Chapter 10

Peacebuilding dialogue as democratic education

Conflictual issues, restorative problem-solving, and student diversity in classrooms

Kathy Bickmore

2012 In James Arthur & Hilary Cremin (Editors),
Debates in Citizenship Education (Routledge), 115-131.

OISE, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Introduction

How should citizenship education be addressing conflict to build peace? State-funded schools are key locations for diverse young people to have guided opportunities to practise roles, skills, understandings and relationships for participation in democratic dialogue about the inevitable conflicts of social life. Yet constructive conflict learning opportunities in schools are often quite limited – for students in general, and especially for marginalized students. Teachers seem to have little institutional support, and few opportunities to develop skills and confidence, as conflict dialogue facilitators. Based on review of scholarly literature, this chapter examines diverse ways in which facilitated dialogue on difficult issues may be implemented in schools in various cultural and social contexts, and the implications of such learning opportunities for diverse student participants. The chapter juxtaposes different types of school-based conflict dialogue emerging from different roots in research and practice, arranged on a continuum from post-incident restorative justice problem-solving to pro-active critical discussion of contentious issues.

Conflict, democracy and education

Conflict – (perceived) opposition or struggle among interests, ideas, or demands – is omnipresent in social life. *Violence* is ‘the use of force to establish or maintain otherwise dysfunctional relations of power and authority’ (Franklin, 2006: 260). *Nonviolence*, in contrast, is resourcefulness: creation of options and relationships to address conflicts constructively, even in the face of long odds (*ibid.*: 261). ‘The widely held and seldom expressed but implicit viewpoint of most cultures is that violence is real and nonviolence is unreal. But when non-violence becomes a reality it is a powerful force’ (Kurlansky, 2006: 6). Thus conflict does not necessarily imply violence: it may be handled in ways that create learning, movement towards justice and other positive change. What kinds of implicit and explicit citizenship education might have these constructive, educative consequences?

116 The social and political context of CE

Like other unheralded and taken-for-granted aspects of nonviolent action, conflict talk is all around us, greasing the wheels of society, often unnoticed unless it provokes offence or violence. Norwegian peace researcher Johan Galtung (1969) describes ‘negative peace’ as the (temporary) cessation or *absence* of overt, physical violence. ‘Positive peace’, in contrast, refers to the *presence* of social justice, embedded in democratic conflict management processes and structures – continually addressing conflict and violence in their systemic as well as surface manifestations. Positive peace requires, among other things, institutional spaces and learned habits for conflict dialogue across difference.

In plural and unequal societies, those inside and outside the culture of power (Delpit, 1995) have unequal opportunities to learn to communicate persuasively, and to be heard, across difference. What Brazilian educational theorist Paulo Freire (1970) called ‘banking’ education – traditional top-down delivery of ostensibly-uncontestable knowledge – is apparently reinforced by prevailing policies of curriculum standardization and high-stakes testing. Freire argued that such education reinforced passive acceptance of social injustice. In response, he argued for broad, inclusive implementation of ‘problem-posing education’ – critical dialogue about social conflicts – and ‘praxis’ – on-going cycles of reflection and action on those problems – as education for democratization. Thus, constructive conflict talk is foundational for democracy and democratic education, as well as peacebuilding (also see Curle, Freire and Galtung, 1974).

Given the *status quo* of inequality in imperfectly-democratic systems, Davies advocates ‘interruptive democracy’ practices that introduce and include conflicting voices and viewpoints to address injustices and support democratic learning (Davies, 2004). Like Freire and Galtung, Davies argues that conflict avoidance, or adopting a so-called neutral stance, legitimates the dominant system (also Apple, 1979). In contrast, inviting critical thinking, confrontation and talk about conflict – ‘interrupting’ the *status quo* – contributes to democratic peacebuilding. State-funded schools, as key institutions where diverse populations meet to prepare for a collective future, are the logical places to facilitate learning and practice of thoughtful, inclusive, interruptively democratic conflict dialogue.

Conflict learning opportunities (implicit citizenship education) in schools

Since conflict is inevitable in social life, it’s not a matter of *whether* schools address conflict, but rather *how* they do so (silences and negative sanctions, as well as positive experiences of inclusion, shape learning experiences). Clearly, the regularized activities of schooling – discipline and classroom pedagogies – may address contentious social and political problems, as well as interpersonal disputes, in ways that offer (or deny) constructive guided opportunities to learn.

Peace and conflict theory distinguishes three overlapping goals for managing conflict: *peacekeeping* (monitoring and control to temporarily prevent or stop violence), *peacemaking* (problem-solving dialogue to resolve disputes) and

peacebuilding (democratizing and nurturing healthy social relationships to address the underlying sources of violence) (Galtung, 1996; Harris and Morrison, 2003). In schools, students may learn from models and practices in every phase of the conflict cycle:

Before harm is done: do schools focus on enhancing security to prevent or minimize violence (*peacekeeping*), and/or on teaching dialogic conflict management and anti-discriminatory practices to develop strong community relationships (*peacebuilding* education)?

During management of conflicts: do schools focus on reasserting control through punishment and exclusion (*peacekeeping*), and/or on guiding thoughtful, respectful dialogue for self-governing conflict resolution (*peacemaking*)?

After harm is done: do schools avoid facing divisive conflicts whenever possible, or facilitate restorative justice dialogue to (re-)build mutual understanding and cross-cutting social ties and redress underlying injustices (*peacebuilding*)?

The lived ‘citizenship’ curriculum of conflict management in a *peacekeeping*-heavy system would emphasize surveillance and restriction, especially for lower-status and non-compliant students. Alternatively, *peacemaking* and *peacebuilding* systems would emphasize development of autonomous, equitable democratic skills and relationships. Conflict dialogue is one important component of *peacemaking* and *peacebuilding*.

Citizenship education theory and rhetoric often advocates conflict communication goals *in principle*; for example, school mission statements and curriculum documents invoke critical thinking, inclusion and mutual respect (e.g. Bickmore, 2006; 2008). Unfortunately, such opportunities seem to be rare *in practice* (e.g. Hahn, 1998; Sears, Clark and Hughes, 1999), especially in contexts of high-stakes accountability (Noguera and Cohen, 2006) and in classrooms of predominantly non-affluent and visible minority students (Dull and Murrow, 2008; Hess and Avery, 2008). On one hand, alternate perspectives and disrupting the *status quo* are essential for democratic *peacebuilding*: from this perspective, marginalized students’ perspectives are best heard in, and resources for, conflict pedagogies. On the other hand, marginalized students’ perspectives are, by definition, under-valued and often disrespected: from this perspective, they face disproportionate risk from conflict pedagogies.

Conflict dialogue in schools

Dialogue is a communication process that aims to build relationships between people as they share experiences, ideas, and information about a common concern. It also aims to help people take in more information and perspectives than they previously had, as they attempt to forge a new and broader understanding of a situation.

(Schirch and Camp, 2007: 6)

118 The social and political context of CE

There are many kinds of conflict talk, such as debate, constructive controversy, issues discussion, conflict resolution and deliberation. I define the term *dialogue* broadly, to foreground facilitated communication for understanding in the context of interpersonal and intergroup conflict. Dialogue processes may be just as heated as debate, but are not focused on competing or winning. The goals of dialogue may emphasize developing understanding, or decision-making, as in deliberation or conflict resolution (Parker, 2003).

The conflicts addressed in dialogue need not be ‘controversial issues’, in the sense of continuing public disagreement among defensible opposing views (Hess, 2004; Hess and Ganzler, 2007). For example, justice problems (such as anti-Semitism, Islamophobia or gender-based violence), in which the teacher does *not* accept all viewpoints as legitimate, can provoke highly-conflictual and educative conversations, when participants examine the ways their own actions may perpetuate or resist those problems (e.g. Avery, Sullivan and Wood, 1997; Boler, 1997; Ellsworth, 1989). Even where teachers attempt to take an unbiased stance, their choices of what to talk about and how inevitably embody non-neutral values and ideologies (e.g. Apple, 1979; Freire, 1998). All contemporary conflict dialogue (like any citizenship education) takes place in the context of dynamic and unequal social power. Dialogue can be democratizing if such power differentials are explicitly acknowledged and addressed in both content and procedures.

Thus, while the typical hidden curriculum in Western public schooling is standardized, avoids conflict and (at least implicitly) teaches deference to hierarchy, it is entirely possible for implicit and explicit citizenship education to cut against this grain, and instead to encourage critical, inclusive engagement through constructive conflict dialogue. School-based opportunities for conflict dialogue learning and practice range from restorative problem-solving that addresses inescapable conflicts *after* they erupt into visible incidents of harm, to democratization initiatives that intentionally *bring to the surface* previously silenced underlying conflicts and unpopular viewpoints to create openings for conscientization and building positive peace (Freire 1970; Galtung, 1969).

Interpersonal peacemaking, restorative justice and student self-governance

School-based peacemaking dialogue initiatives include peer mediation, in which trained students facilitate negotiation to help peers autonomously resolve interpersonal disputes. Peer mediation can be implemented in classrooms, giving all enrolled an opportunity to participate (Johnson and Johnson, 1996). However, it is more commonly implemented as a co-curricular ‘cadre’ leadership initiative, in which selected students mediate on call or in the school yard. Quality peer mediation programmes reduce aggressive behaviour, and develop mediators’ and peer participants’ reasoning, social skills and openness to handle conflict constructively (Bickmore, 2002; Burrell, Zirbel and Allen, 2003; Cunningham, 1998;

R. Harris, 2005; Heydenberk and Heydenberk, 2005; Jones, 2004). Inclusive programmes with diverse peer mediators are the most sustainable and effective (Bickmore, 2001; Day-Vines *et al.*, 1996). However, recent research in Canadian schools (Bickmore, 2010) suggests that many peer peacemaking programmes are not being sustained in the current educational policy climate, or do not offer inclusive learning opportunities to diverse students.

Restorative and transformative justice circle dialogue processes, derived from aboriginal traditions, are also emerging as effective alternatives to punitive systems in many contexts. Circle processes include victims, offenders and community members in problem-solving dialogue, to address underlying causes of complex conflicts and aggression (also Consadine, 1999; Pranis, Stuart and Wedge, 2003).

Transformative processes enable the wider community to participate [and] ... to take responsibility for the underlying causes of crime: poverty, abused children, unemployment, discrimination, and other deep social problems. ... It does not need to solve the whole unemployment or poverty problem at once, but each case dealt with transformatively enables the community to work on a portion of it, contribute to its healing, and understand and address better the larger issues that lie behind it.

(Morris, 2000: 254)

In schools, circles are particularly appropriate for addressing seriously harmful situations, and conflicts that are too complex or power-imbalanced for mediation. However, like peer mediation, they are also appropriate for less acute conflict situations and for proactive educational activities (Ashworth *et al.*, 2008; Blood and Thorsborne, 2005; Claassen and Claassen, 2004). Brenda Morrison's (2007) and Gillean McCluskey and colleagues' (2008) research show positive early results of conferencing and other circle initiatives, in Australian, British, US and Canadian schools. They explain that well-facilitated, inclusive, thoughtful conflict dialogue can be transformational because it engages hearts as well as minds, and supports development of skills and healthy relationships.

Dialogic peacemaking such as peer mediation and restorative circles are instances of self-governance, in that students participate in making autonomous decisions to help resolve problems that affect them (Bickmore and MacDonald, 2011). Other kinds of student governance, though not typically recognized as peacemaking, are also opportunities to practice conflict dialogue. Surveys associate such participation with young people's development of commitment and skills for democratic participation (Kahne and Sporte, 2008; Torney-Purta and Barber, 2005). Clearly student governance participation constitutes a *potential* opportunity for conflict dialogue, but there is little evidence that this occurs often, nor is it clear how such dialogic participation may be most inclusively, equitably and effectively facilitated (Wyness, 2009; Wyse, 2001).

Conflict education infused in academic curriculum

Contrasting ideologies, perspectives, and problems – conflicts – are embedded in any subject matter, and may be brought out into the light, probed and discussed in classroom pedagogy (e.g. Claire and Holden, 2007; Deng and Luke, 2008; Elbow, 1986; Kumashiro, 2004). Learning opportunities addressing such conflicts need not involve public issues. David and Roger Johnson, for example, propose a pedagogical strategy they call ‘structured academic controversy’, but explain it as ‘a procedure for learning, not for addressing controversial issues or controversial subject matter’ (2009: 39). At the same time, they argue that addressing conflict is what makes subject matter engaging:

Conflict is to student learning what the internal combustion engine is to the automobile. The internal combustion engine ignites the fuel and the air with a spark to create the energy for movement and acceleration. Just as the fuel and the air are inert without the spark, so, ideas in the classroom are inert without the spark of intellectual conflict. Intellectual conflict is the spark that energizes students to seek out new information and study harder and longer.
(Johnson and Johnson, 2009: 37)

Conflict dialogue practices integrated into subject-matter curriculum may focus, for example, on interpersonal communication skills, and/or questions of global justice, and/or characters’ perspectives in literature or historical narratives, and/or discipline-based approaches to analysing problems (e.g. Bickmore, 1999a and b; Ibrahim, 2005; Jones and Sanford, 2003). Such pedagogies can facilitate engagement and skill building in technical subjects such as math and science (Crumbaugh, 1996; Frankenstein, 1987; Settlage and Sabik, 1996), as well as in humanities subjects such as arts, literature and social studies (Barton and Levstik, 2004; Catterall, 2007; Luke and Myers, 1994; Sandmann, 2004; Sills-Briegel and Camp, 2000; Wasson, Anderson and Suriani, 1999). Clearly, not all conflict skills curriculum offers opportunities for students to actually apply those skills in dialogue, or explicitly supports students’ development of skills and understandings for talking about conflict.

Controversial and sensitive issues pedagogies in classrooms

To prepare for democratic citizenship in this conflictual world, young people evidently benefit from guided practice – not merely with generic conflict or discussion skills, but with actually addressing sensitive, controversial issues (e.g. Hess and Avery, 2008). Guided classroom lessons may be relatively safe environments (compared with the political world outside) in which students and teachers can learn to address such uncertain, emotional issues (e.g. Crocco and Cramer, 2005; McCully, O’Doherty and Smyth, 1999; Morishita, 1991; Otoya-Knapp, 2004; Wood, 2007). For example, Neil Houser (1996) argues that too often elementary teachers, in the name of safe and caring classrooms, over-emphasize conflict

avoidance and under-emphasize the challenges and conflictive viewpoints that are equally essential to provoke learning.

Inclusive, thoughtful discussion of controversial political issues in citizenship education classrooms can effectively develop students' respect for alternative points of view, sensitivity to inequity, skills and inclinations to participate in democratic processes (Hahn, 1998; Hess and Ganzler, 2007; Hess and Posselt, 2002; Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald and Schultz, 2001). Some research, including a study of newspaper-based pedagogies in grade 5–6 classrooms across Argentina (Chaffee *et al.*, 1997) and a survey of over 4000 non-affluent visible minority students in Chicago (Kahne and Sporte, 2008), suggests that these positive impacts of conflict discussion pedagogies may be especially pronounced among students of lower socio-economic status, who often have fewer opportunities for such learning outside of school. However valuable, implementation of conflictual pedagogies is not common, at least in Canadian schools (Sears, Clark and Hughes, 1999; Sears and Hughes, 2006). A US observational study also found open, sustained classroom discussions of controversial or justice issues to be extremely rare, even though these were described by students as their most meaningful educational experiences (Simon, 2001).

At the same time, even the most well-intended, inclusive discussion of conflicts may not mitigate social inequalities (Ellsworth, 1989; 1997). When conflict surfaces, it is often the lowest-status and most marginalized participants who are exposed to the most risk, because it is their ways of being and thinking that are most likely to be unfamiliar or unpopular. Observational studies on teachers' strategies for facilitating conflict dialogue suggest that poor and visible minority students often have fewer opportunities to participate in sustained, inclusive discussions in academic classrooms compared to more privileged peers (Dull and Murrow, 2008), and that when those discussions do occur, those students are disproportionately marginalized or stigmatized (Hemmings, 2000; Subedi, 2008). 'Just as diversity can be a deliberative strength, it can also re-inscribe social divisions if students feel they are being silenced or do not want to voice opinions that differ from the majority' (Hess and Avery, 2008: 514). However, pedagogical approaches do make a difference. For example, in comparing two classrooms in the same school, Hemmings (2000) found that a competitive debate approach marginalized less-confident and lower-status students more than a cooperative, open discussion approach.

Gender and sexual identities also may influence students' engagement and experiences in conflictual discussions. For example, a study of psychosocial development in a ten-week Holocaust/genocide and citizenship education grade 8 course found that girls on average reduced their degree of racism more than boys (Schultz, Barr and Selman, 2001). Another study (Larson, 2003) showed that some high school students who were quiet in in-person class discussions gained a voice in online discussions. Further research is needed on how teachers open curriculum-linked opportunities for dialogue and make it constructive in mixed groups, and the consequences of these experiences for diverse students.

Anti-oppression, human rights, inter-group bias and equity pedagogies

A different kind of controversial issues curriculum – anti-discriminatory and justice education – emerges from different communities of scholars than the above controversial issues work (e.g. Boler and Zembylas, 2003; Bolgatz, 2005; Cípolle, 2004; Day, 2002; Roberts, Bell and Murphy, 2008). For example, discussions may compare dominant texts with alternative narratives that reflect the experiences of racialized or otherwise oppressed peoples (e.g. Dei, 2000; Howard, 2004). Even very young children are capable of engaging in thoughtful, respectful discussions of oppression and other issues, for example in literature circles (Fain, 2008). Feminist dialogue and consciousness raising approaches often focus on recognizing exclusions and facilitating inclusive opportunities for voice (e.g. Bell, 1996; Bickmore, 1996; Ellsworth, 1997; Hooks, 1994; Tyson and Hinton-Johnson, 2003; Weikel, 1995; Wells, 1996). Again, discussion-based pedagogies that foreground identity-related injustice issues may be experienced differently by diverse student participants (see also Bajaj, 2004; Bekerman, Zembylas and McGlynn, 2009; K. Schultz, Buck and Niesz, 2000). Further theory and research is needed to understand the ways various approaches to dialogue pedagogies may offer diverse students equitable opportunities to participate in naming, speaking out and being heard on conflictual questions.

Some anti-bias education is organized around encounters: bringing together members of adversary groups, face-to-face or on-line, for facilitated cooperative activity and dialogue about current and historical conflicts between their groups. ‘Contact’ theory (Allport, 1954) argues that inter-group contact can reduce prejudice and increase openness to the other side’s perspectives *if*: process and participant selection equalize status between the groups, contact is close and prolonged, groups cooperate towards common goals and institutional environments support such cooperation and prejudice reduction (Stephan, 1999; Tal-Or, Boninger and Gleicher, 2002). Unfortunately, these conditions are not often met in actual programmes. However, this literature often offers nuanced descriptions of facilitation strategies applicable to a range of dialogue on difficult issues, in the context of social difference and inequalities (e.g. King, 2009; Nagda, McCoy and Barrett, 2006; Schirch and Campt, 2007). Evaluations of such programming often indicate positive effects (at least in the short-term) on participants’ awareness, empathy for the Other, and thinking skills for addressing diversity and equity (Dessel and Rogge, 2008; DeTurk, 2006; Maoz, 2002). Curriculum that recognizes both individual difference and multiple (hybrid, cross-cutting) group identities may facilitate de-escalation of destructive conflict between groups (Freedman, Weinstein, Murphy and Longman, 2008; Ross, 2007). Like restorative peacemaking approaches, critical anti-bias education initiatives, especially inter-group dialogue, often invite powerful emotions, including anger, that may provoke profound, transformative (though risky) learning experiences.

Contact dialogue initiatives in schools, in practice, are often of short duration, based on individualistic psychological assumptions and monological notions of identity and culture, and inadequately address inequality and power (Bekerman, 2007). Notable exceptions are a small but growing number of integrated schools attended by students from former enemy groups over extended periods (Bekerman and McGlynn, 2007; Zembylas, Bekerman, McGlynn and Ferreira, 2009). However, integrated schools may address inter-group conflicts in remarkably different ways: Caitlyn Donnelly and Joanne Hughes (2006) show how teachers in some Northern Ireland integrated schools tended to emphasize inter-group commonalities and avoid discussion of controversial issues, whereas teachers in some Israel-Palestine integrated schools tended to encourage expression and discussion of identity differences. On one hand, inter-group contact may disrupt the *status quo* by bringing representatives from different groups into dialogue about their experiences of oppression, mutual distrust, and conflict. Yet on the other hand, inter-group (and other anti-bias) initiatives may emphasize commonalities and individual attitudes rather than political and structural issues, and thus avoid fully confronting difficult conflicts or disrupting existing social hierarchies.

Discussion: cross-cutting issues

The above review of literature suggests clear agreement, among a wide range of citizenship education, justice education and restorative peacemaking scholars, that young people are only likely to develop nonviolent democratic engagement skills and inclinations when they have regular opportunities to practise voicing and discussing contentious questions. Some of this literature also demonstrates how such conflict dialogue may be feasibly and effectively implemented in public school settings. Yet, neither interpersonal conflict dialogue for restorative peacemaking nor critical citizenship conflict issues dialogue pedagogies are widely implemented in most state-funded schools in the West. While conflictual *topics* may be mentioned, evidently there is little *sustained, inquisitive, carefully-facilitated communicative talk* about difficult issues, especially in classrooms populated by working class and ethnocultural minority students. Despite the importance of social and democratic engagement, learning activities that risk provoking strong emotions are often avoided or prematurely curtailed in schools. Thus educators are not necessarily facilitating the democratic conflict and peacebuilding learning that research indicates is both possible and necessary.

Two cross-cutting issues, in particular, emerge from the above literature review and indicate where research is needed: how student diversity and inequality may be addressed in various kinds of conflict dialogue, and how teachers may receive opportunities and support to learn how to confidently, equitably and effectively facilitate such dialogue. Comparisons among contrasting cases of conflict dialogue – from post-incident restorative peacemaking through pro-active democratic and peacebuilding issues discussion – should shed light on different options and elements of addressing these challenges:

124 The social and political context of CE

Student diversity: how are diverse, unequal-status students included in various kinds of conflict dialogue in schools, and how are they enabled (or not) to develop their distinct voices and democratic agency? Agency is ‘the ongoing process of (un)making ourselves through explorations of our positioning within [multiple and contrasting] discourse’ (McKenzie, 2006: 203). How are such explorations in schools facilitated to make them safe (respectful) enough, and yet challenging (dissonant) enough, to enable diverse and marginalized young participants’ relational engagement and talk across differences? What dialogue formats, and what skills and strategies (performance), facilitate constructive, respectful expressions of diverse identities, ideologies and emotions by the widest possible range of participants?

Teacher preparation and support: what kinds of professional learning opportunities may best encourage and support teachers to take reasonable risks to facilitate effective conflict dialogue? Teachers very often teach ‘defensively’ (McNeil, 1986), avoiding both conflictual subject matter and open dialogue about complex issues. This problem is likely exacerbated by current policies of high-stakes accountability for narrowly-defined, standardized academic outcomes (Ladwig, 2010). Many teachers have had little opportunity to gain confidence or skills for handling complex, sensitive, social and political subject matter, either in their own student years or in typical teacher education (Boler and Zembylas, 2003; Kelly and Brandes, 2001; Tupper, 2005). Despite this context and the uncertainty, risks and time/energy costs of facilitating sustained, emotional conflict dialogue, a few teachers do persistently find ways to teach in ways that invite conflict dialogue learning opportunities (e.g. Blood and Thorsborne, 2005; Wilson, Haas, Laughlin and Sunal, 2002; Wolpow, Johnson and Wognild, 2002; Yamashita, 2006).

Conclusion

There is already much theory and research about what ‘could’ or ‘should’ be done to improve the democratic and peacebuilding learning opportunities of students in public school, and it’s clear that conflict dialogue is an important part of that picture. What is missing and sorely needed is a well-grounded theoretical framework for understanding *why* those promising democratic peacebuilding pedagogies are so rare, especially in under-resourced public schools serving diverse populations, and *what can be done about it*. Such research has immense significance for addressing core goals in citizenship education and peace/conflict education theory, as well as practical utility for educators.

Acknowledgement

The Peace-Building Dialogue in Schools research project, emerging from the above literature review, is funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Council of Canada.

Questions for further investigation

- How valuable (worth the risks) do you believe it is to engage students in discussing sensitive, identity-linked social conflict issues in classrooms, and why?
- How can contrasting voices and unpopular viewpoints be truly included? (E.g. 'Relevant' justice topics, Delegate authority to the group, Pair-share, Journaling, Opinion Spectrum, 4 Corners, etc.)
- How can the most vulnerable participants be protected? (E.g. Roles, opportunities for all to speak, Teach communication norms and skills, Normalize conflict and dissent, non-competitive, etc.)

Suggested further reading

- Bickmore, K. (2008) 'Social studies for social justice: learning/navigating power and conflict', in Levstik, L. and Tyson, C. (Eds.) *Handbook of Research in Social Studies Education*. New York, NY: Routledge. pp. 155–71. My chapter in this handbook, which outlines the state of the research in Social Studies Education. A key text for researchers.
- Claire, H. and Holden, C (Eds.) (2007) *The Challenge of Teaching Controversial Issues*. London: Trentham Books. A relevant and practical text, spanning early years to higher education, which tackles key dilemmas and offers possible approaches in teaching controversial issues. See also Dr Paul Warwick's chapter in this book.
- Pranis, K. (2005) *The Little Book of Circle Processes: A New/Old Approach to Peacemaking*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books. Important book introducing Peacemaking Circles, which provide support for those affected by crime and conflict.

References

- Allport, G. (1954) *The Nature of Prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison Wesley.
- Apple, M. (1979) *Ideology and Curriculum*. London: Routledge.
- Ashworth, J., Van Bockern, S., Ailts, J., Donnelly, J., Erickson, K. and Woltermann, J. (2008) 'The restorative justice center: An alternative to school detention', *Reclaiming Children and Youth*, 17, 3, 22–6.
- Avery, P., Sullivan, J. and Wood, S. (1997) 'Teaching for tolerance of diverse beliefs', *Theory Into Practice*, 36, 1, pp. 32–38.
- Bajaj, M. (2004) 'Human rights education and student self-conception in the Dominican Republic', *Journal of Peace Education*, 1, 1, 21–36.
- Barton, K. and Levstik, L. (2004). *Teaching History for the Common Good*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bekerman, Z. (2007) 'Rethinking intergroup encounters: Rescuing praxis from theory, activity from education, and peace/co-existence from identity and culture', *Journal of Peace Education*, 4, 1, pp. 21–37.
- Bekerman, Z. and McGlynn, C. (Eds.) (2007) *Addressing Ethnic Conflict through Peace Education: International Perspectives*. New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Bekerman, Z., Zembylas, M. and McGlynn, C. (2009) 'Working toward the de-essentialization of identity categories in conflict and postconflict societies: Israel, Cyprus, and Northern Ireland', *Comparative Education Review*, 53, 2, 213–34.

126 The social and political context of CE

- Bell, L.-A. (1996) 'In danger of winning: Consciousness raising strategies for empowering girls in the United States', *Women's Studies International Forum*, 19, 4, 419–27.
- Bickmore, K. (1996) 'Women in the world, women in the classroom: Gender equity in the social studies', *High School Journal*, 79, 3, 231–41.
- (1999a) 'Elementary curriculum about conflict resolution: Can children handle global politics?', *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 27, 1, 45–69.
- (1999b) 'Teaching conflict and conflict resolution in school: (Extra-)curricular considerations', in Raviv, A., Oppenheimer, L. and Bar-Tal, D. (Eds.), *How Children Understand War and Peace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. pp. 233–59.
- (2001) 'Student conflict resolution, power "sharing" in schools, and citizenship education', *Curriculum Inquiry*, 31, 2, pp. 137–62.
- (2002) 'How might social education resist (hetero)sexism? Facing the impact of gender and sexual ideology on citizenship', *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 30, 2, 198–216.
- (2006) 'Democratic social cohesion? Assimilation? Representations of social conflict in Canadian public school curricula', *Canadian Journal of Education*, 29, 2, pp. 359–86.
- (2008) 'Peace and conflict', in Arthur, J., Davies, I. and Hahn, C. (Eds.) *Sage Handbook of Education for Citizenship and Democracy*. London: Sage Publications. pp. 438–54.
- (2010) 'Policies and programming for safer schools: Are "anti-bullying" approaches impeding education for peacebuilding?', *Journal of Educational Policy*, 25, 4 (July), pp. 648–87.
- Bickmore, K. and MacDonald, A. (2010) 'Student leadership opportunities for making "peace" in Canada's urban schools: Contradictions in practice', *Interamerican Journal of Education for Democracy/ Revista Interamericana de Educación para la Democracia*, 3, 2, pp. 125–52.
- Blood, P. and Thorsborne, M. (2005, March 3–5). 'The challenge of culture change: Embedding restorative practice in schools', paper presented at the Sixth International Conference on Conferencing, Circles and other Restorative Practices, Sydney, Australia.
- Boler, M. (1997) 'The risks of empathy: Interrogating multiculturalism's gaze', *Cultural Studies*, 11, 2, pp. 253–73.
- Boler, M. and Zembylas, M. (2003) 'Discomforting truths: The emotional terrain of understanding difference', in Trifonas, P. (Ed.) *Pedagogies of Difference: Rethinking Education for Social Change*. Halifax: Fernwood. pp. 110–36.
- Bolgatz, J. (2005) 'Teachers initiating conversations about race and racism in a high school class', *Multicultural Perspectives*, 7, 3, 28–35.
- Burrell, N., Zirbel, C. and Allen, M. (2003) 'Evaluating peer mediation outcomes in educational settings: A meta-analytic review', *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 21, 1, 7–26.
- Catterall, J. (2007) 'Enhancing peer conflict resolution skills through drama: An experimental study', *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 12, 2, 163–78.
- Chaffee, S.H. et al. (1997) *Political Socialization via a Newspaper-in-Schools Program in Argentina: Effects of Variations in Teaching Methods* (Final Report). Stanford, CT: Spencer Foundation.

- Cípolle, S. (2004) 'Service learning as a counter-hegemonic practice: Evidence pro and con', *Multicultural Education*, 11, 3, 12–23.
- Claassen, R. and Claassen, R. (2004) 'Creating a restorative discipline system: Restorative justice in schools', *The Fourth R* (Winter), 9–12.
- Claire, H. and Holden, C. (Eds.) (2007) *The Challenge of Teaching Controversial Issues*. London: Trentham Books.
- Consadine, J. (1999) *Restorative Justice: Healing the Effects of Crime* (2nd Ed.). Lyttelton, NZ: Ploughshares Press.
- Crocco, M.S. and Cramer, J. (2005) 'Women, WebQuests, and controversial issues in the social studies', *Social Education*, 69, 4, 143–8.
- Crumbaugh, C. (1996, April) 'From harmony to cacophony: A study of student disagreement in a fourth grade math classroom', paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, New York City.
- Cunningham, C. (1998) 'The effects of primary division, student-mediated conflict resolution programs on playground aggression', *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 39, 5, 653–62.
- Curle, A., Freire, P. and Galtung, J. (1974) 'What can education contribute towards peace and social justice? Curle, Freire, Galtung panel', in Haavelsrud, M. (Ed.) *Education for Peace: Reflection and Action*. Keele: University of Keele. pp. 64 – 97.
- Davies, L. (2004) *Education and Conflict: Complexity and Chaos*. London: Routledge/Falmer.
- Day, L. (2002) 'Putting yourself in other people's shoes: The use of Forum Theatre to explore refugee and homeless issues in schools', *Journal of Moral Education*, 31, 1, 21–34.
- Day-Vines, N., Day-Hairston, B., Carruthers, W., Wall, J. and Lupton-Smith, H. (1996) 'Conflict resolution: The value of diversity in the recruitment, selection, and training of peer mediators', *School Counselor*, 43, pp. 392–410.
- Dei, G.S. (2000) 'Towards an anti-racism discursive framework', in Dei, G.S. and Calliste, A. (Eds.) *Power, Knowledge, and Anti-racism Education*. Halifax: Fernwood.
- Delpit, L. (1995) *Other People's Children: Cultural Conflict in the Classroom*. New York, NY: New Press.
- Deng, Z. and Luke, A. (2008) 'Subject matter: Defining and theorizing school subjects', in Connelly, F.M., He, M.F. Phillion, J. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Curriculum and Instruction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. pp. 66–87.
- Dessel, A. and Rogge, M. E. (2008) 'Evaluation of intergroup dialogue: A review of the empirical literature', *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 2, 62, 199–238.
- DeTurk, S. (2006) 'The power of dialogue: Consequences of intergroup dialogue and their implications for agency and alliance building', *Communication Quarterly*, 54, 1, 33–51.
- Donnelly, C. and Hughes, J. (2006) 'Contact, culture and context: Evidence from mixed faith schools in Northern Ireland and Israel', *Comparative Education*, 42, 4, pp. 493–516.
- Dull, L. and Murrow, S. (2008) 'Is dialogic questioning possible in social studies classrooms?', *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 36, 4, pp. 391–412.
- Elbow, P. (1986) *Embracing Contraries: Explorations in Teaching and Learning*. New York: Oxford University Press.

128 The social and political context of CE

- Ellsworth, E. (1989) 'Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy', *Harvard Educational Review*, 59, 3, pp. 297–322.
- (1997) *Teaching Positions: Difference, Pedagogy, and the Power of Address*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Fain, J.G. (2008) 'Um, they weren't thinking about their thinking: Children's talk about issues of oppression', *Multicultural Perspectives*, 10, 4, pp. 201–8.
- Franklin, U. (2006) 'Stormy weather: Reflections on violence as an environment', in Franklin, U. and Swenarchuk, M. *The Ursula Franklin Reader: Pacifism as a Map*. Toronto, ON: Between the Lines. pp. 257–62.
- Frankenstein, M. (1987) 'Critical mathematics education: An application of Paulo Freire's epistemology', in Shor, I. (Ed.), *Freire for the Classroom: A Sourcebook for Liberatory Teaching*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton-Cook. pp. 180–210.
- Freedman, S.W., Weinstein, H., Murphy, K. and Longman, T. (2008) 'Teaching history after identity-based conflicts: The Rwanda experience', *Comparative Education Review*, 52, 4, pp. 663–90.
- Freire, P. (1970) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York, NY: Seabury Press.
- (1998) *Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy, and Civic Courage*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Galtung, J. (1969) 'Violence, peace, and peace research', *Journal of Peace Research*, 6, 3, pp. 167–92.
- (1996) *Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development, & Civilization*. London: Sage Publications and International Peace Research Assn.
- Hahn, C. (1998) *Becoming Political: Comparative Perspectives on Citizenship Education*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Harris, I. and Morrison, M. (2003) *Peace Education* (2nd Ed.). Jefferson, NC: McFarland.
- Harris, R. (2005) 'Unlocking the learning potential in peer mediation: An evaluation of peer mediator modeling and disputant learning', *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 23, 2, 141–64.
- Hemmings, A. (2000) 'High school democratic dialogues: Possibilities for praxis', *American Educational Research Journal*, 37, 1, pp. 67–91.
- Hess, D. (2004) 'Controversies about controversial issues in democratic education', *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 37, 2, pp. 253–55.
- Hess, D. and Avery, P. (2008) 'Discussion of controversial issues as a form and goal of democratic education', in Arthur, J., Davies, I. and Hahn, C. (Eds.) *Sage Handbook of Education for Citizenship and Democracy*. London: Sage Publications. pp. 508–18.
- Hess, D. and Ganzler, L. (2007) 'Patriotism and ideological diversity in the classroom', in Westheimer, J. (Ed.) *Pledging Allegiance: The Politics of Patriotism in America's Schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press. pp. 131–38.
- Hess, D. and Posselt, J. (2002) 'How high school students experience and learn from the discussion of controversial public issues', *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 17, 4, 283–314.
- Heydenberk, R. and Heydenberk, W. (2005) 'Increasing meta-cognitive competence through conflict resolution', *Education and Urban Society*, 37, 4, 431–52.
- Houser, N. (1996) 'Negotiating dissonance and safety for the common good: Social education in the elementary classroom', *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 24, 3, pp. 294–312.

- Howard, T. (2004) 'Does race really matter? Secondary students' construction of racial dialogue in the social studies', *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 32, 4, pp. 484–502.
- Ibrahim, T. (2005) 'Global citizenship education: Mainstreaming the curriculum?', *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 35, 2, 177–94.
- Johnson, D. and Johnson, R. (1996) 'Conflict resolution and peer mediation programs in elementary and secondary schools: a review of the research', *Review of Educational Research*, 66, 4, pp. 459–506.
- (2009) 'Energizing learning: The instructional power of conflict', *Educational Researcher*, 38, 1, pp. 37–51.
- Jones, T. (2004) 'Conflict resolution education: the field, the findings, and the future', *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 22, 1–2, 233–67.
- Jones, T. and Sanford, R. (2003) 'Building the container: Curriculum infusion and classroom climate', *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 21, 1, 115–30.
- Kahne, J. and Sporte, S. (2008) 'Developing citizens: The impact of civic learning opportunities on students' commitment to civic participation', *American Educational Research Journal*.
- Kelly, D. and Brandes, G.M. (2001) 'Shifting out of "neutral": Beginning teachers' struggles with teaching for social justice', *Canadian Journal of Education*, 26, 4, 437–54.
- King, J. (2009) 'Teaching and learning about controversial issues: Lessons from Northern Ireland', *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 37, 2, pp. 215–46.
- Kumashiro, K. (2000) 'Toward a theory of anti-oppressive education', *Review of Educational Research*, 70, 1, 25–53.
- Kurlansky, M. (2006) *Nonviolence*. New York, NY: The Modern Library.
- Ladwig, J.G. (2010) 'Beyond academic outcomes', *Review of Research in Education*, 34, pp. 113–41.
- Larson, B. (2003) 'Comparing face-to-face discussion and electronic discussion: A case study from high school social studies', *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 31, 3, pp. 347–54.
- Luke, J. and Myers, C. (1994) 'Toward peace: Using literature to aid conflict resolution', *Childhood Education*, 71, 2 (Winter), 66–9.
- McCluskey, G., Lloyd, G., Kane, J., Riddell, S., Stead, J. and Weedon, E. (2008) 'Can restorative practices in schools make a difference?', *Educational Review*, 60, 4, pp. 405–17.
- McCully, A., O'Doherty, M. and Smyth, P. (1999) 'The speak your piece project: Exploring controversial issues in Northern Ireland', in Forcey, L. and Harris, I. (Eds.), *Peacebuilding for adolescents*. New York: Peter Lang. pp. 119–38.
- McGlynn, C., Zembylas, M., Bekerman, Z. and Gallagher, T. (2009) *Peace Education in Conflict and Post-conflict Societies: Comparative Perspectives*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- McKenzie, M. (2006) 'Three portraits of resistance: The (un)making of Canadian students', *Canadian Journal of Education*, 29, 1, pp. 199–222.
- McNeil, L. (1986) *Contradictions of Control: School Structure and School Knowledge*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Maoz, I. (2002) 'Conceptual mapping and evaluation of peace education programs: The case of education for coexistence through intergroup encounters between Jews and Arabs in Israel', in Salomon, G. and Nevo, B. (Eds.), *Peace Education*:

130 The social and political context of CE

- Concepts, Principles and Practices around the World*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. pp. 259–70.
- Morishita, F. (1991) 'Teaching about controversial issues: Resolving conflict between creationism and evolution through law-related education', *American Biology Teacher*, 53, 2, 91–3.
- Morris, R. (2000) *Stories of Transformative Justice*. Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars Press.
- Morrison, B. (2007) *Restoring Safe School Communities: A Whole School Response to Bullying, Violence and Alienation*. Leichhardt, NSW: Federation Press.
- Nagda, B.R., McCoy, M.L. and Barrett, M.H. (2006) 'Mix it up: Crossing social boundaries as a pathway to youth civic engagement', *National Civic Review*, 95, 1, pp. 47–56.
- Noguera, P. and Cohen, R. (2006) 'Patriotism and accountability', *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87, pp. 573–78.
- Otoya-Knapp, K. (2004) 'When Central City high school students speak: Doing critical inquiry for democracy', *Urban Education*, 39, 2, 149–71.
- Parker, W. (2003) *Teaching Democracy: Unity and Diversity in Public Life*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Pranis, K., Stuart, B. and Wedge, M. (2003) *Peacemaking Circles: From Crime to Community*. St Paul, MN: Living Justice Press.
- Roberts, R., Bell, L.A. and Murphy, B. (2008) 'Flipping the script: Analyzing youth talk about race and racism', *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 39, 3, 334–54.
- Ross, A. (2007) 'Multiple identities and education for active citizenship', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 55, 3, pp. 286–303.
- Sandmann, A. (2004) 'Literature that promotes justice for all', *Social Education*, 68, 4, 254–59.
- Schirch, L. and Campt, D. (2007) *The Little Book of Dialogue for Difficult Subjects*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books, Inc.
- Schultz, L., Barr, D. and Selman, R. (2001) 'The value of a developmental approach to evaluating character development programs: An outcome study of Facing History and Ourselves', *Journal of Moral Education*, 30, 1, pp. 3–27.
- Schultz, K., Buck, P. and Niesz, T. (2000) 'Democratizing conversations: Racialized talk in a post-desegregated middle school', *American Educational Research Journal*, 37, 1, 33–65.
- Sears, A., Clark, G. and Hughes, A. (1999) 'Canadian citizenship education: The pluralist ideal and citizenship education for a post-modern state', in Torney-Purta, J., Schwille, J. and Amadeo, J. (Eds.) *Civic Education across Countries: Twenty-Four National Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement. pp. 111–35.
- Sears, A. and Hughes, A. (2006) 'Citizenship: Education and indoctrination', *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 2, 1, pp. 3–17.
- Settlage, J. and Sabik, C. M. (1996) 'Harnessing the positive energy of conflict in science teaching', *Theory Into Practice*, 36, 1, 39–45.
- Simon, K. (2001) *Moral Questions in the Classroom*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Stephan, W. (1999) *Reducing Prejudice and Stereotyping in Schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

- Subedi, B. (2008) 'Fostering critical dialogue across cultural differences: A study of immigrant teachers' interventions in diverse schools', *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 35, 4, pp. 413–40.
- Tal-Or, N., Boninger, D. and Gleicher, F. (2002) 'Understanding the conditions necessary for intergroup contact to reduce prejudice', in Salomon, G. and Nevo, B. (Eds.) *Peace Education: The Concept, Principles, and Practices around the World*. Mahwah, N.J: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. pp. 89–107.
- Torney-Purta, J. and Barber, C. (2005) 'Democratic school engagement and civic participation among European adolescents: analysis of data from the IEA Civic Education Study', in *Online Journal for Social Science Education*. Special Edition Edition (http://www.jsse.org/2005-se/torney_purta_barber_iea_analysis.htm) published 16.02.2005. (Retrieved from http://www.sowi-onlinejournal.de/2005-se/torney_purta_barber_iea_analysis.htm on 1 June 2006.)
- Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H. and Schultz, W. (2001) *Citizenship and Education in 28 Countries: Civic Knowledge and Engagement at Age 14*. Amsterdam: IEA (International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement).
- Tupper, J. (2005). *Searching Citizenship: Social Studies and the Tensions of Teaching*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.
- Tyson, C. and Hinton-Johnson, K. V. (2003) 'Once upon a time: Teaching about women and social justice', *Social Education*, 67, 1, 54–7.
- Wasson, R., Anderson, R. and Suriani, M. (1999) 'Integrating a multicultural peace-building strategy into a literacy curriculum', in Forcey, L. and Harris, I. (Eds.), *Peacebuilding for Adolescents*. New York: Peter Lang. pp. 119–138.
- Weikel, B. (1995) "'Girlspeak" and "boyspeak": Gender differences in classroom discussion' in Kleinfeld, J. and Yerian, S. (Eds.), *Gender Tales: Tensions in the Schools*. New York: St. Martin's Press. pp. 7–11.
- Wells, M. (1996) 'From margin to centre: Interventions supporting gender equity in the Toronto Board of Education', *Women's Studies International Forum*, 19, 4, 371 Teachers' perspectives on incorporating current controversial issues into the social studies curriculum', *International Social Studies Forum*, 21, 31–45.
- Wolpow, R., Johnson, N. and Wognild, K. (2002) 'Designing, implementing and evaluating a teacher inservice program enabling 6th–12th grade rural teachers to integrate Holocaust studies into their curriculum', *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 30, 4, 563–88.
- Wood, A.G. (2007) *What Do We Tell the Children? Confusion, Conflict and Complexity*. Stoke on Trent, UK: Trentham Books.
- Wyness, M. (2009) 'Children representing children: Participation and the problem of diversity in UK youth councils', *Childhood*, 16, p. 535.
- Wyse, D. (2001) 'Felt tip pens and school councils: Children's participation rights in four English schools', *Children and Society*, 15, 4, pp. 209–18.
- Yamashita, H. (2006) 'Global citizenship education and war: The needs of teachers and learners', *Educational Review*, 58 1, 27–39.
- Zembylas, M., Bekerman, Z., McGlynn, C. and Ferreira, A. (2009) 'Teachers' understanding of reconciliation and inclusion in mixed schools of four troubled societies', *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 4, 4, 406–22.