi's horizons. Kumar commented on children's curiosity, their wanting to know from their elders why such violence had suddenly erupted, why innocent people were being killed, and why the police were not stopping the killers. Similar curiosity and frustration were noted in a study of the needs of learners and teachers in global citizenship in England (Davies, Harber & Yamashita 2005). When students were asked what they wanted to know about global citizenship, the most often cited area was war and conflict – in the current context (of Iraq, for instance) rather than historically. While some teachers seized the opportunity to use the Iraq war as means to discuss conflict and its causes, many lacked confidence or were concerned that discussion would inflame ethnic tensions in multicultural classrooms. Children of all ages wanted to know more, and wanted the topic treated in depth so they could understand. Kumar astutely analyses the way textbooks treat the assassination of Mrs Gandhi, noting that some bury the incident in the middle of a paragraph as if it was not a landmark but rather a part of a continuity of history, (portraying war or violence as 'normal', as discussed earlier). Such treatment also ignores the part played by the child in learning – 'anticipating and reflecting the child's mind' – thus leaving the 'deep structure' constructed by the child's exposure to 'popular' knowledge in the family and community, the vivid orally stored collective memories.

Yet we do not know enough about whether schools and teachers in other conflict societies manage to tackle events *as they occur,* looking at local as well as national manifestations of violence. What did teachers and schools in Rwanda do, or those living in the Democratic Republic of Congo, or Kosovo? After a conflict, in my experience, there is a general downplaying of the causes and results of violence in the interest of promoting and maintaining 'harmony'. Yet we need to know whether this silence does indeed foster harmony or whether it simply leaves the learner open to other influences. In another paper I have developed a typology of 10 ways in which schools teach about conflict, ranging from negative through neutral to positive (Davies 2005), but more studies are required to examine children's perceptions of conflict and where they glean their explanations for it. This leads to the fourth opening for research..

Citizen research' or 'citizen evaluation': Part of peacebuilding is citizens' capacity to be involved in critical evaluation of their own society, and education should foster research skills for participants to evaluate their own projects, communities and societies – not simply be evaluated by others. While there is increasing attention being paid to 'students as researchers' and to 'children as citizens', the two are not always linked. A key aspect of learning to be a citizen is arguably learning how to research as a citizen – how to seek information, how to gather and synthesise information and how to disseminate evidence; that is, how to contribute to wider networks of knowledge. There are examples of citizen research in environmental areas, keeping watch on local environments and feeding data into national or international databanks; many activist organisations also encourage research. Greenpeace, for example, has a section on its website called 'Do Your Political Research!' which shows people how to find out who their member of parliament is,

> A key aspect of learning to be a citizen is arguably learning how to research as a citizen – how to seek information, how to gather and synthesise information and how to disseminate evidence; that is, how to contribute to wider networks of knowledge.

what its activities are, and what its party represents. Citizen research on peace and conflict could involve all sorts of contributions from adults and young people about the nature of communities, incidence of conflicts and the mapping of trends, as well as where peace interventions have made a difference. The 'war on terror' has been used to fuel people's fears and to justify war; yet the number of people actually killed in terrorist attacks is less than the number killed in road accidents. Do children know that the USA, UK and France earn more income from arms sales to developing countries than they give in aid (Oxfam 2005)? People need accurate data and to be involved in generating and disseminating it. If there are to be 'Observable Verifiable Indicators' (OVIs) as in evaluation methodologies, then these need to be argued about and decided upon by all stakeholders. Citizen research provides not just training in recording, but a sense of responsibility for accuracy and feeling for collaboration towards a greater project – in this case, peace.

> **Do children know that the USA, UK and France earn more income from arms sales to developing countries than they give in aid (Oxfam 2005)?**

Conclusion

I summarise four major conclusions and pressing agendas:

1. Peace education evaluation needs to be conducted within the framework of war education evaluation: Are the positive outcomes for a programme supported by other aspects of schooling or are they counteracted? What is the effect of different styles of schooling within which any peace initiatives take place? In the lessons drawn from RPP, one of Anderson's and Olson's four key questions of context analysis is, 'Who or what needs to be stopped?' (i.e. who has a vested political or economic interest in maintaining conflict?). Similarly, who or what in formal education needs to be stopped before education for peace becomes effective?

2. Tracing complex webs of impact rather than linear evaluations are in order: Evaluating the impact of peace education programmes is mostly very different from trying to evaluate the impact of war education, as the latter normally does not have specific programmes (unless we are talking of the 'defence' curriculum or military learning in schools) and is a hidden or unintended aspect of school life. However, some aspects of 'backwards mapping' could trace formative events in school life which might have triggered orientation either to peace movements or to joining fascist or fundamentalist groups more prone to violence to achieve ends. Again from the RPP analysis, four criteria of effectiveness of a peace practice effort for *'peace writ large'* would be highly appropriate here:

- It causes participants to take up initiatives for peace work on their own;
- It contributes to the reform or building of institutions that address grievances that underlie the conflict;
- It enables people increasingly to resist violence or manipulation to violence;
- It increases the security of people and their perception of security (Anderson 2004:10).

All four are needed for an effort to be 'effective', but 'backwards mapping' of the first and third in relation to individual or group experiences of formal education would provide vital insights.

3. We should not be shy of 'indicators' and benchmarks, with both small- and large-scale criteria: We have seen that there are already many ways to evaluate the impact of a

peace education initiative in terms of whether it fulfils its immediate goals (student attitudes, knowledge, orientations), but the 'bigger picture' remains elusive in terms of impact on society. While there is the argument that we should therefore not even try, and focus instead only on processes, some attempt at obtaining convincing longer-term or wider data is crucial if we are to persuade funders and policy makers to put more emphasis on peace education. Various 'silences' on education for peace/conflict and on violence need to be shattered. I argue therefore for international comparison studies of 'achievements' in education for peace. This means developing indicators for success just as with conventional academic curriculum; for example, with indicators for democracy in school (Davies 1995). The 'logframe' approach has admittedly many disadvantages. Hoffman points out that:

The problematic nature and structure of the logframe methodology almost invariably leads to conflict being located as a risk – often as a 'killer assumption' that poses a serious potential threat to a project – rather than being viewed as something the project might seek to address directly through its activities (2005:6).

This resonates with the notion of 'positive conflict', which is part of 'interruptive democracy' (Davies 2004), and we need indicators for both. The presence of an active and challenging school council might be an indicator of positive conflict; violence by teachers or students a negative one. But students must be involved in this indicator work, which, in itself, provides an opportunity for peace education.

4. We need evaluation of the impact of evaluation: We know that the international evaluations of achievement make an impact on educational policy makers. We now need research on which evaluations of peace – or conflict – have made an equal impact on policy makers, and where and in what contexts education policy and funds have changed as a result of such evaluations. Again, who has a vested interest in maintaining education as it is? Who needs to be supported in the effort for change?

Without such efforts, we will be no nearer an understanding of why at least a hundred years of formal and 'moral' education in most countries have failed to make the world a safer place.

LYNN DAVIES is Professor of International Education and Director of the Centre for International Education and Research at the University of Birmingham, United Kingdom.

Endnotes

[1] See 'Jews, Christians, War and Peace in Egyptian School Textbooks', Centre for Monitoring the Impact of Peace (CMIP) 2004, New York, and the work of the Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research, available at www.gei.de/english/index1.shtml

[2] As in the work of the Fritz Bauer Institute (available at www.fritz-bauer-institut.de/); Adorno, T. 2003, *Can One Live after Auschwitz? A Philosophical Reader*, Stanford: Stanford University Press; and Arendt, H. 1951, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, London: Secker & Warburg; 1958, *The Human Condition*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

References

Afghanistan Peace Education Programme 2005, 'Building Peaceful Societies 2002-2003', McMaster Centre for Peace Studies; available at www.humanities.mcmaster.ca

Aguilar, P. & Richmond, M. 1998, 'Emergency Educational Response in the Rwandan Crisis' in Retamol, G. & R.Aedo-Richmond eds., *Education as a Humanitarian Response,* London: Cassell.

Anderson, M. 2004, 'Experiences with Impact Assessment: Can We Know What Good We Do?' in Austin, A., Fischer, M. & Ropers, N. eds., *Transforming Ethno-political Conflict: The Berghof Handbook*, Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften; available at www.berghof-handbook.net

Anderson, M. & Olson, L. 2003, *Confronting War: Critical Lessons for Peace Practitioners*, Cambridge: The Collaborative for Development Action.

Avalos-Bevan, B. 1996, 'Schooling and the State: A Review of Current Issues' in Turner, J. ed., *The State and the School: An International Perspective*, London: Falmer.

Bush, K. 1998, 'A Measure of Peace: Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA) of Development Projects in Conflict Zones', Working Paper 28, Ottawa: International Development Research Centre.

Bush, K. & Saltarelli, D. 2000, *The Two Faces of Education in Ethnic Conflict: Towards a Peacebuilding Education for Children,* Florence: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre.

Church, C. & Shouldice, J. 2002, *The Evaluation of Conflict Resolution Interventions: Framing The State of Play,* Londonderry: INCORE.

Davies, L. 1995, 'International Indicators of Democratic Schools' in Harber, C. ed., *Developing Democratic Education*: Education Now; 1999, *School Councils and Pupil Exclusions*, London: School Councils UK; 2004, *Education and Conflict: Complexity and Chaos*, London: Routledge Falmer; 2005, 'Teaching about Conflict through Citizenship Education'; available at www.qup.ac.uk/edu/seminar/seminar_paper_davies.doc

Davies, L., Harber, C. & Schweisfurth, M. 2003, *Global Review of 50 Years of UNESCO ASPnet Schools,* Birmingham: Centre for International Education and Research.

Davies, L., Harber, C. and Yamashita, H. 2005, *Global Citizenship: The Needs of Teachers and Learners,* Birmingham: Centre for International Education and Research.

EFP (Education for Peace) 2005, 'Impact of Education for Peace', International Education for Peace Institute; available at www.efpinternational.org/organization/efpbalkans/impact.html

Feuerverger, G. 2001, *Oasis of Dreams: Teaching and Learning Peace in a Jewish-Palestinian Village in Israel*, London: Routledge Falmer.

Foster, J. & Naidoo, K. 2001, *Young People at the Centre: Participation and Social Change*, London: Commonwealth Secretariat.

Gallagher, T. 2004, *Education in Divided Societies*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Gearon, L. 2003, *How Do We Learn to Become Good Citizens?* BERA Professional User Review.

Harber, C. 2004, *Schooling as Violence: How Schools Harm Pupils and Societies,* London: Routledge Falmer.

Harber, C. & Davies, L. 2002, *School Management and Effectiveness in Developing Countries,* London: Continuum.

Harris, I. 2004, 'Evaluating Peace Education', University of Wisconsin-Stevens; available at www.uwsp.edu/history/WIPCS/JSpc

Hoffman, M. 2005, *Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment Methodology*; available at www.berghof-handbook.net

Kerr, D. 2003, 'Developing Effective Citizenship Education in England: Using the IEA Civics Education Study to Inform Policy, Practice and Research', symposium paper presented at AERA conference, 21-25 April, Chicago.

Kimmel, M. 2000, 'Reducing Men's Violence: The Personal Meets the Political' in Breines, I., Connell, R. & Eide, I. eds., *Male Roles, Masculinities and Violence: A Culture of Peace Perspective*, Paris: UNESCO.

Kumar, K. 1996, *Learning from Conflict*, Hyderabad: Orient Longman

Let's Talk 2001, *Let's Talk: A Review* 80:20, Bray, Northern Ireland: Educating and Acting for a Better World.

McMahon, W. 2003, 'Shorter and Longer Impacts of Education on Development Goals', paper presented at OXCON conference, September.

Nelles, W. 2004 ed., *Comparative Education, Terrorism and Human Security: From Critical Pedagogy to Peacebuilding?* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

OECD/DAC 1999, *Guidelines for Evaluating Humanitarian Assistance in Complex Emergencies*, Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, Development Assistance Committee.

Oxfam 2005, *Making Sense of World Conflicts: Activities and Source Materials for Teaching English, Citizenship and PSE*, Oxford: Oxfam.

Reychler, L. 2001, 'Monitoring Democratic Transitions' in Reychler, L. & Paffenholz, T. eds., *Peacebuilding: A Field Guide*, Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Roker, D., Player, K. & Coleman, J. 1999, 'Young People's Voluntary and Campaigning Activities as Sources of Political Education', *Oxford Review of Education* 25:2:185-198.

Saltman, K. & Gabbard, D. 2003 eds., *Education as Enforcement: The Militarisation and Corporatisation of Schools*, New York: Routledge/Falmer.

Seitz, K. 2004, *Education and Conflict: The Role of Education in the Creation, Prevention and Resolution of Societal Crises – Consequences for Development Cooperation*, Eschborn: Deutsche Gesellschaft fur Technische Zuammenarbeit (GTZ).

Smith, A. & Vaux, T. 2003, *Education, Conflict and International Development*, London: Department for International Development.

Tanada, K. 2001, 'Mindanao: Trail of Conflict; Paths to Peace', *SangSaeng* Asia Pacific Centre for Education for International Understanding 2, Winter:25-29.

Tibbits, F. 2004, 'Literature Review on Outcomes of School-based Programmes Related to "Learning to Live Together"', paper for IBE/UNESCO, Geneva.

UNDP 2000, *Human Development Report: Human Rights and Human Development*, Oxford: OUP; 2002, *Human Development Report: Deepening Democracy in a Fragmented World*, Oxford: OUP.

UNESCO 1996, 'Learning: The Treasure Within', report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the 21st Century – the Delors Report, Paris: UNESCO.

Vriens, L. 2003, 'Responsibility for the Future: The Key to Peace Education' in Wintersteiner, W., Spaijic-Vrkas, V. & Teutsch, R. eds., *Peace in Europe,* Münster/New York.

WANEP 2005, 'Non-violence and Peace Education'; available at www.wanep/org/programmes/peace_education.htm

Warner, A. 2004, 'Impact Monitoring: Conceptual Clarifications', paper presented at IBE/UNESCO experts meeting, Geneva, November.

World Bank 2005, *Reshaping the Future: Education and Post-conflict Reconstruction*, Washington: World Bank.

Yates, M. & Youniss, J. 1999 eds., *Roots of Civic Identity: International Perspectives on Community Service and Activism in Youth*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.