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Abstract

Each year the Asia-Pacific Centre of Education for International Understanding (APCEIU), operating under the auspices of UNESCO, hosts a peace education training-of-trainer’s program for teacher-educators from across the Asia-Pacific. In this thesis, I examine through a qualitative case study approach the programmatic design and evaluation of the APCEIU training program, seeking to monitor its medium-term impact on educators. The research is framed within a larger study of peace education programs around the world. Frameworks of peace education conceptualized by Betty Reardon and Swee-hin Toh, and critical approaches to peace and development as animated by Paulo Freire and Johan Galtung, provide the theoretical foundations for the study. Research findings are based on consultation records, documentary analysis, observations, and questionnaire responses from evaluations of the 2009 program. In the medium-term impact assessment report, 14 educators offered data pertaining to their post-program implementation of peace education concepts and practices in their work.
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CHAPTER 1

Education, Peace and the Political Economy of East Asia

To be hopeful in bad times is not just foolishly romantic. It is based on the fact that human history is a history not only of cruelty, but also of compassion, sacrifice, courage, kindness. What we choose to emphasize in this complex history will determine our lives. If we see only the worst, it destroys our capacity to do something. If we remember those times and places – and there are so many – where people have behaved magnificently, this gives us the energy to act, and at least the possibility of sending this spinning top of a world in a different direction. And if we do act, in however small a way, we don't have to wait for some grand utopian future. The future is an infinite succession of presents, and to live now as we think human beings should live, in defiance of all that is bad around us, is itself a marvelous victory.

-- Howard Zinn, 1922-2010 (2007, p. 170)

INTRODUCTION TO STUDY

Peace education is an emerging academic discipline and professional practice for the development of formal and non-formal learning programs toward the creation of peace around the world. There is a multitude of peace education programs, with different approaches, principles, and goals. Some of the programs seek the immediate cessation of physical violence in schools and communities (Johnson and Johnson, 1996). Others emphasize values and behaviors, such as nonviolence, cooperation, social justice, and sustainability (Harris, 1988; Reardon, 1988). Some desire social reformation, others social transformation (O’Sullivan, 1999; Hicks, 1994). And still others aim toward international understanding (Boulding, 1988). Some programs work with elementary schools, others with high schools (Reardon and Cabezudo, 2002; Danesh, 2008). Some are integrated into undergraduate curricula, others in teacher-training institutes (Jenkins, 2004; Toh, 2004). Some train professionals and others work with community associations (Jenkins, 2007). Some work with governments, others with non-governmental organizations and civil society initiatives (Hague Appeal for Peace, 1999). The approaches vary.

At the present moment there are peace educators working in every region of the globe. A cursory reading though seminal works in the field, such as Ian Harris’s Peace Education (1988), Betty
Reardon’s *Comprehensive Peace Education* (1988), or Burns and Aspelag’s *Peace Education Around the World* (1996), and through newsletters and periodicals published by the Global Campaign for Peace Education,\(^1\) illustrates the tremendous reach of educators working for peace. In East Asia, where peace education developed at the end of WWII in response to nationalistic aggressions and experience of the fallout from atomic weaponry,\(^2\) peace education can be said to be growing exponentially, with national Departments of Peace already established in Nepal and the Solomon Islands. The Indian Government introduced peace as a core subject into the National Curriculum Framework (NCERT, 2005), thereby requiring teachers to be trained in peace education, and is working toward developing conflict resolution programs in schools around the subcontinent. I have worked in recent years with peace education programs in Japan, South Korea, India, the United States and Canada. The field is emerging.

Yet major questions remain at the various levels in which peace education is conducted. For example, what is the impact of peace education teaching in schools and communities? One level higher, what is the impact of teacher-training programs? Another level higher in the policy schemata, what is the impact of our teacher-educator training? And what is the impact of our public discourse and policy-making toward international understanding, cooperation and peace? As a teacher-educator I operate under the assumption that the training of teacher-trainers will have a multiplying effect on educators, their students, and the communities in which those students reside. Thus I posit that training teacher-educators could potentially influence myriad individuals and organizations across nations, as those teacher-educators train teacher-trainers, and teacher-trainers then train teachers. The impact is multi-dimensional and multi-leveled and eventually reaches students who then might develop knowledge, values, attitudes, and behaviors consistent with the development of cultures of peace. In fact, Nevo and Brem (2002), Harris (2003, 2008), and Danesh (2008) all argue that greater program evaluation is needed to ensure that peace education programs are effectively achieving their goals.

Therefore, with the aforementioned in mind, I chose as a research site for this thesis the teacher-

---

\(^1\) The newsletter for the Global Campaign for Peace Education is regularly published at [http://www.tc.edu/peaceed/newsletter/](http://www.tc.edu/peaceed/newsletter/).

\(^2\) For more comprehensive information on the development of peace education programs in East Asia, see R. J. Burns and R. Aspeslagh (Eds.) (1996), *Three decades of peace education around the world*, New York: Garland.
educator training program of UNESCO’s Asia-Pacific Centre of Education for International Understanding (APCEIU), a Centre I worked for (as consultant and trainer) in the summer of 2009. APCEIU is an institution whose mandate is to educate for peace under the auspices of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights Article 26b, which reads:

Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.

UNESCO’s Constitution (1945) begins with the well-known declaration that “war begins in the minds of men [and women], therefore it is in the minds of men [and women] that the defenses of peace must be constructed.” The founders of UNESCO understood that without cultural understanding, cooperation and intentional education toward peace, the creation of political and economic mechanisms of the United Nations and world governments for resolving conflict would remain stagnant; for, the architect of possibility exists first in the mind. APCEIU, as a UNESCO category II center, is leading in the endeavor for peace education in East Asia. APCEIU is housed in Seoul, South Korea.

Through a peace education lens, I examine the APCEIU program within the broader arena of the political economy of East Asia and in concordance with peace education frameworks developed for the Peace Education Center at Teachers College Columbia University (Hague Appeal for Peace, 1999; Reardon and Cabezudo, 2002) and the United Nations University for Peace (Jenkins, 2004; Toh, 2004). I chose these programs as comparison sites for three reasons: 1) because I have studied in each of the programs, 2) because they are in practice at the periphery of the Asia-Pacific in North America, and 3) because, I would argue, many of the peace education programs functioning in East Asia have originated in scholarship and practice from these two programs. I expect that analyzing these two programs and assessing the impact of the

---

3 I was trained in peace education pedagogy at Teachers College Columbia University and in peace education programmatic design and policymaking at the United Nations University for Peace in Costa Rica.

4 The Center for Peace Education at Miriam College, Quezon City, Philippines, uses the Peace Education model developed at Teachers College and the Hague Appeal for Peace Conference in 1999; ‘Women in Security, Conflict Management and Peacebuilding’, an NGO operating under the auspices of the Foundation for Universal
APCEIU training workshops might reveal lessons for radical peace educators that could be translated into other working contexts.

I consider the impact of the program through Daniel Schugurensky’s (2003) ‘expansive hypothesis’, which assesses both internal changes in attitudes and behaviors, and the expansion of professional engagements to new contexts. Schugurensky writes that as citizens become more engaged in the subject of study (i.e. peace education) at the local levels of decision-making (e.g. school-based and institutional design) this often increases their interest in broader issues of regional, national and international scope. Schugurensky argues that this participation has an educative effect where the consequence is the development of informed, critical citizens who are prepared to take action on larger challenges beyond their immediate grasp. This is both a professional practice and case of participatory democracy. Many scholars theorize that through participating in democratic processes citizens learn active citizenship by doing (Mill, 1862; Rousseau, 1968; Pateman, 1970; Mansbridge, 1997; Merrifield, 2001; Schugurensky, 2000 and 2004; Lerner and Schugurensky, 2007; Pinnington and Schugurensky, 2010). According to Pateman (1970, p. 45): “The theory of participatory democracy argues that the experience of participation in some way leaves the individual better psychologically equipped to undertake further participation in the future.”

Similarly, Reardon and Cabezudo (2002) argue that democratic practices in the classroom may lead to greater exercise of democratic decision-making in society. They declare:

Education for global citizenship in a culture of peace requires a pedagogy of democratic engagement. Active and participatory engagement of students in the learning process initiated by peace curricula is the most relevant and effective pedagogy to prepare students for active participation in the global change process now being carried forth by global civil society (p. 70).

Responsibility of His Holiness the Dalai Lama, New Delhi, India, organizes its teacher-training programs around the Teachers College model and theoretical writings of Teachers College scholar, Betty Reardon; the University for Peace model for peace education, developed by Swee-hin Toh and Virgina Cawagas, has been utilized in various capacities at the University of Alberta in Canada, Griffith University in Australia, APCEIU in South Korea, and the Mindanao Institute on Peace Education in the Philippines. These examples are not exhaustive.
Thus, I am researching how the APCEIU program encouraged internal and behavioral changes among the participants, and the multiplier effect concerning the creation of new peace education training programs and policies in their home countries after training was completed. The APCEIU program acted as a fertile training ground for preparing educators to teach for peace, justice and sustainability across the Asia-Pacific.

In the APCEIU training program, I served as a consultant in the development of the program content, principles, materials, evaluation procedures, and training methodologies. The consultant phase of the program ran from April-September 2009. During training, I acted as an assistant facilitator with the three lead facilitators, Dr. Swee-hin Toh, Mr. Francis Daehoon Lee, and Ms. Lea Espellardo. In this capacity, I directed training workshops and discussions with the APCEIU participants pertaining to the six organizing themes of the model of peace education developed by Toh (2004). Inherently, as a trainer and consultant, I was also a participant and learner throughout the process. My reflections on the training are integrated within the chapters of this thesis. As consultant and assistant facilitator, my main duties included leading a session on a whole-school approach to peace education, leading the textbook analysis forum, serving as an assistant during the intercultural and disarmament education workshops, and developing materials for the formative and summative program evaluation (see Appendix A).

THE KOREAN CONTEXT

Before moving on, it is necessary to present a modicum of historical narrative about Korea and education in the country. The Korean Peninsula is home today to nearly 70 million people (approximately 48 million in South Korea and 23 million in North Korea) with a rich history of culture, arts, humanities, politics, economics, and military conquests (CIA, 2010). The past 60 years have in many respects been dictated by two forces: on the one hand, the miraculous economic rise of the State from extreme poverty that engulfed the nation post-WWII to the economic powerhouse it is today, and on the other hand, the militaristic posturing of North and South Korea. Since 1948 the peninsula has been divided at the 38th parallel between North and South Korea. This occurred in large part due to frictions between the United States and then-
Soviet Union who oversaw the region according to a UN trusteeship agreement between the two superpowers immediately following the end of WWII. The countries are technically still at war since there has never been a formal resolution of the Korean War (Cumings, 2005). This last point, while seemingly inconsequential, reemerges often during diplomatic exchanges between the Koreas and other members of the currently suspended Six-Party Talks. It furthermore impacts the psyche of the Korean people who have experienced countless invasions throughout their history.

South Korea has had six republics since 1948 with varying degrees of ‘thin democracy’ and autocratic rule. In 1987, following decades of governmental oppression, including the Gwangju uprising and massacre, South Korea formally established a liberal democracy. In the late 1990s, the South, under the leadership of Kim Dae-Jung, implemented a ‘Sunshine Policy’ toward the North. This policy strengthened ties between the States through South Korean economic and agricultural assistance to the North, for which Kim Dae-Jung received the Nobel Peace Prize in 2000 (Cumings, 2005). In 2010, at the time of writing, diplomatic relations between North and South Korea were again tense, exacerbated by conservative President Lee Myung-Bak’s hardline policies toward the North and pressure put on the North by the Six-Party Talks to institute total nuclear disarmament. Furthermore, in March 2010 the two nations were the nearest war they had been in several years due to the North’s torpedo sinking of the South Korean submarine, Cheonan (ROK Ministry of National Defense, 2010). Within this context, education is an exigency toward forming political opinion of the North.

Education in Korea, like in other nations, is a dynamic endeavor controlled and operated by various social, political, and economic actors and institutions. Socially, education is the primary vehicle for increased economic and social participation, and the development engine behind the great economic success of Korea during the latter half of the 20th century (when the so-called Asian Tigers blossomed) (Cumings, 2005; MEST, 2009). In Korea, formal education sows the seeds for social and cultural development through a modern values system that aims to harness

---

5 To use the language of Benjamin Barber in referring to democracies where suffrage seems more a formality masking inequalities than substantial political voice that might contribute to policy change.
6 South Korea completed its investigation on May 20, 2010. The United States quickly confirmed and agreed with the report. China will complete its own assessment.
civic virtues and development-oriented views that have led to an increased middle-class, as well as aspirations for the nation to become a leader in technology, education and sustainable agriculture (MEST, 2009).^7

Korea, also like many of its Asian neighbors, believes itself to be a homogeneous nation (MEST, 2009). This perception is embedded in both a deep history and modern political discourse that centers individual and national identity on bloodlines (Cumings, 2005). I take special note of the Ministry of Education’s declaration of Korea as a homogeneous nation because of the problematic lens through which this locates education and learners in Korea. As I have explored elsewhere (Kester and Glustein, 2009), the notion of homogeneity within Eastern Asia is oft exaggerated, and there are serious social, cultural, political, and economic consequences of such a policy paradigm when confronted with the diversity currently emerging through transnational migrations. Within this context non-formal and community-based education programs, such as demonstrations, marches and education centers, play an important role in complementing or challenging the formal school system and the formalization of hegemonic knowledge through State functions. Peace education offers not only an alternative view but also a channel through which marginalized communities might vocalize their grievances and challenge the State and hegemonic classes.

Within the context of economic development and increased migration, and in the shadows of the rise and fall of British imperialism and the international dominance of US neoliberal development, particularly in East Asia, the teaching and learning of English and so-called “multicultural education” (integration/acculturation) programs has become ubiquitous. English Villages, which are isolated education centers intended to simulate international travel and replicate American values in Korea, have become popular. These modern sites of linguistic imperialism, codified in the English classroom and university, and giving “English students” substantial social capital, reveals the need for further inquiry into: 1) the syncretic nature of history, cultures and politics, and 2) the power of public discourse to question the fatalistic assumptions that modernity is the “end of history and the last man” (Francis Fukuyama, 1992). Modernity in this case is often expressed through subscription to liberal democracy, equality, the

---

^7 In the MEST document *Education in Korea*, peace is not mentioned in relation to education.
assessment of one’s ability to speak English, experience in the West, and adherence to neutral, objective science.

In light of the aforementioned points, the power of public discourse, community-building, formal peace education programs, and advocacy work might be used as avenues to examine historical events of the Asia-Pacific in relation to peacebuilding. Among the many important moments in the Asia-Pacific since the start of WWII to be included in dialogue on peace are: the Comfort Women\(^8\) abuses and Rape of Nanjing, the 1945 A-Bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, post-WWII US imperialism, Yasukuni Shrine, the 1997 IMF Crash, and the plight of the Zainichi.

Within Korea specific, integral moments are the division of North/South Korea and the establishment of the De-Militarized Zone in the 1950s, the 1980 Gwangju Massacre, the establishment of democracy in 1987, the death of Kim Il-Sung, and the Six-Party talks with South/North Korea. Many of these events, especially if the military was involved, have been excluded from national textbooks in the region and omitted from the media, particularly where contemporary media sensationalizes the actions of Kim Jung-II in the North. Greater documentation of these events is necessary for healing and reconciliation (Zehr, 2008). Framing this context within Toh’s (2004) model of peace education, which includes six themes for peacebuilding (disarmament, sustainability, human rights, social justice, intercultural understanding, and personal peace), educators might see that each of these moments roughly relates to a theme of peace education:

- US military bases in the Asia-Pacific as sites for *disarmament education*
- Hiroshima as a space for *disarmament education* and reconciliation talks
- The De-Militarized Zone and North Korea as sites for *disarmament*
- The De-Militarized Zone also relates to *sustainability* and *inner peace* in the Koreas
- The Gwangju Massacre raises issues of *social justice* and democracy

---

\(^8\) Comfort Women are women, primarily Korean and Chinese, though other nationalities were involved as well, who were abducted by the Japanese military during WWII to serve as sex slaves for soldiers. The women were systematically raped and tortured during the war and psychologically traumatized for many years thereafter. Out of shame most Comfort Women died without exposing the war crimes committed against them, though since the mid-1990s some have come forward to speak of the atrocities executed under authorization of the Japanese government.
The Zainichi condition raises human rights violations. The IMF crash relates to social justice. Yasukuni shrine concerns intercultural solidarity between Japan, Korea, and China. The Comfort Women atrocities relate to disarmament education, social justice, and inner peace in East Asia.

The purview of these six themes and critical social issues could offer potential for the practice of Garoian and Gaudelius (2008) call spectacle pedagogy. Spectacle pedagogy examines the complex relationships between politics, public events, visual representation, and culture. Assessing historical and current events, such as the Comfort Women abuses, the Gwangju Massacre, the 1997 IMF crash, and Yasukuni Shrine, among the other social issues highlighted above in East Asia, serves to illuminate the attitudes, values and behaviors that underscore our cultures, communication and conflict.

APCEIU: NURTURING PEACE EDUCATION IN KOREA AND THE ASIA-PACIFIC

Within the context previously discussed here APCEIU is working with and for its 47 Member States in the Asia-Pacific region to promote Education for International Understanding (EIU) towards a Culture of Peace. Formal negotiations for the creation of APCEIU began in 1995 with the 30th General Conference of UNESCO adopting a resolution in October 1999 to officially organize APCEIU. The Centre operates under the auspices of UNESCO as a UNESCO Category II center (UNDP, 2009). UNESCO categorizes its centers into Category I and Category II agencies. Category I centers are under the direct control and funding of UNESCO headquarters and National Commissions, such as the Korean National Commission for UNESCO. Category II centers, on the other hand, operate under the umbrella of UNESCO but are funded independently either by their Member States through the National Commissions or through other interested foundations. The Category II centers are committed to engaging in support of UNESCO’s program objectives. At present, there are 5 Category II centers attached to the UNESCO Education Sector, which includes APCEIU.
APCEIU is guided by the *UNESCO Recommendation concerning Education for International Understanding, Cooperation and Peace and Education relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms* (1974) and the *Declaration and Integrated Framework of Action on Education for Peace, Human Rights, and Democracy* (1995). The Centre seeks to link individuals, communities, nations, and international systems to foster a sustainable relationship between humanity and nature. The mission of APCEIU (Toh and Gundara, 1998) is to:

- **Promote** peace education that strengthens participatory democracy, protection of human rights, social and economic justice, intercultural respect, ecological sustainability, and nonviolent and just reconciliation of conflicts;
- **Collaborate** with educators and institutions who share the visions and goals of expanding, strengthening, and institutionalizing peace education in schools and society;
- **Serve** as a centre of excellence for education, training, research and development of curricula for peace education in the Asia-Pacific;
- **Share** ideas and lessons for enhancing and implementing peace education with educators, policy-makers, institutions, and communities in other regions and countries, through networking and partnerships.

To pursue this mission, APCEIU emphasizes a pedagogical approach to peace education that integrates knowledge and understanding with the development of values and attitudes underpinning a culture of peace. APCEIU promotes critical empowerment for personal and institutional transformation in all areas of life. The mandate is to:

- **Strengthen** national a regional capacities in planning and implementing a broad range of practices in peace education toward a culture of peace.
- **Encourage and facilitate** collaborative links between Asia-Pacific initiatives and other regional, international and global efforts in education.
- **Implement** research and development with regard to the philosophy, teaching methods and curricula for peace education.
- **Organize** training workshops and seminars.
- Produce and disseminate teaching materials and other publications.
- Create opportunities for indigenous voices and vulnerable groups in the Asia-Pacific region to participate in peace education, including the sharing of success stories.
- Promote peace education as one constructive strategy towards democratic and sustainable transformation in the Asia-Pacific region.

The main activities of the center fall under four categories of action, including 1) the promotion of peace education towards a culture of peace, 2) peace education capacity-building of Asia-Pacific Member States, 3) dissemination of information on peace education publications, and 4) strengthening the institutional capacities of APCEIU and the peace education network. These four main activities are spearheaded through four program divisions, including i) Research and Development, ii) Education and Training, iii) Publication and Information, and iv) Project Development. Of concern in this thesis is the Education and Training programs for peace education in the Asia-Pacific. Toh and Gundara (1998) write in their feasibility study for APCEIU:

The critical role of teachers and teacher-educators in building the capacity of Asia-Pacific nations to implement EIU is properly recognized by the proposers of [APCEIU]. Teachers, school administrators, and teacher educators need to be able to facilitate the gaining of relevant knowledge skills and values by the next generation of adult citizens for building peaceful, just and sustainable societies. The [APCEIU] will therefore design, organize and manage professional in-service workshops and seminars in EIU for representative teachers and teacher-educators of Asia-Pacific countries. (p. 46)

The Centre has been operating its in-service capacity-building workshops and seminars annually since 2001 directly introducing the field of peace education to an estimated 700 educators. Indirectly many of these educators then introduce peace education to their colleagues. The training workshops have been the cornerstone of APCEIU since its conception.

MY POSITION IN THIS RESEARCH

Having positioned the site of research within the political economy of Korea and the Asia-Pacific
in the introduction, in this section I position myself in this peace research. Some time ago Disraeli wrote (as quoted in Said, 1979) that the East had become a career of many an Occidental mind. Indeed I find myself in such a position here as I write; and you may find contradictions in my writing about East Asia, as there can be no mistake that I, as a North American in relation to UNESCO and the West, have some degree of power and privilege through the political, economic and educational canons that shadow me. I am aware that I come to this research first as an US citizen, and second as an individual educator. However, I argue that such a description is also simplistic. To some degree these distinctions between American and Asian are oversimplified classifications, and postmodern and post-structural literature challenges these essentialisms. In many respects, I live a life – as educator, researcher, social activists, North American and East Asian – of hybridity.9 Faced daily with the complications of living between two worlds, I find my research straddles this same threshold of East and West.

The complexities of the multiple identities (North American / Asian / researcher / educator / man / feminist) within and between Self and Other plays itself out herein. Fairn herising (2005) challenges the idealization that there is a fixed point between oneself and other, or when one is a researcher and when one does research. How is it that we can possibly propose to fully know ourselves, and to write ourselves into a text, toward making transparent our biases as researcher? How and why are the borders of Otherness reinforced in our research and training?

It is my belief, grounded in feminist and qualitative methodologies that writing oneself into a text is an intentional disruption of positivist notions of objectivity, neutrality, disinterest and disembodiment. Maria Mies (1983, p. 121) writes, “The contradictory existential and ideological condition of…scholars must become the starting point for a new methodological approach…In order to make this possible, feminist…must deliberately and courageously integrate their repressed, unconscious…subjectivity…in the research process.” Therefore, I locate myself within this research and generate inquiry on researcher positionality that will weave throughout the chapters of this thesis in an attempt to raise questions of power, position, privilege, and political and social action possibilities. The dualities of the Self demand that I recognize I am

9 To evoke the language of postmodern scholar Homi Bhabha.
both privileged and affected, a man and a feminist, at the Centre and at the Periphery, West and East, North and South.

Here, I draw on Paulo Freire’s notion of knowledge and meaning-making from lived experiences as the starting point for self-awareness and emancipatory action through critical education and personal reflexivity. Hence, I also put forth that the research findings herein are springboards for further analysis and development in the field of peace education toward improved training programs and personal practices.

As my personal experiences have placed me on a trajectory of study and engagement with the East, I aim not to essentialize Asia, to Other the people and contexts half a world away, nor to minimalize the borders that exist between ‘US’ and ‘Them’. Nor do I aim to create a tendentious polemic dictating the horrors of objectification and exoticization of the East, or the ambivalent admiration of the West. My presentation and re-presentation in this chapter of the political and social contexts of East Asia seeks to elucidate the ontological, epistemological, and methodological assumptions I make as a researcher, and how these assumptions are intertwined with my research as an educator, trainer, and activist. I also claim that these are ideas presented herein, as text, and as such note that the power of these ideas lies in a political and educational praxis that brings these concepts forth into practice, policy and reflection. Hence, I intend to recognize borders without succumbing to them in order to re-imagine boundaries within education.

Kant (2003 / 1781) opens his book (*Critique of Pure Reason*) with the declaration:

> That all our knowledge begins with experience there can be no doubt. For how is it possible that the faculty of cognition should be awakened into exercise otherwise than by means of objects which affect our senses…to compare, to connect, or to separate these…into a knowledge of objects, which is called experience? In respect to time therefore, no knowledge of ours is antecedent to experience, but begins with it. (p. 1)

Therefore, my learning and teaching in East Asia, recapitulating in different times and places, composes my personal existential epistemology, a spatio-temporal epistemology found in much
feminist thought (Mies, 1983; McNay, 1992; hooks, 1990; Grewal and Kaplan, 1994). Looking
back now through the eyes of an educator, life-long learner, and critical researcher, I appreciate
my own experiences in Asia and the Americas, and the humble environment in which I grew up
in Appalachian Kentucky, as a series of interconnected and substantial learning moments.

Returning to Kant’s previously mentioned expression, I surmise that he does not mean all
experience leads to knowledge, but he does indicate the tremendous potential of experience to
impact the “educated” mind. And I use “educated” here broadly, not to refer to the “educated” in
the sense of persons holding university qualifications, but to evoke the mind occupied with
thought and reflection, or what might be deemed reflexive individuals. Indeed, Antonio Gramsci
(2000) opines that there are “organic intellectuals”, intellectuals among all socio-economic
classes that philosophize and generate meaning, who challenge the assumption of knowledge,
codified in epistemology and produced and owned by the elite classes. Thus, if it is within
experience that advanced knowledge might originate, and if knowledge might germinate in all
socio-economic conditions, then I offer my standpoint here to situate myself within this research
as an educator, researcher, and activist.

I believe that education is a political act. It is directed toward a specific social purpose. To this
end, as an educator and researcher I have several objectives:

1. To facilitate learning from various texts and contexts, diverse perspectives on global
issues, social movements, democracy and peace
2. To foster learning communities through dialogical processes that are committed to the
study of social justice and peacebuilding, a process that acknowledges and embraces
indigenous and marginalized worldviews and communities
3. To learn through reflection on personal experiences and social conditions, a critical
praxis of popular knowledge, systematic research, and futures envisioning
4. To facilitate learning toward social and political action possibilities, a social justice
agenda for transformative economics, politics, social relations, and sustainability
5. To engage with democracy through doing and to employ nonviolent social action as a
method of public pedagogy
ORGANIZATION OF THESIS

I have organized the thesis around the main goal of assessing the influence of teacher-educator training programs on participants, pedagogy, programmatic design and policy development. This goal fits within the context of identifying common characteristics (and challenges) of peace education programs at Teachers College Columbia University and the United Nations University for Peace, including program form, content, pedagogy, and structure. The goal is explored throughout the thesis and pursued through three primary questions:

1. What content, pedagogy, and form are similar (or different) among various peace education programs?
2. What are enabling conditions and indicators for successful peace education programs?
3. What is the expansive effect of peace education training programs? (Program effect is measured by attitudinal and behavioral changes, the development of peace education programs, and emerging educational policies for education for peace.)

I frame the research through thematic and methodological debates within the field of peace education (Chapter 2), feminist post-structuralism (Chapter 3), and conceptual frameworks of education for peace (Chapter 4). In Chapter 2, I find that a comprehensive review of literature on peace education programs and evaluation reveals a significant lack of literature on the effectiveness of peace education and the expansive effect of what happens after training is completed (Danesh, 2008; Harris, 2003; Nevo and Brem, 2002). I further outline the history and evolution of the APCEIU program from concept to curriculum to teacher-training. Then, to explore methods of peace education program evaluation, I analyze data collected from the 2009 APCEIU training program and offer recommendations for the development of future programs (Chapter 5). In Chapter 6, I assess what impact the project has had on the participants’ work as teacher-trainers, trainers-of-trainers and policy-makers, particularly assessing if they have established (or are in the process of establishing) new peace education projects and programs in
their home countries. Finally, I present conclusions from the APCEIU study and recommendations for future training programs (Chapter 7).

INTRODUCTORY CONCLUSION

I remain inspired by the notion that a better world is possible, that as peace educators attempt to link local and global perspectives for social transformation through learning, teaching, teacher-training, and policy-making, there are ample case-studies that show the power of nonviolent action and education for peace. As points of example, I cite Thoreau’s civil disobedience, Gandhi’s nonviolent salt march, King’s march on DC, The ‘yellow revolution’ of the Philippines, the youth and student-driven OTPOR revolution in Serbia, and in some respects the innovative and community-driven CarrotMobs of today. Many of these examples of nonviolent resistance are documented for educators and practitioners in Gene Sharp’s (1973) *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*. The nonviolent methods together offer inspiration and detailed accounts of the power of collective action and strength of social movements as educative forces.

Following in Chapter 2, I will examine in greater detail the history of peace education, current debates in the field, and educating for cultures of peace and transformative learning, all of which inform the APCEIU training workshops conducted annually in Korea.
CHAPTER 2

Literature Review of Peace Education Programs

At the risk of seeming ridiculous, let me say that the true revolutionary is guided by a great feeling of love. It is impossible to think of a genuine revolutionary lacking this quality. We must strive every day so this love of living humanity will be transformed into actual deeds, into acts that serve as examples, as a moving force.

-- Che Guevara

Peace education is a values-oriented field that aims to cultivate in learners the knowledge, attitudes, skills, and behaviors upon which a culture of peace is predicated (UNESCO, 1995). Reardon (1999) states: “The development of learning that will enable humankind to renounce the institution of war and replace it…with the norms of a peaceful society [as articulated in] the Universal Declaration of Human Rights remains a core of the peace education task” (pp. 31-32). Peace educators teach about contemporary social, political, economic, ecological, and ethical problems, exploring the root causes of each problematique and creating nonviolent social strategies to manage the multiple manifestations of violence. These educators contend that schooling typically emphasizes the mind, intellect and knowledge over compassion and empathy, thereby exacerbating an existing dichotomy between mind-body, subject-object, rationality-emotionality and science-art. This environment of learning fosters, among other things, a gendered space in which the supposed masculine, i.e., intellect, is given privilege over the perceived feminine, i.e., affection. Extrapolations of the mind-body and masculine-feminine divide serve to buttress us-them dualisms that underscore good versus evil discourses of militarism and patriarchy.

Hence, educators for peace seek to nurture international understanding through a process of re-humanization of the Other, across national and gendered borders, and through promoting social and ecological justice that prepares learners for planetary stewardship, global citizenship, and human understanding (Reardon, 1988). Furthermore, peace educators and learners explore together the possible alternatives to conflict that could transform current realities of trauma,
hunger, homelessness and other forms of violence into better futures where resources are shared and conflict is managed nonviolently through multicultural and multilateral partnerships (Boulding, 1988; Hicks, 1988). By fostering the skills necessary to translate an ethics of care (Noddings, 1992) into caring, cooperative, and peaceful behaviors, peace educators seek to nurture cultures of peace and nonviolence that supersede animalistic rationalizing of human violence (Adams, 2000).

In this literature review, I explore research focused on peace education concepts, principles, practices and challenges. I identify disparate and common themes, pedagogies, and training objectives of the multidisciplinary field. Accordingly, this chapter seeks to explore the following questions: What peace education content is similar and differentiated in the various programs? What are the major theoretical and methodological debates animating research in peace education? What substantive gap in the research is worthy of further study?

WHAT IS PEACE EDUCATION?¹⁰

Peace education is part of the larger field of ‘peace and conflict studies,’ which may be subdivided into ‘peace research,’ ‘peace activism,’ and ‘peace education.’ Peace education as a philosophy and practice is found in the work of several educators, including John Dewey and Paulo Freire. These eminent educators especially inform the field of peace education as practiced at the Peace Education Center of Teachers College Columbia University.¹¹ In addition, critical humanist authors, such as Tolstoy and Thoreau, and peace activists, such as Gandhi and King also influenced peace education through their practices of social critique, civil disobedience and active nonviolence. Peace education philosophy is also found in the work of heads of States (e.g. Oscar Arias, His Holiness the Dalai Lama, His Majesty King Hussein of Jordan), authors (e.g. Tolstoy, Thoreau, Emerson), social thinkers (e.g. Mead, Fanon, Foucault), and social learning theorists (e.g. Bandura and Walters).

¹⁰ This chapter includes sections from a thematic paper I published in the Peace and Conflict Review 4(2): 58-67, Spring 2010. The sections are used herein with special permission of the Journal (See Appendix E).
¹¹ See http://www.tc.columbia.edu/Peaceed/.
The growing literature on peace education reflects a dynamic field. Harris (2004) divides peace education into five categories: international education, development education, environmental education, human rights education, and conflict resolution education. Curricula in peace education cover a range of topics, including the history and philosophy of peace education (Reardon, 1988; Burns and Aspeslagh, 1996; Harris and Morrison, 2003), the dialectic between ‘negative’ and ‘positive’ peace (Galtung, 1969; 1996), gender and militarism (Reardon, 1993; 2001), conflict resolution education (Johnson and Johnson, 2006) and the formation of peaceful values in education (Boulding 1988; Toh and Cawagas, 1991).

On nurturing cultures of peace, Sommerfelt and Vambheim (2008) write that peace requires citizens to contain their aggression, exhibit cooperative behavior, and resolve conflicts without violence. Jenkins (2007) illuminates the difference between education about peace and education for peace. Education about peace includes modules on war and peace and leaders of peace movements, such as Gandhi and King. Education for peace, on the other hand, intends to nurture knowledge, values, behaviors and capacities to confront violence.

Peace education as a practice in schools is attributed to Maria Montessori, John Dewey and Paulo Freire, among other scholars, though earlier thought on education for peace can be traced back to Comenius, Erasmus and Socrates. Montessori, in her work, sought to foster peace on three inter-related levels: the individual, community and nation, and the global/cosmos. The individual level relates to person-centered awareness of the self, whereas the community level refers to interpersonal relations, and the global level concerns cultural and environmental consciousness at the level of interaction between States and non-State actors (Montessori, 1949). Dewey, on the other hand, informed peace education through his work on the inter-relationship between education and democracy, stating that one role of education is to foster active citizenship through promoting increased learner participation in processes of democracy; yet, Dewey emphasized that for this to be plausible the education system itself must model democracy in its structures and the human relations it mediates (Dewey, 1916).

Freire (1970) centered education on revealing systems of oppression, particularly through the exploration of language and identity and by challenging the ‘banking-model’ of teaching and
learning. For Freire conscientization, or a praxis of action-reflection-action, involves a process of reflecting on place in this world; this process then informs critical and self-aware action for social justice. All three educators, Montessori, Dewey and Freire sought to create education that was learner-centered, autonomous and participatory. For them, the concept of classroom education represents and directly mirrors social outcomes relevant to the relationship between education and democratic political systems. Hence, autonomous learning relates to individual and national autonomy and democratic classroom participation models active citizenship in a democratic system.

Translating Montessori, Dewey and Freire’s theoretical and conceptual models of critical education into practice, peace education is a problem-posing education that attempts to build in every person the values and behaviors on which a culture of peace is predicated, including the development of non-violent conflict resolution skills and a commitment to working together to realize a shared and preferred future. Many scholars in the field (e.g. Galtung, 1969; Reardon, 1988; Harris, 1988) address violence and the war system as the core problematic inhibiting the development of peace cultures, and they seek to propose viable alternatives to the multiple manifestations of violence, such as poverty, homelessness, wrongful imprisonment, internally-displaced persons, asylum seekers, human rights abuses.

Violence, within the field of peace education, might be defined as “avoidable, intentional harm, inflicted for a purpose or perceived advantage of the perpetrator or of those who, while not direct perpetrators, are, however, advantaged by the harm” (Reardon, 2001, p. 35). In this respect, education for peace seeks to raise dialogue on critical issues at the heart of the community in order to transform oppressive systems from a violent orientation toward a culture of peace. Thus, through education for peace, educators and students critically discuss manifestations of, and justifications for, violence; they identify the actors involved and propose peaceful futures (Boulding, 1988; Hicks, 1994).

Peace education includes the cultivation of peacebuilding skills. Some of these skills are dialogue, negotiation, mediation, alternative dispute resolution, artistic conflict resolution, and active listening. Peace educators also teach the values of respect, understanding, and
nonviolence, present skills for analyzing international conflict, educate for alternative security systems, and use a pedagogy that is democratic and participatory. Thus, peace education as a practice and philosophy refers to matching complementary elements between education and society, where the social purposes, why we teach, match the content, what we teach, and pedagogy, how we teach, of the educative process. Each of these components must be mutually conducive toward fostering peace cultures. Accordingly, peace education is an emancipatory dialogical experience conducted through participatory learning, where learners cooperatively grapple with contemporary issues relevant to their local and global contexts.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF PEACE EDUCATION

Though peace education has been practiced for centuries and has roots in European philosophical thought the field became institutionalized largely in the 1950s and 1960s in Western Europe and the United States. Johan Galtung, a Norwegian mathematician and sociologist, who is often credited as the ‘Father of Peace Studies’, is in many ways responsible for the mobilization of peace educators at this time. Galtung founded the International Peace Research Institute (PRIO) in 1959, which in 1964 began the first academic journal devoted to peace studies, the *Journal of Peace Research*. In 1964, Galtung also co-founded the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), which today houses the influential *Journal of Peace Education* and includes the Peace Education Commission. As a scholar, Galtung is perhaps most famous for formulating the dialectic between ‘negative peace’, or the absence of war, and ‘positive peace’, which is the presence of cultural values and institutional practices that sustain peace cultures and the creation of mechanisms for resolving conflict nonviolently (Galtung, 1988, 1996).

During the same time Galtung was initiating the movement for peace research in Europe, several educators in the United States were mobilizing networks and organizations for peace in North America. Notable among these academics are Kenneth Boulding, Elise Boulding and Betty Reardon. Kenneth and Elise Boulding – an economist and sociologist, respectively – were active Quakers and peace activists of the late 20th Century. The Bouldings, along with Johan Galtung, were instrumental in the development of IPRA, and especially important in gaining its
consultative status to the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). Elise Boulding served on the Congressional panel that led to the creation of the United States Institute of Peace (USIP) in Washington, D.C., an institute that is responsible today for numerous conflict resolution programs in public schools across the United States (Morrison, 2005).

Many contemporary scholars also cite Betty Reardon of Teachers College Columbia University as the ‘Mother of Peace Education’, particularly as a leading pioneer in the design of education for peace programs within higher education (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993; Harris, 2004). Whereas Galtung and Kenneth and Elise Boulding conducted peace research and parented civil society organizations for peace activism within the community, Reardon sought to construct formal education programs. She oversaw the establishment of the peace education concentration in Master’s degree programs at Teachers College Columbia University in 1981 and also founded the International Institute for Peace Education (IIPE) in 1982. IIPE annually brings together researchers, educators, and activists across the globe to study peace and conflict issues in local learning communities worldwide. Reardon was also instrumental in the formation of the movement for the Global Campaign for Peace Education at the Hague Appeal for Peace Education civil society conference in 1999. She served as a lead consultant in the formation of the MA program in Peace Education at the United Nations University for Peace in Costa Rica and is an active author today.  

Concurrently in East Asia, Professors Swee-hin Toh and Virginia Cawagas played a central role in the development of peace education programs in the Philippines, South Korea, and Australia. They are professors who have taught and consulted with Universities and UN organizations in the Philippines, Australia, China, South Korea, Japan, Thailand, Canada, and Costa Rica. Today Professors Toh and Cawagas teach at the United Nations University for Peace. For Toh’s work in the field, he received the 2000 UNESCO Prize for Peace Education. Both Toh and Cawagas were instrumental in the development of APCEIU and the peace education capacity-building workshops.

Since 1945, there have been many achievements in the field of peace and conflict studies, including the successes of nonviolent movements in India, the US, Bosnia, and the Philippines. The creation of national Departments and Ministries of Peace in the Solomon Islands, Nepal and Costa Rica, and the adoption of conflict resolution curricula in counties across the US and Canada, and in the entire education systems of Uganda and India, point to the growing salience of peace education and activism across the world. The first peace studies program in the US was established at Manchester College in Indiana in 1948, and in the 1960s McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario, began the first peace and conflict studies program in Canada. Today, there are over 200 peace education programs, broadly defined,\(^\text{13}\) at universities and independent research and training centers worldwide.

**PEACE EDUCATION: A MULTIDISCIPLINARY FIELD**

There are multiple perspectives concerning peace and a number of conceptual frameworks that mirror these differing paradigms. For example, Burns and Aspeslagh (1996) organize peace education around five common themes: the international system, peace, development, human rights, and the environment. Harris (2004) divides the field into five general themes: international education, development education, environmental education, human rights education, and conflict resolution education. Toh (2004) conceptualizes the field through six themes: dismantling the culture of war, environmental peace, education for justice and compassion, human rights education, cultivating intercultural solidarity, and harnessing inner peace. And Hicks (2004) organizes peace education around issues of non-violence, human rights, social justice, world-mindedness, ecological balance, meaningful participation, and personal peace.

Of these different approaches to peace education, it is clear that three themes are interwoven throughout: eco-peace, international studies, and human rights. Hicks (2004) and Toh (2004)

---

\(^{13}\) This includes peace and conflict studies, conflict resolution, and peace education programs. The estimate of 200 + is an amalgam of information from the Global Campaign for Peace Education newsletter and the Peace and Collaborative Development Network, [http://www.internationalpeaceandconflict.org/](http://www.internationalpeaceandconflict.org/).
additionally include inner peace, or personal peace. These four themes combined represent the various levels of peace education as described by Maria Montessori (1949/1995), discussed earlier in this chapter. Human rights are the international normative documents through which these levels of peace are articulated and supposedly protected by national, regional and international courts.

A review of major works in the field reflects this varied content. Consider four major edited volumes of the past two decades:

- *Peace Education: Global Perspectives* (Bjerstedt, 1993)
- *Three Decades of Peace Education Around the World* (Burns and Aspeslagh, 1996)
- *Transforming Education for Peace* (Lin, Brantmeier, and Bruhn, 2008)

These volumes express general trends of the field. For example, all but one of these books are published in the United States (the other is Swedish), and the titles articulate the comprehensive and global scope of peace education. Furthermore, an observer notices the transition from ‘peace education’ to ‘education for peace’ in the titles. This is indicative of an important change that has developed in the field over the past 30 years. In earlier years, peace education was concerned with education about peace, or sharing knowledge about histories and peacemakers; and, in later years the field became equally interested in education for peace, or the capacity of education to cultivate in students peacemaking skills and dispositions (Jenkins, 2007). Thus peace education complements knowledge content with peace pedagogy. This is also articulated in the various UN Decades since the 1970s.

Reading through the chapters in the above volumes shows a preference toward describing the subject of peace education, drawing on examples globally – especially from Japan, Northern Ireland, the US, and Middle East – and infusing ecology into peace education. Each of the volumes includes a chapter or two on Japan, except Salomon and Nevo (2002) who maintain a
focus on Europe, Africa and the Middle East. The emphasis on the Middle East is largely in the edited volumes published after 9/11, which coincides with national emphases on North American and Middle Eastern cooperation and understanding post-9/11.\textsuperscript{14}

A read through the volumes leaves the impression that peace education is a fairly new phenomenon. As already expressed earlier, however, peace education has been practiced by isolated individuals and peace societies for centuries and was especially prevalent in North America in the 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} Centuries (Stomfay-Stitz, 1993). During this time peace activists sought to prevent the US from joining WWI in Europe, promoted international exchange after WWII, sought to end the Vietnam War, raised awareness of US and Canadian military action in Latin America in the 1980s-1990s, and challenged the presence of NATO troops in the Balkans in the 1990s.

In Canada, Quebecers also resisted conscription in WWI and there was a popular education movement in Eastern Canada, called the Antigonish Movement, led by Moses Coady and Jimmy Thompkins, that challenged the economic and social dominance of large mining, banking and housing corporations at the time. The Antigonish movement led to the establishment of many co-operatives and credit unions in Eastern Canada and generated confidence in the people that they could be \textit{masters of their own destiny} (Coady, 1939), thus detaching themselves from the manufactured dependence on economic industries of that time. These movements represent, on the one hand, peace activism, and on the other, peace education. It was through collective education processes, both formal and non-formal, that the movements matured to nurture coherence and cohesiveness.

Recent publications in the field have turned focus to terrorism and foreign policy. This change has evolved in part because of contemporary events and also due to criticisms that many peace educators omit critical discussions of national policy from their teaching and learning. Some peace educators would posit that this reflects school and statewide emphases on conflict resolution education in place of peace education, where conflict resolution education often

\textsuperscript{14} This is easily detected through observing trends in US governmental scholarships, for example, Fulbright grants, Boden fellowships, and scholarships offered by the Department of Homeland Security.
pertains to the development of interpersonal communication and nonviolent skills. Peace education, on the other hand, concerns an orientation toward global citizenship and critiques of the war system (Harris, 2008). Carl Mirra (2008) indeed writes about the need for a critical analysis of US foreign policy in peace education. He contends there is probably a connection between the US use of force against enemies and the use of aggression by citizens. Consider, for instance, that on the same day that the Columbine High School massacre occurred in Denver, Colorado, the US air force was bombing Bosnia. Mirra might well argue the implication is that how individuals learn to employ violence interpersonally correlates to the State’s use of force and vice versa. This would indicate a substantial need for education to unpack this relationship.

Conceptually, there have been many frameworks developed to mirror the comprehensive and holistic nature of the field of peace education. Four such models include the Learning to Abolish War model (Reardon and Cabezudo, 2002) based on the 1999 Hague Agenda for Peace, the Integral Model for Peace Education (Brenes, 2004), the Flower-Petal Model (Toh & Cawagas, 1993; Toh, 2004), and the Framework for the Master of Arts Program in Peace Education at the United Nations University for Peace (Jenkins, 2004). Two of the models will be discussed in Chapter 4 when conceptual frameworks for peace education are explored. In another article analyzing the various peace education models (Kester, 2008), I offer an in-depth review of each of these frameworks in the process of outlining a course of action for developing peace education programs in high schools and undergraduate institutions. I propose that the aim of the amalgamated program is to cultivate a culture of respect and peaceful coexistence based on peace content, cooperative pedagogy and a whole-school approach to educating for cultures of peace.

**EDUCATION FOR PEACE: VALUES AND INQUIRY-BASED TEACHING AND LEARNING**

Education for peace begins with ontological and epistemological questions of the meaning of life, our place within society, and our agency largely within civil, social, cultural, political, ecological, spiritual, and economic structures of human organization. Students in peace studies
raise inquiry around questions of: Who am I? How do I identify myself? What, if anything, represents me? To what communities do I belong? What is community? How do members define community? What are the assets of a community? What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats to a particular community? How do I solve conflicts? How do I involve myself with others in my community? What are examples of conflict and peacebuilding in my community, and how do I harness the potential encapsulated within conflict to transform it? How do I define violence? How do I justify violence? When do I use violent or peaceful means? How is violence and peace taught? What are alternatives to violence? How do I define peace? How does society define peace? What are the implications of these definitions? What is the relationship between peace education, peace research and peace activism?

These questions are examples of the inquiry-based methodology and reflective practice that forms education for peace. Epistemologically, peace education focuses on the relationship between learning, violence, and cultures of peace. How do I learn? What do I learn? Who teaches the content? How is it taught? Who supports the content? In what spaces is peace learned? In what spaces is violence learned? What is done with the learning? Where do we go from here?

Many of my students begin courses with the cynicism that the idea of creating peace is naive and impossible. They perceive peace as a utopian concept rooted in the ideals of social harmony, quietude and passivity. Herein lies the problematic: that on the one hand society perceives peace as silent and non-confrontational, yet for practitioners in the field of peace studies, peacebuilding is dynamic, active and potentially agitating to the status quo. Peace education is not necessarily education for activism, though its intent is to create an informed, active and engaged citizenry, where civic participation and citizen decision-making form a strong community and a healthy democracy.

The process of peace education could be described as a process of revealing worldviews, values, biases and unmasking the intent behind education, though many educators maintain that education is neutral, not a political activity. Freire (1970), however, and many other peace educators (Reardon, 1988; Burns and Aspelagh, 1996; Jenkins, 2007; Kester, 2008) contend that
by the very nature that education has objectives and social purposes it intends to foster among youth and adults, education is a political act. The questions asked by educators direct learning in a particular direction, whether that direction be religious, homophobic, ‘color-blind’, exclusionary, progressive, neoliberal, militaristic. The lessons educators choose to direct guides the classroom discussion toward a specific sphere of experience, or social purpose, suggesting that is impossible to divorce from the objectives of education that are grounded in the hopes, aspirations, worldviews and agendas of those developing and delivering the curriculum.

To counter claims of ‘neutral’ education, critical social theorists and critical pedagogues (Apple, 1969; Freire, 1970; Giroux, 1981, 2006; McLaren, 1989) contend that by claiming education as a neutral process many ‘neutral’ educators indoctrinate learners through education that is in fact education for capitalism, market-ideology, competition, violence, neoliberalism and greed without allowing students to question the masked agenda. These are the values behind a ‘neutral’ education that are also the dominant values of society. They therefore seem neutral. Peace education, on the other hand, is overt in its intentions to confront, understand, and resist violence. Because peace education is clear in its objectives, it is not a process of indoctrination (Mayor, 2005). Peace education does not pour knowledge into the minds of students or tell students what to do, who to vote for, or how to shop. Nor does peace education utilize a system of experts who come into the classroom and tell students what to think. Peace education helps learners begin to raise questions and gives students the tools they need to direct their learning. It is in its critical form an education about how to learn, not what to learn.

Inquiry-led education helps motivate learners to raise questions themselves, and become reflective and active learners. Engagement with issues at the core of contemporary society is the message students receive as they begin to ask critical questions in the classroom and participate actively in their communities. Students come to understand that the medium—the structure of learning—is the message. Some of the lessons students learn are to value a variety of points of view, be confident, speak up, share opinions in a respectful way, resolve conflict dialogically, and reflect critically. Through this inquiry-based method of learning, sharing of personal knowledge and experiences, asking critical questions, and listening actively to others, students experience a range of thoughts and perspectives on cultural understanding, non-violent
communication and conflict management. Youth and adults begin to see old events, peoples, experiences and structures in a new light. They may begin to question their previous assumptions, values and worldviews. This is transformative learning. Reflection and dialogue transforms the way students see themselves, their communities, the world, and their agency within these structures. The dialogue and reflection is grounded in social and political theories of educators, political scientists, environmentalists, practitioners and philosophers, such as Immanuel Kant (2005/1795), John Dewey (1916), Maria Montessori (1949), Paulo Freire (1970), Kenneth and Elise Boulding (1988), David Bohm (1996), Betty Reardon (1988, 2001), and Vandana Shiva (2005).

Finally, the classroom, its relationship between learning, socialization, culture and conflict, and the use of a specific value-laden pedagogy to achieve a desired result is central to cultivating an informed and engaged public. Education for peace, thus, includes participatory pedagogy and dialogue that more fully reflects the intended outcome of education for peace. The most appropriate path toward this democratic objective is through learner-centered inquiry and democratic pedagogy (Dewey, 1916; Freire, 1970; Reardon and Cabezudo, 2002; Schugurensky, 2004). Classrooms must be spaces of multi-way, inter-generational, inter-cultural, pan-economic dialogue that introduces learners to new modes of thought, rather than sites of superficial discussions, memorization and information absorption that anesthetizes education (Kester, 2007).

**TOWARDS TRANSFORMATIVE LEARNING AND CULTURES OF PEACE**

Since the late 1980s, several educators have amalgamated various dimensions of peace education under the umbrella term ‘culture of peace’ (Adams, 1989; 2000; Boulding, 2000; Goodman, 2002). In this view, the overarching goal of education for peace is more than the reduction of violence but the transformation of mindsets that emphasize cultures of war. Through a culture of peace lens, peace educators explore cultural violence more deeply and aim to transform cultures of violence to cultures of peace. To realize this aspiration peace education programs purposefully educate for critical awareness, cultural solidarity, empowerment, and transformation toward peace cultures, creating students who are responsible citizens, open to other cultures, respectful
of differences, and able to resolve conflicts nonviolently (Kester, 2008). In respect to the transformation of a culture of war to a culture of peace, UNESCO describes a culture of peace as:

a set of values, attitudes, traditions and modes of behavior and ways of life based on, among others, respect for life, ending of violence and promotion and practice of non-violence through education, dialogue and cooperation; full respect for and promotion of all human rights and fundamental freedoms; commitment to peaceful settlement of conflicts; and adherence to the principles of freedom, justice, democracy, tolerance, solidarity, cooperation, pluralism, cultural diversity, dialogue and understanding at all levels of society and among nations. (UNESCO, n.d.)

An important document that grounds the movement for cultures of peace is *The Seville Statement on Violence* (Adams, 1989). Building on the pioneering work of Margaret Mead, *The Seville Statement* is a declaration by psychologists and medical practitioners that violence is not an innate characteristic of the human condition. In essence these practitioners are challenging the biological fatalism that premises many people’s justifications for violent conflict, defense spending and fear of the Other. The Seville Statement encompasses five scientific propositions (p. 1):

1. It is scientifically incorrect to say that we have inherited a tendency to make war from our animal ancestors,
2. It is scientifically incorrect to say that war or any other violent behavior is genetically programmed into our human nature,
3. It is scientifically incorrect to say that in the course of human evolution there has been a selection for aggressive behavior more than for other kinds of behavior,
4. It is scientifically incorrect to say that humans have a 'violent brain',
5. It is scientifically incorrect to say that war is caused by 'instinct' or any single motivation

In this vein Mikhail Gorbachev, as quoted in Adams (ibid, p. 1), stated:
When disarmament is discussed a common thesis is that man is violent by nature and that war is a manifestation of human instinct. Is war the perpetual concomitant of human existence then? If we accept this view, we shall have to reconcile ourselves with continuous development and accumulation of ever more sophisticated weapons of mass destruction. Such thinking is unacceptable. It is reminiscent of times when more sophisticated weapons were invented and used to conquer other peoples and enslave and pillage them. That past is no model for the future.

Adams (1989) goes on to declare that the *Seville Statement* “confronts an active resistance in the mass media and related social institutions more than it confronts an inherent ignorance or 'psychological inertia' in ordinary people. The myth that war is part of human nature does not appear to be so much an inherent component of 'common sense' so much as it is the end result of a campaign of psychological propaganda that has been promulgated in the mass media in order to justify political policies of militarism” (p. 8).

As Gorbachev said ‘That past is no model for the future.’ In this respect, peace educators and students seek to propose alternative futures (Boulding, 1988; Hicks, 1988, 2004) through asking: Where are we now? Where did we come from? How did we get here? Where do we want to go? And how do we get there? This type of education is transformative learning (Berry, 1988, 1999; O’Sullivan, 1999). Transformative learning is a deep cultural and philosophical adjustment through which peoples come to see life and living through new lenses. Values and attitudes are transformed, for example, from competition, consumerism and a-historicism to cooperation and shared resources, and through this transformation new possibilities begin to emerge for a society based on common principles, needs, interests and shared visions. O’Sullivan (1999) writes: “Truly, we live in a momentous time of survival and we are in desperate need of a broad historical system of interpretation to grasp our present situation. Although we cannot predict the future, we must nevertheless make educated guesses about where our present state of affairs is leading” (p. 16).

Anne Goodman, Professor of Community-Based Peacebuilding at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, writes that the culture of peace encompasses diverse and integrally connected projects and actions as well as the principles that underscore the
work of peacemakers. She contends that working to abolish nuclear weapons, generating alternative sustainable energy, challenging the global market economy, working toward disarmament, conducting conflict resolution in conflict zones, working for more democratic political institutions, advocating for more women in decision-making roles at all levels of political and economic institutions, and trying to get peace education into schools, are all part of working and teaching for cultures of peace. Goodman delineates between the “official” and “unofficial” aspects of cultures of peace (Goodman, 2002, pp. 187-188). She explains that the official cultures of peace mission is outlined and promulgated by UNESCO and the UN, while unofficial components are driven by grassroots efforts in local communities such as peace gardens, peace circles, peace zones, advocacy networks, and local educators for peace. Examples of these regional networks include the Canadian Voice of Women and the anti-nuclear movements of the past 60 years in North America and particularly Japan, or the civil society movement for democracy in South Korea during the 1970s and 80s.

In fact, ‘unofficial’ realms of peace education have evolved radically over the past 60 years. Consider, for example, the current civil society initiative in Canada for a Canadian Department for Peace15 and the much larger Global Campaign for Peace Education.16 Peace movements are all around us. And, as the field is growing dramatically, there is an increasing demand for investigation into whether peace education programs are having a positive impact on learners and contributing to more peaceful individuals and societies. While Bickmore (2002) and Johnson and Johnson (1996) cautiously conclude that conflict resolution programs do decrease levels of violence in schools, Nevo and Brem (2002), Harris (2003, 2008), and Danes (2008) all argue that greater program evaluation is needed to ensure that peace education programs are effective.

In Chapter 3, I will introduce peace education evaluation literature, outline enabling conditions for successful programs, describe my research methodology, and explore the relationship between anti-oppressive research and critical peace education practice.

15 See http://www.departmentofpeace.ca/. As expressed previously, movements for departments of peace are growing in numerous countries. Departments of peace have already been established in Nepal, the Solomon Islands, and Costa Rica.
CHAPTER 3

Peace Education Evaluation Methodology

*If we are revolutionaries, we are revolutionary artists, not gunmen.*

--- John Lennon and Yoko Ono

In the first two chapters I presented the political economy of East Asia and a literature review of peace education philosophy, concepts, and practices. This chapter reviews literature on peace education evaluation and articulates my research methodology and methods within an epistemology of anti-oppressive research. The section on peace education evaluation and methods includes a documentary analysis of existing works in the field. The literature review reveals information from a variety of sources, including UNESCO Associated-Schools Projects (Churchill and Omari, 1981), EURED (2002), Nevo and Brem (2002), Fountain (1999), Mika (2002), Harris (2003, 2008), UNICEF (1995), and UNESCO-APPEAL (2001).

**PEACE EDUCATION EVALUATION LITERATURE AND METHODS**

Churchill and Omari (1981, p. 101-105), on evaluating UNESCO Associated-Schools Projects in Mauritania, Argentina, Colombia, the Philippines, Japan, Poland, and Germany, found that most programs focused impressively on cross-cultural correspondence, exchange of teaching materials, and teacher/student exchanges between countries. The evaluation participants concluded that more international education is needed in the curriculum, with disarmament contained as a theme of the lessons. More realistic books and films ending with open-ended questions were cited, and the educators said increased work for attitudinal changes should be part of curricula and pedagogy. The evaluation participants also stated their desire for more international links to be established between educators and institutes. This, they argued, would be beneficial for international education. The educators also declared that greater emphasis on affective education should be introduced into curricula to complement cognitive learning. Churchill and Omari (ibid) conclude:
The Associated Schools activities should be characterized by a strong component of self-evaluation, the result of which should show both the strengths and weaknesses of teaching practices. This evaluative material on teaching practices should then be utilized broadly through direct personal contacts between educators and through systematized dissemination and diffusion. In short, the aim is to create a system of sharing knowledge – both experiential and scientific – on how to prepare young people to live in a world where peace is a conquest built on cooperation. (p. 107)

The EURED teacher-training model (2002) argues that action research, a method of educator self-evaluation, may be a model of program/teacher evaluation acceptable for it allows for constant adaptation, which is an important component of peace education programs since the state of the field changes so rapidly today. EURED relies on a model of self-reflection developed by Ben Chetkov-Yanoov that assesses learning objectives for teachers, including “getting to know oneself: self-understanding with respect to one’s own attitudes to violence and peace; getting to know the subject: knowledge about the factors of war and peace and peace education; and learning to communicate the subject: objectives and methods of peace education” (EURED, 2002, p. 29). This approach also lends itself to an educational praxis of educator ‘conscientization’ based on a practice of reflection-action-reflection (Freire, 1970). Accordingly, educators should remain vigilant – through personal reflection rather than professional observation – of how they are practicing peace in and beyond teacher-training to ensure a holistic practice of peace education in their lives.

Nevo and Brem (2002) summarized a body of research on peace education programs, broadly defined, that were conducted from 1981-2000. The publications were identified through a search of PsyLit, ERIC, and peace education websites. They began by categorizing programs into ‘facets’ pertaining to the purposes of programs, age of participants, didactic approaches, duration of programs, research design and methods of measurement. The most important findings echoed the conclusions of Churchill and Omari (1981): that not enough attention in peace education programs is given to behavioral development. Most programs, on the contrary, appeal to rationality, not emotions. Few programs work with participants beyond one year, and most evaluations of programs conclude that they are effective. Additionally, Nevo and Brem (2002)
found that programs that attempt to reduce violence are less effective than other peace education programs that might emphasize intercultural understanding. Programs that are shorter with a total duration counted in weeks and months are more effective than longer programs that extend beyond a year. These findings have serious implications for the APCEIU program, a brief intercultural contact program for diverse educators.

Furthermore, Mika (2002) and UNESCO-APPEAL (2001) call for assessment processes to be used as learning tools. In other words, rather than assessing through tests and questionnaires alone, facilitators and program managers could monitor learning through a variety of teaching and reflection techniques. These methods might include posters and drawings, group discussions, role-plays, situational analysis, learning games, or portfolios. The UNESCO-APPEAL handbook states:

One way to make assessment less stressful is to involve learners in the assessing themselves. It is possible to design enjoyable assessment techniques where facilitator and learner both contribute… Group discussions, role-plays and demonstrations are some of the user-friendly techniques that are alternatives to pen and paper tests. (2001, p. 11)

Hence, many peace education programs conceive of evaluation in terms of program objectives, curriculum assessment, creative instruction methods, and reflecting on personal transformation. Evaluation is often conducted through the identification of peace education indicators and learners’ formative and summative evaluations of programs. Fountain (1999) states that peace education evaluation might include surveys, questionnaires, interviews, focus groups, observations and reviews of school records. These data collection methods focus on – as is often the case with peace education programs – qualitative and ethnographic methods. Such methods are appropriate to comprehensively evaluate students’ attitudinal and behavioral changes.

In a personal conversation, noted peace educator Ian Harris17 explained to me that evaluating peace education programs is a complex endeavor, because it pertains to non-measurable attitudinal and behavioral changes among learners. The clearest measurement, he said, would be

through questionnaires, interviews and observations – though an educator could quantify whether the program reached its knowledge objectives through quantitative surveys (also reflected in Harris, 2008).

Thus, student reflections, observations and school records could help identify whether these attitudinal and behavioral changes have taken place. Again, this approach emphasizes active and participatory pedagogy as a means of teaching and learning that is appropriate to the democratic ideals of peace education (Dewey, 1916; Reardon and Cabezudo, 2002). This type of pedagogy is most likely to assist in the observational assessment of attitudinal, behavioral, and value changes – though it should be noted here that not all value and behavioral changes are desired, nor do educators expect to change students quickly (Harris, 2003). In fact, sometimes educators may wish to enhance or support the peaceful behaviors students already exhibit.

The *Integrated framework on education for peace, human rights and democracy* (UNESCO, 1995) states:

> The ultimate goal of education for peace, human rights and democracy is the development in every individual of a sense of universal values and types of behavior on which a culture of peace is predicated. It is possible to identify even in different socio-cultural contexts values that are likely to be universally recognized…Education must develop the ability of non-violent conflict-resolution. It should therefore promote also the development of inner peace in the minds of students so that they can establish more firmly the qualities of tolerance, compassion, sharing and caring. (Section 2)

UNICEF Egypt (1995) provides behavioral indicators for programs. The program categorizes behavioral indicators as *knowledge* objectives, *skill* objectives, and *attitude* objectives. The *knowledge* objectives include knowledge of prevailing gender norms and stereotypes with indicators such as participants labeling the concept of stereotype when presented with bias and giving examples of prejudices. The *skill* objectives include development of communication skills, including attentive and active listening, restating the events of a story, refraining from creative liberty (e.g. changing the actual events of the story), and paraphrasing concepts back to the speaker. The *attitude* objectives include willingness to take action including indicators such
as knowing one’s agency and control over things in one’s environments (e.g. personal and natural environments), identifying range of choices in the face of conflict, choosing constructive and collaborative action, and expressing satisfaction with having taken action and achieving the desired outcomes. If these attitudinal and behavioral indicators are witnessed among students during and after the program (measured against pre-tests and post-tests), then it is possible to quantify changes among learning participants in the evaluation of programs.

Beyond changes in attitudes and behaviors, other scholars emphasize the use of critical, empowering, and transformative peace education pedagogy as an exigency toward learning for peace (Hicks, 1988; Toh and Cawagas, 1993; O’Sullivan, 1999). In this purview the emphasis is on monitoring pedagogy, not students.

In accordance with the above discussion, Churchill and Omari (1981) provide a list of criteria for program evaluation that seeks to assess programs in relation to peace education program goals, indicators, student learning, teacher skills and associational networks. Churchill and Omari propose a general criteria for evaluation that monitors the education program’s “relevancy and worth of the projects in the light of evolving needs,” consistency with peace education objectives as recorded in the “original project objectives” and the realization of programmatic guidelines from the “UNESCO recommendation concerning education for international understanding” (p. 11) They also question the “worth of the activities in relation to expenditures (financial and human), taking into account eventual opportunity costs to participants” (ibid). Finally, Churchill and Omari assess criteria indicating the worth of the program to participants. They ask how the program has increased positive effects on participating schools, education in the country, international relations and UNESCO programs in Member States. Their model follows:

1. Participating schools:
   (a) student learning and attitudes
   (b) teacher skills and development
   (c) community relationships around the school
2. **Education in the country:**
   (a) educators’ attitudes toward education for international understanding
   (b) educators’ attitudes toward education innovation and changes
   (c) impact on official policy and curriculum and syllabi
   (d) influence on community attitudes and relationships

3. **International relations in the country:**
   (a) establishing links between schools and educators in different countries
   (b) developing information channels between UNESCO and countries concerned

4. **UNESCO programs in Member States:**
   (a) developing knowledge and support for UNESCO within countries and communities

**ENABLING FACTORS OF SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS**

There are also a number of enabling factors that support successful programs for international understanding and peacebuilding. Program designers and educators may draw on these enabling conditions to ensure effective peace education programs. Gordon Allport (1954), for example, in his *contact hypothesis*, discusses under what conditions prejudice is reduced and mutual understanding fostered. He posits that conditions necessary for inter-group contact to be effective include (a) supportive environment, (b) equal status among participants, (c) close and sustained contact, and (d) cooperation. In other words, trainers and participating members of the learning community need to be committed, they must take full moral and financial responsibility for the training, the physical and ecological environment in which the learning takes place must support the goals of the program. For the training to have a lasting effect, members of the larger community, other departments in the school, community organizations, also need to reflect the goals and values of training (Feuerverger, 2001).
This is, of course, an ideal situation. However, where it is likely that not all of these factors will be present, for example, financial stability, it is necessary that some are, such as support of the larger educational community. Also, it is paramount that members of the learning community are regarded as equals. After a supporting environment and equal status has been created, it is then possible to have close prolonged contact to foster international understanding and cooperation. A common goal and sense of purpose will assist in fostering a cooperative learning community. I would also assert that at least one important element is missing from Allport’s model: (e) the revelation and dialogue on power dynamics present in learning communities which mirror greater societal norms and institutions.¹⁸

Tal-Or, Boninger, and Gleicher (2002) emphasize how the recognition of multiple forms of identity may form peaceful environments where learners begin to reconstitute notions of in-group and out-group, consequently raising inquiry into concepts of the other, as in Muslim and Hindu, or White and Black, that may or may not lead to the production of super-ordinate identities. They describe super-ordinate identities where Black and White share identities as US citizens, or Muslim and Hindu share a South Asian identity. These super-ordinate identities when facilitated well may lead to discussions of shared values and common futures, where once competitors might become cooperators. Arie Nadler (2002, p. 137-138) also highlights enabling factors of successful peacebuilding, appropriate for the peace education learning space, that include (a) deliberately designed equality, (b) interpersonal trust, (c) awareness and respect for the various cultural beliefs and practices present in the training, and (d) addressing real, pressing, and common problems. Adler, therefore, includes the need to include “real and common problems” in the training. This ensures contextually relevant training.

There are myriad ways to ensure that these enabling factors are met and to facilitate a type of learning environment conducive to peacebuilding, as highlighted above by Churchill and Omari (1981), Nevo and Brem (2002), and UNICEF (1995). For example, facilitators could use dialogue circles to foster equality and trust and to deconstruct assumptions of the Other (Bohm, 1996), and conduct experiential learning through the use of theatre to develop trust among

¹⁸ In this regard, the work of peace educator Mohammed Abu-Nimer is very important in dealing with contact across power differentials.
participants (Boal, 1992). Educators could use the jigsaw teaching technique to manufacture a sense of equal status and responsibility among learners, where learners share responsibilities. Facilitators could also employ futures-envisioning activities to define shared values and common visions for the future (Boulding, 1988; Hicks, 1988). The activities included here, along with the enabling factors, program goals, and cumulative learning from previous peace education evaluations, could help create sound education for peace programs in the future. These evaluation measures pertain to the successful implementation of program objectives, educator pedagogy and learning by students. I am proposing not only to assess the capacity to implement the APCEIU program, but also the medium-term impact the program has had on learners. I explore this in Chapter 6.

ANTIO-OPPRESSIVE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

My work as an educator and researcher is informed by multiple research traditions, such as critical theory, post-structuralism, Marxist humanism, post-modernism, and feminism, and I maintain that to borrow from and move between these traditions (Sandoval, 2000), rather than subscribing to one alone, allows for greater critique and nuance within questionnaire formation and analysis. Patton (1990) writes:

A paradigm of choices rejects methodological orthodoxy in favor of methodological appropriateness as the primary criterion for judging methodological quality. The issue then becomes not whether one has uniformly adhered to prescribed canons of either logical-positivism or phenomenology but whether one has made sensible methods decisions given the purpose of the inquiry, the questions being investigated, and the resources available. (p. 39)

To be ideologically bound to one school of thought would hinder a more complete analysis of the complexities involved within the research and human relationships. To this end, my study is encompassed within research assumptions that emanate from anti-oppressive methodologies, including:
1. All knowledge is socially constructed and political
2. Learning occurs in process and form as much as content and results
3. Conflict is potentially a positive process and offers the possibility of growth and new ways of being in the world
4. Critical teaching and research is about power and relationships
5. Anti-oppressive research is social-justice oriented

Pott and Brown (2005) write about the social-justice orientation, “as an anti-oppressive researcher, we are social justice activists, not only in the placard-waving sense, but also in the sense of making a personal commitment to action, of purposefully working to make change for individuals, communities, and institutions” (p. 260). To work in this regard, educators must be critical in orientation and empowered at the personal and collective levels to act. I realize, however, that educators are only autonomous and mobile insomuch as they relate to different worldviews, practices, and institutional limitations.

Butler (2004) states, concerning relationships, “to persist in one’s own being is only possible on the condition that we are engaged in receiving and offering recognition. If we are not recognizable…then it is not possible to persist in one’s own being, and we are not possible beings; we have been foreclosed from possibility” (p. 31). This echo of Butler’s earlier work on performativity relates to Gramsci’s notion of hegemony and social classes in that our personal and collective becoming happens as a site of congruence between multiple social, economic, and political forces. For Gramsci, and other cultural theorists, for example, Spivak & Bhabha, and educationists, such as Giroux & McLaren, cultural studies is an intervention across the dividing lines of domination and subjugation, social justice work and practicality, or autonomy and program regulations.

There is added nuance in which cultural studies complements Freire’s Pedagogy of the Oppressed in that educators recognize and unpack their co-participation with oppressive forces, and likewise free their personal and collective agency from the bonds of entropy; entropy fettered in victimization and helplessness. This is useful for my anti-oppressive analysis of educational training programs. In other words, I must take into account the complicity of the
academy, universities and UNESCO, in perpetuating social classes and reproducing subaltern positionalities, or conversely promoting emancipatory and transformative actions.

In this regard, Johan Galtung coined the term “structural violence” in 1975, when he noted that violence, beyond the physical, is institutionalized and insidious. He argues that violence continues in so-called times of peace when it is more difficult to identify, to put one’s hand on. Thus, structural violence refers to institutional policies and cultural norms that exclude certain groups of people from political, economic and social development. Discussing structural violence here, I present it here in accompaniment to direct violence.

Galtung describes violence itself as the tension between what is possible and what is real. When speaking of direct violence, he is talking about war-making and abuse, acts which are numbered in injuries, trauma, deaths, and body-counts. Structural violence, on the other hand, is more difficult to quantify, but may be done so if we imagine the number of deaths, diseases or traumas caused each year due to poverty, lack of healthcare, lack of healthy food choices, the presence of hate crimes, or unsafe transport. Another way of thinking about structural violence is to consider the social injustices that continue in so-called times of ‘peace’, what is now commonly referred to as negative peace, or the absence of war. Positive peace, by contrast, is the presence of social justice.

By highlighting the realities that structural violence pervades our lives in times of ‘peace’, Galtung challenges the notion that these are in fact periods of social harmony, and in doing so he asks practitioners to remain reflexive in their teaching and research. So, what are ways that research might be violent? And how does this thesis attempt to circumvent these oppressions?

Galtung (1975, pp. 264-265) writes that some cornerstone assumptions and practices of positivism [cited here as structurally violent], and the modernist approach it supports, are the notions of:

1. Leaving oneself [as researcher] out of the research in order to promote objectivity through detachment
2. Penetrating a community to which the researcher does not belong thereby imposing on participants the will of an ‘outsider’
3. Mining people for data, using people as objects of study without developing relationships and concern for the individual and community in which the research takes place
4. Publishing and maintaining rights to data findings without sharing the results with the group or community under study
5. Claiming validity and authority in the findings; presenting conclusive findings that precede and set a precedent for future studies

In contrast to these approaches to positivist research, which is by no means an exhaustive list, my approach to critical humanist education and scholarly study in this thesis relies on:

1. Stating my position explicitly as researcher, educator and life-long learner
2. Acknowledging that I am a member of the research community of peace educators and peace education, and a new scholar in the Asia-Pacific
3. Conducting research with the community, not on the community, because I am a peace educator and a trainer-participant within the training workshops at APCEIU
4. Sharing the results and generated knowledge from the study with participants and UNESCO before publication and future research
5. Affirming that this study is but a beginning. It is not conclusive, but aims to increase the peace education communities’ knowledge of evaluation and the impact of peace education programs on participants, and as such will continue the dialogue on assessment into a new generation of peace research

To illuminate Galtung’s points on research as structural violence, I draw on Tuhiwai Smith’s *Decolonizing Methodologies* (1999): “From the vantage point of the colonized…the term ‘research’ is inextricably linked to European imperialism and colonialism. The word itself, ‘research’, is probably one of the dirtiest words in the indigenous world’s vocabulary” (p. 1). Smith goes on to explain that research based in empiricism and positivism is concerned with measuring the ability, and concomitant subscription by the masses, to divide complex relationships and organizations into fragments, bits that are easily measured and studied deeply
in parcel. This atomizing effect serves to detach research from teaching and teaching from activism, and each of these three from people’s lived experiences, assets, and needs. In essence, the research becomes isolated from the people.

Attempting to connect research to the peace educators, this thesis and the training program for teacher-educators in the Asia-Pacific is grounded in multiple international normative frameworks as articulated and ratified by member States through UN apparatuses. The frameworks are the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (1980), Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989), and the Seville Statement against Violence (1989). Civil society initiatives such as the Earth Charter (2000) are also taken into account. These normative frameworks vocalize the rights and responsibilities articulated by communities across the globe, and thus take into account people’s declarations on peace, democracy and human rights.

These international humanitarian declarations, which are in many cases instruments of law, are important to the protection of peoples’ rights. Education toward raising peoples’ awareness of these rights is a necessary complement to the rights themselves so that grassroots organizations and individuals might protect their legal endowments (Reardon, 1996). For example, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (2007) defines human rights education as promoting “values, beliefs, and attitudes that encourage all individuals to uphold their own rights and those of others. It develops an understanding of everyone’s common responsibility to make human rights a reality in each community” (n.p.). It should be noted that human rights education is not about teaching what human rights are but rather what they should be and how to ensure their realization. The employment of these international frameworks in peace education is an attempt to come full-circle and ensure a comprehensive education that merges bottom-up and top-down approaches to social, economic, and political change.

TOP-DOWN, BOTTOM-UP TENSIONS

Critical theorists understand the internal tensions between maintaining personal and community
autonomy in light of formulating national and international standards beyond the scope of the local reality. The dynamism of governance, participatory democracy and decision-making processes are not static; thus, the creation of a world declaration, even within a single nation, does not necessarily carry over to emerging social groups of the same nation. Therefore, an attempt to standardize rights and responsibilities must always be understood as insufficient and in constant flux toward the betterment of the instruments, on one hand, and the betterment of the human condition, on the other. To this end, Gramsci’s work on *cultural hegemony* and *organic intellectuals* (2000), Freire’s *critical pedagogy* (1970), Said’s *Orientalism* (1979), Foucault’s *discourse analysis* (1969) and *panopticon* (1975), Derrida’s *difference* (1982), and Butler’s *performativity* (2004) might be critical talking points in a praxis that is key to fostering education for cultures of peace through a critical lens. This framework is also integral to understanding the dialectical relationship between top-down and bottom-up policy approaches to peace education, development, and evaluation processes.

Gramsci’s cultural hegemony pertains to the social, cultural and political apparatuses that give certain classes dominance over others through cultural representation and social policy, within and beyond the State. As the State and elites represent the classes through official literature, media discourse, education and the political economy, some marginalized individuals begin to perform these representations of Self/Other in submission to the economic, political and social forces that define them. In other words, cultural hegemony roughly relates to cultural and political domination of the elite classes, the civil and military bureaucracy and ecclesiastics. Performativity, on the other hand, is the subaltern internalization of the oppressions.

In the middle space between the dominant and subaltern we find the institutions of the elite, many of these state functions: educational institutions, media organizations, corporations, military and police, and disciplinary systems, such as jails, prisons, and ‘alternative’ schools. These institutions uphold the power of the privileged classes through implementation of policies from above and discursive hegemony prevalent throughout society. I find that within a dialogue on these crucial systems, the concepts of critical pedagogy, Orientalism, and panopticon are significant to critical teaching.
In all of this, exists the dissonance, or differance, between the Subject and Object, or the expression and internalization of Self and Other. Derrida evokes the concept of differance to explain oppositional identification. For example, we know “nighttime” to be different from “daytime” or “dawn” or “dusk”, and “nighttime” is explained through this relational juxtaposition, just as poverty might be “explained” through concepts of relative deprivation or meritocracy. Homi Bhabha, who I had the privilege of meeting at APCEIU, states “the concept of identification asserts that it is only by relating to something different that you can get a sense of your own identity” (Cho, Han and Kim, 2009, p. 36). Thus within educational research and policymaking it is imperative to examine deeply and cautiously any notion of standardization, and the actors involved in the process, in order to inhibit the employment of cultural hegemony that might lead to the further oppression of peoples.

Freire’s work is also of particular importance to peace education in the spaces of non-formal and adult education learning communities. In fact, Freire differentiates critical education from so-called peace education. In 1986, when he was awarded the UNESCO Prize for Peace Education, which he shares with other Laureates, such as Robert Muller (1989), Mother Teresa (1992), and Swee-hin Toh (2000), Freire didn’t refer to himself as a peace educator, though he was highly influential to the development of the field of peace education after publication of Pedagogy of the Oppressed (1970). I take note of his critiques of the field from the interpretive context of the 1980s. Freire spoke to this in his acceptance speech:

From the nameless, unfortunate and exploited people of the world I have learnt, above all, that peace is fundamental, indispensable, but that it must be fought for. Peace is something which is created, built up, transcending reality, the perverse facts of social life. Peace is created and developed in the never-ending construction of social justice. This is why I do not believe in so-called peace education that, instead of bringing to light the world of injustice, obscures it and has the effect of oppressing its victims even more. On the contrary, the education that I am fighting for, that I am struggling for, is a rigorous, responsible, essentially democratic or progressive form of education which, in order to encourage students to learn, challenges and critically assesses them. (UNESCO, 1988, p. 27)

Freire’s exposition of pedagogy of the oppressed is an approach to peace education and research that is deeply located in the politics of positionality of the educators and learners. It is an
acknowledgement that education and research are political acts. Freire articulated the importance of contextually relevant education as a socio-political event, and dialogue as praxis for critical and empowering teaching and learning. Freire described this as *conscientization*. As a peace educator, however, I realize that personal consciousness does not necessarily lead to critical action, e.g., doctors who smoke are aware of the detrimental health effects of such behavior, yet they continue to smoke. I also acknowledge education that over-emphasizes individual responsibility through locating peace and empowerment in the individual might be in the service of neoliberalism, which seeks to download responsibility from States and institutions onto the individual while, at the same time, pulling control to the Centre (Schugurensky, 2009).¹⁹

Finally, my peace research, like the peace education I advocate for, seeks to reinstitute the relationships between the cognitive, visceral, and corporeal spheres of learning, the spheres where we are, where we become, and where we attempt to belong. Acknowledging that each moment, everywhere, in public and private spaces, is a potential learning opportunity buttresses my belief that we are constantly learning and participating in research that might be used in action to regenerate, renew, and re-present our aspirations toward a better world. Spectacle pedagogy, dialogue and nonviolent resistance as methods of social action might serve to liberate the learner and educator from the walls and spaces that aim to contain ‘education’ within formal structures. That all our knowledge, research, and teaching begin with experience there can be no doubt, and allowing new ideas to emerge through dialogue and critical research offers “the possibility of sending this spinning top of a world in a different direction” (Zinn, 2007, p. 170).

**RESEARCH METHODS FOR APCEIU EVALUATION**

The research methodology I employed in the APCEIU evaluation is grounded in naturalistic and exploratory inquiry, which does not attempt to manipulate the research setting but “to understand

¹⁹ This has implications for some forms of conflict resolution education that place responsibility for violence onto the individual without consequential analysis of social and political forces that teach violence. For this reason, when critical peace educators speak of inner peace, the “personal as political”, and individual action, it is critical that they also offer critiques of colonialism, patriarchy, imperialism, and militarism, as well as civil society initiatives.
and document the day-to-day reality of the setting or settings under study…The data of the evaluation include whatever emerges as important to understanding the setting” (Patton, 1990, p. 42). The research is rooted in Freire’s faith in people for making a better world and in the World Social Forum’s oft-cited mantra that another world is possible. The notion that we can look within our local communities and find issues which are issues across the globe, and if we can find solutions to these issues collectively at home, then we have something to share in a practical and pragmatic way, guides my research as I seek to learn from and within communities toward social, economic, ecological, and political action possibilities.

Within the comparative context of these programs, I examined in-depth, through a qualitative case study approach, the design, development, and evaluation of APCEIU’s 2009 training workshops for teacher-educators in the Asia-Pacific. I chose a qualitative case study approach due to the capacity of this research method to reveal, through direct participant-observation, document analysis, purposeful sampling, and open-ended questionnaires, detailed descriptions of peace educators’ actions, professional activities, and institutional relationships after specific program training (Patton, 1990).

I conducted the research in Seoul and Toronto, through an institutional analysis\textsuperscript{20} of APCEIU documents and peace education literature. I collected photos and evaluation materials during the workshops, and completed a follow-up questionnaire via email with the participants eight months later. To provide a baseline of comparison for the follow-up assessment, APCEIU conducted pre-program questionnaires, formative assessments, and summative evaluations of the training program before and during the workshops. These immediate evaluations are assessed to highlight the impact of the training program on the participants’ degrees of growth throughout the workshops, as well as the participants’ evaluation of program content and teaching methodology at the immediate conclusion of the program. The outcomes are compared with results from the evaluation of other peace education programs (Churchill and Omari, 1981; Nevo and Brem, 2002) to substantiate findings across different social and political contexts.

\textsuperscript{20} The analysis included a review of APCEIU’s website, which elucidated the organization’s history, mission and pedagogical approaches to peace education, a thorough examination of APCEIU’s publications and reports on education for international understanding in the Asia-Pacific from 1997-2010, and an assessment of the 2009 evaluation forms for the training workshops.
Additionally, the outcomes of the pre-program questionnaire, summative evaluations, and follow-up questionnaire are compared in the concluding chapter to offer recommendations for educators in the design of future programs.

Participants were chosen for this impact assessment based on their participation in the 2009 training workshops. In the selection process for the training, participants were elected per their leadership positions within educational institutions in their home countries as well as proficient capacities for English conversation. Expecting that the APCEIU training would be passed on through teacher-training in the home locale, the APCEIU program sought to impact education for peace in the broader Asia-Pacific. These key assumptions are measured through the evaluation questionnaires in Chapter 5-7.

**CONCLUDING REMARKS**

What I have introduced here is a brief look into the theoretical and experiential epistemology that informs my thinking about education, research, activism, and peace. I arrive at several conclusions through this chapter on peace education evaluation and research methodology. First, as has been iterated throughout the thesis, there must be more evaluations of peace education programs. These evaluations will ensure that programs are successful and will assist in adapting necessary components of workshops to create stronger peace education training in the future. Second, evaluations of peace education programs must further highlight aspects of training that hinder success in order to learn from failure. Three, program designers should carefully consider the goals and length of courses against expected outcomes, as Nevo and Brem (2002) show that intercultural instruction is more effective than violence reduction and longer programs are typically less effective than shorter projects.

In Chapter 4, I will engage with a variety of conceptual frameworks of peace education used around the world and illustrate these frameworks in practice through analyzing the content of peace education programs at the United Nations University for Peace in San Jose, Costa Rica, and the Peace Education Center at Teachers College Columbia University. I study and compare
the programs to identify disparate and common themes, pedagogies, and training objectives. This, I expect offers comprehensive insight into the myriad traditions of peace education and practices within institutions worldwide that also inform the practice at APCEIU.
CHAPTER 4

Content, Form and Structure of Transformative Peace Education

If we are to reach real peace in the world, and if we are to carry on a real war against war, we shall have to begin with the children.

-- Mahatma Gandhi

The inclusion of youth and adults in peacebuilding initiatives brings vibrancy and creativity to peacebuilding efforts. Believing that youth and adults offer creative energy and active potential for the transformation of violent conflict in the world – and believing that education is a space for nurturing cultures of peace or cultures of war – peace educators maintain that practitioners have a responsibility to dialogue with youth on knowledge, values, skills, and behaviors conducive to fostering global harmony and social justice. Peace is described as the absence of physical and structural violence, and the presence of justice; therefore, students might explore peaceful values, root causes of global problems, study international law, practice conflict resolution through simulations, and formulate visions for a shared and peaceful future.

Accordingly, the goal of this chapter is to introduce and discuss peace education as education for humane purposes and social justice, where youth and adults are involved in the transformation of society and the construction of peaceful futures. The chapter is divided into three sections: 1) peace education frameworks: the content of peace education, 2) pedagogy for peace: involving youth and adults in community, and 3) models of peace education: learning in community. The chapter focuses on the social purposes (why), content (what), pedagogy (how), and structure (where) of teaching peaceful values, behaviors, and skills, as well as generating a commitment among youth and adults toward social agency and democratic participation.

PEACE EDUCATION FRAMEWORKS: THE CONTENT OF PEACE EDUCATION

While it is paramount that education for peace be specific to the teaching and learning context in which the learning is to take place and where the lessons are to be practiced, educators may nonetheless formulate their peace education lessons around common peace education themes. Burns and Aspeslagh (1996) describe these themes in five domains: 1) the international system, 2) peace, 3) development, 4) human rights, and 5) the environment. Additionally, there are several peace education frameworks to draw from as educators, as documented by the author in “Developing Peace Education Programs: Beyond Ethnocentrism and Violence” (Kester, 2008). Two of these frameworks, discussed hereafter, highlight peace education content as the exploration of root causes of conflict, knowing international humanitarian and human rights laws, envisioning alternative structures of security, and learning skills for managing micro/macro conflicts without resorting to violence. They are the Learning to Abolish War model (Reardon and Cabezudo, 2002) and the Flower-Petal Model of Peace Education (Toh, 2004).

The Learning to Abolish War model emphasizes four strands of learning: root causes of conflict, international law, conflict management and global disarmament (Figure 1). The conceptual framework of this model places violence at the core of cultures of war, and non-violence and international understanding at the center of cultures of peace. This framework is particularly concerned with the role of international law in maintaining global justice, the construction of peacebuilding mechanisms, and the formation of personal lifestyles and behaviors conducive to fostering a culture of peace. In this framework education for peace is education for the abolition of war. This education relies on an exploration of what constitutes peace, dialogue at the intersection of identity and violence, and a process of re-defining human security in terms of needs and social welfare in place of national security, the armaments industry and militarism. Peace education through this framework seeks to foster a commitment among educators to educate for non-violence, envision new mechanisms for political participation, and generate active citizenship among learners.
The *Flower-Petal Model of Peace Education* (Figure 2), on the other hand, is another framework for forming education for peace programs. In this model, a culture of peace is placed at the center. A culture of peace has been defined by the United Nations as:

>a set of values, attitudes, traditions and modes of behavior and ways of life based on respect for life, ending of violence and promotion and practice of non-violence through education, dialogue and cooperation…promotion of all human rights and fundamental freedoms…commitment to peaceful settlements of conflicts…efforts to meet the developmental and environmental needs of present and future generations…respect for and promotion of equal rights and opportunities for women and men. (UN, 1999, n.p.)

The *Flower-Petal Model*, accordingly, has six categories comprising a culture of peace, including: 1) dismantling the culture of war, 2) environmental peace, 3) education for justice and compassion, 4) human rights education, 5) cultivating intercultural solidarity, and 6) harnessing inner peace. Dismantling a culture of war is concerned with mitigating all support for the war system, including competitive games, gender oppression, defense spending, oppressive security systems, and the sale of toys that mimic violence and teach children destructive behaviors (i.e. toy guns and knifes, violent video games, excessive violence in film). It includes dissolving weapons access as well as disarming the mind of hate. Environmental education includes
fostering global stewardship, simple living, and combating the environmental degradation that accompanies unsustainable development and war. Educating for justice and compassion deconstructs globalization processes, neoliberalism, and the notion of a commons. Education for human rights introduces students to their civil, economic, political, cultural and religious rights, among others, and assesses the nature of violations of these rights. Intercultural solidarity is concerned with interactions between differing groups and cultural norms, and national and international institutions that perpetuate violence or foster peace. Education for inner peace allows students to evaluate their own physical, emotional, and spiritual states as well as the interplay between micro and macro conflicts. The Flower-Petal framework focuses on intercultural solidarity, disarmament education, and the relationship between diverse forms of life and ways of living that subvert ethno-centrism, de-humanization, and pseudo-speciation while fostering peace, global environmental stewardship and contemplative practices.

In addition to the conceptual frameworks outlined above, there are a number of normative frameworks, or international standards, that serve as the basis for developing peace education programs. One such normative framework is the Declaration and Integrated Framework of Action on Education for Peace, Human Rights, and Democracy (1995), a guiding piece of the
education and training work at APCEIU. The Declaration and Integrated Framework suggests “basic guidelines which could be translated into strategies, policies and plans of action at the institutional and national levels according to the conditions of the different communities” (n.p.). The guidelines include:

- Teaching with an international approach
- Teaching about forms of conflict, their causes and effects
- Teaching human rights and international standards (e.g. National constitutions, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, the Earth Charter)
- Teaching about democracy and civic participation
- Teaching about development, de-colonization and globalization
- Teaching the histories of nations and States
- Teaching about the United Nations and international institutions

These conceptual and normative frameworks inform contemporary peace education programs and form the developmental basis of education for peace, particularly as seen in the previous chapter on the work of APCEIU and the other exemplar peace education training programs examined in this thesis. Through referencing these documents educators may create a peace education program specific to their schools, institutions, government agencies, and non-formal learning environments. Other organizing frameworks designers could utilize in the development of education for peace programs include Brenes’s Integral Model of Peace Education (2004), Jenkins’s Framework for the Master of Arts in Peace Education at the University of Peace (2004), or Danesh’s Education for Peace Integrative Curriculum (2008).

PEDAGOGY FOR PEACE: INVOLVING YOUTH AND ADULTS IN COMMUNITY

Educators often find that the educational methods, e.g., lecturing and test-taking, do not match their intended social outcome, whether that social objective relates to government, business, education, or technology, and this is largely what peace education concerns, as I practice it:
matching active and participatory pedagogy with social justice mandates. Our schools and nations intend to create democracy and community interdependence, yet to do so educators often use tactics of war-making, e.g. obedience-drilling, secrecy, and competitive games, that reflect more fully the very ideologies the school system intends to transcend – or not as the case may be. For example, many educators teach the benefits of capitalism through competitive games to illustrate individualism and work ethic, yet to teach the values of capitalism in this overly simplified manner exaggerates the negative characteristics of a capitalistic system, such as greed and exclusion. This education is fragmenting and divisive rather than holistic and interdependent; it focuses on patriotism, militarism, and materialism.

Such a lesson seems to value materialism above character. So we are presented with the ideological and existential contradiction that our means do not meet our intended ends, our content and pedagogy are in conflict, and democracy and active citizenship is compromised in the process. Education must consider this contradiction, as many scholars have (Dewey, 1916; Freire, 1970; Reardon and Cabezudo, 2002). In contrast, to teach cooperation, respect, the value of diversity, creativity and empathy, educators could use cooperative games, participatory pedagogy, and creative problem-solving activities that emphasize learning to know, learning to do, learning to work together, and learning to be (Delors, 1996).

Classroom spaces pose further democratic contradictions. Consider that classrooms are often sites of oppression. Several frequent learning situations occur in our classrooms that undermine fair and democratic education. Take, for instance, the overly didactic classroom where material is lectured to students in an authoritarian style, with learners listening passively but not engaging each other, the instructor, or the material. This is not to suggest that didactic teaching is inherently oppressive, rather that there are so many other unconventional methods of teaching that may be more appropriate for the intended outcome of the educative process. There are a number of characteristics that might define an oppressive classroom, including: 1) teachers lecturing for the entire period without responses from learners, or without giving learners the opportunity to question the agenda, 2) teachers allowing one or a few students to dominate class
time, which silences the majority,\(^2\) 3) students being encouraged to memorize ‘facts’ rather than engage in critical thinking and inquiry, 4) course material is irrelevant to students’ lived experiences, e.g., US textbooks being used to teach Ethiopian youth, and 5) student-bullying is allowed to flourish as ‘boys just being boys’\(^2\) (Kester, 2007).

In light of this situation, educators have been working to cultivate a culture of peace for several decades. The United Nations, as facilitator, has promoted this dialogue. The UN General Assembly passed the *Declaration and Integrated Framework of Education for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy* (1995), *Declaration on a Culture of Peace* (1998), and declared the year 2000 as the ‘International Year for a Culture of Peace’, while 2001-2010 was set as the ‘UN International Decade on Education for Peace and Nonviolence for the Children of the World.’ The 1995 and 1998 resolutions articulate necessary components of education for peace and a culture of peace, respectively. Each includes education on knowledge, values, skills, and behaviors that support peaceful societies and unpacks thinking that supports the war system (see *Figure 3*). Furthermore, the UN implemented peace education into its educational bodies, i.e., UNESCO, UNITAR, UNU, and UPEACE, to serve as a model for mainstreaming peace education into educational institutes, international organizations and local agencies.

*Figure 3. Towards a Culture of Peace*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From A CULTURE OF WAR</th>
<th>Towards A CULTURE OF PEACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power based on force</td>
<td>Power based on mutual agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having an enemy, dualism, dichotomy</td>
<td>Solidarity, international understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian governance</td>
<td>Democratic participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrecy</td>
<td>Transparency, free flow of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armaments stockpiling</td>
<td>Disarmament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploitation of people</td>
<td>Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploitation of nature</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight male domination</td>
<td>Gender equity and equality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) Another approach to this same conflict may deduce that other students are not responsibly participating in class. This is sometimes perhaps a valid point, but before concluding this, the educator must consider whether pedagogy, form, and structures in the classroom are at fault.

\(^2\) Certainly girls in the school system are also prone to bullying, conflict and violence. But in the instance of girls social decorum does not accept this performance as readily as deviant male behavior. Therefore, while the actions may be similar the interpretation and mitigation of those actions by administration differ by gender.
Reardon (2001) describes education for a culture of peace:

Learners must be guided towards a clear comprehension of the major obstacles to a culture of peace: the normative and behavioral obstacles that lie at the heart of our discussion of capacities and skills; and the institutional and existential obstacles, the global problems that are the worldwide manifestations of the culture of war. Together these problems comprise the problematic of creating a culture of peace…. One way of looking at the main tasks of creating a culture of peace is to think of the primary goals as reducing and eliminating violence, and enhancing and universalizing human dignity and equality by increasing gender justice. (pp. 111-112)

Furthermore, the Declaration and Integrated Framework of Education for Peace (UNESCO, 1995) suggests that peace education must be trans-disciplinary and included in all learning spaces. Education for peace should not be limited to a single classroom or subject. Additionally, the institution or site in which education for peace operates should be in harmony with the goals and lessons of peace education and peace education should be integrated into all learning spaces. That is, the learning space should foster intercultural and international dialogue and respect, knowledge of national and global systems of governance, respect for all life, and a commitment to non-violence. Authoritarian and exclusive learning spaces work counter to the cooperative and inclusive goals of peace education.

Hence, pedagogy within education for peace focuses on illuminating causal relationships, developing empathy, personal responsibility, social-justice oriented individuals, and nurturing students who are committed to democratic participation and nonviolence in their local and global communities. Educators should be aware of direct and indirect forms of violence and the war system so that education may overcome systems of violence. An education for peace program, thus, pedagogically emphasizes values (tolerance, respect, equality, empathy, compassion), capacities (cultural proficiency, sensitivity), skills (nonviolent communication, active listening, competence in a foreign language, gender-inclusive language), and knowledge (of history and cultures, peace movements) for peace. The pedagogy includes, among other exercises, cooperative learning activities, gender perspectives, creative reflection and journaling, theatre games, role-plays, empathy-building activities, and alternative futures exercises.
MODELS OF PEACE EDUCATION: LEARNING IN COMMUNITY

This section describes two models of peace education designed as community learning spaces. Each of these models arise from the work and practice of peace education at Teachers College Columbia University and the foundational peace education theories of Betty Reardon. I suspect that an exploration of these programs, combined with the case study of APCEIU in Chapter 1, will further reveal how to design and deliver successful training programs for international understanding, peacebuilding, and dialogue across civilizations. The two peace education training programs are the United Nations University for Peace MA Program in Peace Education and the MA concentration in Peace Education at Teachers College Columbia University. These programs both began in the early 1980s.

In 1980, the United Nations General Assembly adopted resolution 35/55 for the founding of a higher education institution dedicated solely to the study and pursuit of sustainable global peace. That resolution led to the establishment of the United Nations University for Peace (UPEACE) Graduate School of Peace and Conflict Studies, with headquarters in San Jose, Costa Rica. The University has liaison offices in New York and Geneva, and regional programs in Africa, the Middle East, Central Asia, Asia-Pacific, Latin America, and the Caribbean. Consequently, UPEACE with its worldwide reach and impact could be argued to be a leading international institution in the global movement toward education for peace and international understanding. UPEACE, then, may be studied as an institutional model of education for peace through its international and multicultural focus, ecological and peace education programs, gender awareness, peace research, and activism training.

The mission of the University, as agreed by the UN General Assembly and stated in the Charter to the University, is “to provide humanity with an international institution of higher education for peace, with the aim of promoting among all human beings the spirit of understanding, tolerance and peaceful coexistence, to stimulate cooperation among peoples and to help lessen obstacles

24 Website: www.upeace.org.
and threats to world peace and progress, in keeping with the noble aspirations proclaimed in the Charter of the United Nations” (UPEACE Charter, 1980, Article 1). UPEACE, it should be noted, is not the first institution of the UN to be established and dedicated to the pursuit of peace through education. Others include UNESCO, the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) and the United Nations University (UNU) in Tokyo, Japan.

UPEACE was, however, until 2009 the only educational institute of the United Nations to offer degree programs. In 2009, UNU began matriculating students. The University for Peace is under the governance of a Rector and Council, and the UN Secretary-General serves as Honorary President of UPEACE, a position currently held by Ban Ki-Moon of South Korea.

Classroom teaching and experiential education at the university is currently offered through 10 Master’s degree programs in four departments. The multiple Master’s programs cover myriad approaches to peacebuilding that have evolved since WWII, including disarmament and security studies, sustainable development, gender, human rights, international law, and education. The programs follow:

A. DEPARTMENT OF GENDER AND PEACE EDUCATION
   1. Peace Education
   2. Gender and Peacebuilding

B. DEPARTMENT OF PEACE AND CONFLICT STUDIES
   3. International Peace Studies (Costa Rica only)
   4. Media, Conflict, and Peace Studies (may be completed as a dual program with Hankuk University of Foreign Studies in Korea)
   5. International Peace Studies (Dual Campus program with Ateneo de Manila University in the Philippines, offered only for Asian students and funded by the Nippon Foundation)
   6. Responsible Management and Sustainable Economic Development
C. DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL LAW AND HUMAN RIGHTS
7. International Law and Human Rights (may be completed as dual program with Hankuk University of Foreign Studies in Korea)
8. International Law and the Settlement of Disputes

D. DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT, PEACE, AND SECURITY
9. Natural Resources and Sustainable Development (Dual program with American University, Washington, D.C.)
10. Natural Resources and Peace
11. Environmental Security and Peace
12. Environmental Security and Peace: Specialization in Climate Change and Security

The University is currently mainstreaming education for peace and sustainable development in alignment with the UN International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Nonviolence for Children of the World (2001-2010) and the Decade for Education for Sustainable Development (2005-2014), as well as gender mainstreaming in alliance with UN Security Resolution 1325 (2000). As part of these declarations and resolutions, UN organizations and Member States are encouraged to mainstream education for nonviolence, sustainable ecological development, and gender equity. The San Jose campus, also home to the Earth Charter Center for Education for Sustainable Development, is accordingly integrating peace education, sustainable development, and gender education in its programs.

In terms of peace education as an academic discipline and not merely a university philosophy, in 2002 the United Nations University for Peace (UPEACE), through consultation with leading international peace educators, including Betty Reardon (Teachers College Columbia University), Abelardo Brenes (University for Peace), Mohammed Abu-Nimer (American University), Thomas Mark Turay (Coady Institute, St Francis Xavier University, Canada), Tony Jenkins (Teachers College Columbia University) Janet Gerson (Teachers College Columbia University), Edmund O’Sullivan (OISE), Anne Goodman (OISE), and Kathy Bickmore (OISE), among others, began formulating a framework and strategy for offering a Master’s degree program in peace education at UPEACE. The program began admitting students in 2004.
The culminating document from the UPEACE consultation (Jenkins, 2004), drafted in New York at Teachers College, designed the Master’s degree program around eight organizing principles: peace education as 1) comprehensive in scope, 2) holistic in organization, 3) values-laden, 4) inquiry-based, 5) conceptually designed, 6) learner-centered pedagogy, 7) peacemaking skills, and 8) intentionally-directed learning. The eight principles of this peace education framework underscore a holistic and comprehensive model of peace education.

In practice, students at UPEACE interact with concepts of social justice and peacebuilding through exploration of the values, beliefs and worldviews present among cultures of the diverse student body. This non-formal approach to peace education embodies a symbiotic relationship between education for peace and multicultural education; for, both multicultural education and peace education aim to raise global awareness, respect for all life and a re-humanization of the Other. In multicultural learning communities learners might deconstruct their previously held prejudices and beliefs about others and formulate models for greater cooperation in the future.

The peace education program, which aims to develop leadership skills and build the capacity of educators to contribute to educational, social, and cultural change, includes a variety of courses (students must complete all 37 credits), including:

- Foundation Course in Peace and Conflict Studies (3 credits)
- Peace Education: Theory and Practice (3 credits)
- Peace Education Seminars (1 credit)
- Human Rights Education (3 credits)
- Peace Education: Strategies for Action (3 credits)
- Research Methods (3 credits)
- Education for Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding (3 credits)
- Cultures and Learning: From Violence Towards Peace (3 credits)
- Leadership and Ethics (1 credit)
- Gender and Peace Education (3 credits)
- Practices of Conflict Management and Peacebuilding (3 credits)
• Independent Research Project (8 credits)

These courses allow students to engage with the state of the field in the 21st Century, to practice participatory, democratic and active pedagogical skills, and to develop skills needed for peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding in institutional design and policy scenarios. The design of the UPEACE program largely benefited from the work of Betty Reardon, Abelardo Brenes, and Tony Jenkins.

Betty Reardon, instrumental in the creation of the UPEACE MA program, also established the Peace Education concentration in the Master’s degree programs at Teachers College Columbia University in 1981, which has been a leading program in education for peace for nearly three decades.\textsuperscript{25} The Peace Education concentration at Teachers College Columbia focuses on analyzing direct, cultural, and structural violence in society through formal and non-formal instruction. Courses that learners engage with highlight pedagogical approaches to social change, curriculum development, and policy writing. In the program that Reardon began at Teachers College in 1981, directed today by Monisha Bajaj and Lesley Bartlett at the time of writing in 2010, the Peace Education concentration includes courses selected from:

• International Perspectives on Peace and Human Rights Education (3 credits)
• Human and Social Dimensions of Peace (3 credits)
• Politics, Education and Conflict (3 credits)
• Education for Social Change (3 credits)
• International Organizations, Civil Society and Peace Education (3 credits)
• Gender, Education and International Development (3 credits)
• Educational Planning: Theory and Practice of Education in Emergencies (3 credits)
• Literacy and Development (3 credits)
• Sustainability and Education (3 credits)
• Critical Theory and Adult Learning (3 credits)
• Developing Critical Thinkers (3 credits)
• Dialogue and Difference (3 credits)

\textsuperscript{25} Website: http://www.tc.columbia.edu/peaceed/
• Cosmopolitan Education (2-3 credits)
• Designing Curriculum and Instruction (3 credits)

MA students in the Teachers College program must complete 12 credits, and Ph.D students 27 credits. Graduates of the Teachers College program have gone on to direct and/or teach at Peace and Conflict studies programs at Georgetown University, the University of Toledo, the University for Peace, and a host of NGOs including Peace Games and the National Peace Academy.

In conclusion, peace education as a practice aims to confront and resist violence to transform societies toward cultures of peace. Peace education focuses both on education about peace and education for peace while addressing the knowledge, values, skills and behaviors needed to nurture a peace culture. The content of peace education includes knowledge of peace movements, peacemakers, ‘negative and positive’ peace, direct and indirect violence, peace as an active process, human rights and responsibilities, worldviews and ideologies, non-violent communication, community and dialogue. The pedagogy used in peace education is cooperative, participatory and active, including case studies, storytelling, role-plays, empathy activities, negotiation and mediation practice, journaling, reflection circles, and alternative futures exercises. The learning objective of peace education aims to transform conflict through dialogue and nonviolence, and, particularly where peace education affects youth and adults, conflict is transformed across generations.

In Chapter 5, I will further explore the evaluation of peace education programs through analysis of assessment results from the 2009 APCEIU peace education training workshops. The chapter includes a description of the training workshop, participants involved, pre-program questionnaire findings and analysis of formative evaluations, and data from summative evaluations. Immediate attitudinal and behavioral changes in September 2009 are listed.
CHAPTER 5

Learning to Live Together:
Evaluating the Immediate Impact of the APCEIU Training Program

*It is not our differences that divide us.*
*It is our inability to recognize, accept and celebrate those differences.*

-- Audre Lorde

Education for International Understanding (EIU),\(^{26}\) as the previous chapters have highlighted, aims to disarm cultures of war through increasing intercultural respect, understanding of international humanitarian and human rights law, environmental stewardship, gender awareness, conflict management skills, and raising levels of inner peace, among other context-specific attitudes, behaviors, and skills. EIU is disarmament and development education, an education that seeks to *disarm minds* from violence, *disarm the capacity of states* to inflict gross asymmetrical and indiscriminate military violence on themselves and others, and education that aims to *develop* tolerant, nonviolent, and cooperative dispositions among learners. EIU concerns education *about* peace and international understanding, and education *for* peace and international understanding, where education *about* peace concerns the cognitive spheres of teaching and learning, and education *for* peace concerns the affective and behavioral dimensions of education. Hence, education *about* peace refers to understanding complex, interlinked systems of violence and mechanisms for supporting nonviolent conflict resolution. Education *for* peace relates to translating that theoretical knowledge into personal actions and community practices for realizing sustainable cultures of peace. Within the scope of this chapter, the evaluation of such EIU programs demands the assessment of *cognitive, attitudinal, behavioral, and capacity-building* changes among program objectives, educator practices, and student expressions of key concepts and skills related to fostering peace cultures.

\(^{26}\) The APCEIU program was officially labeled Education for International Understanding (EIU), though EIU also refers to peace education. Therefore, in the text of this chapter EIU is used interchangeably with peace education.
The cognitive realm of EIU relates to learning knowledge that will assist in the understanding of a complex world of systems and networks that leads to greater sense of human dignity and self-realization. This is in contrast to the typical mechanistic state of learning that aims to prepare learners solely for participating in the market economy and workplace through teaching and learning ‘marketable skills.’ This learning encompasses a lifelong endeavor throughout one’s life and across all generations, life-wide learning across all sectors of modern life – including human and non-human organisms – and life-deep learning that exposes the transformative power of experience. Educators acknowledge that this type of education fosters knowledge through formal schooling, non-formal learning and informal experiences.

The normative realm of learning, on the other hand, concerns the development of attitudes, such as respect, love, tolerance, empathy, justice, solidarity, and sustainability that support the nurturance of cultures of peace. The behavioral aspect of teaching and learning concerns the deconstruction of notions of universalism, pseudo-speciation, hegemony, and violence that might lead toward greater non-violent practices, improved relations, and ultimately more profoundly equitable and just social structures. Finally, the capacity-building aspect of learning concerns translating knowledge, norms, and behaviors into a community ethos and personal habitus of peace through the practice of non-violent communication, negotiation and mediation skills, dialogue, active listening, and envisioning peaceful futures.

The theory and practice of EIU towards a culture of peace is grounded in the scholarly work of educators, political scientists, environmentalists, and philosophers, such as John Dewey (1916), Maria Montessori (1949), Paulo Freire (1970), Vandana Shiva (2005), Elise Boulding (1988), Johan Galtung (1996), David Bohm (1996), Betty Reardon (1988, 2001), Ian Harris (1998), and Swee-hin Toh (2004), among others. The field is multidisciplinary and global, and is also informed by practices of nonviolent resistance (Sharp, 1973), nonviolent communication (Rosenburg, 1999), and the peace movements of Mohandas Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Aung San Suu Kyi and the Dalai Lama (see Hunt, 2002). Particularly of note are the conceptual and normative frameworks for education for international understanding and peace that have emanated from civil society movements in the 20th and early 21st centuries (Hague Appeal for Peace, 1999; Earth Charter, 2000) and the body of work of UNESCO (UNESCO, 1974, 1995;

The need for EIU programs seems empirically evident (see UNDP, 1998; Hague Appeal for Peace, 1999; Sachs, 2005; Yunus, 2007). Conditions around the world, such as the increasing divide between the wealthy and impoverished, extravagant military spending, racial intolerance, gender discrimination and environmental destruction necessitate a change in personal behaviors and collective consciousness. This relates to both the individual and the educational systems that could support greater education toward nonviolent dispositions and skills for a more peaceful world. The recognition for the need for such peace programs is increasing; communities, NGOs and governments have begun to work in the direction of educating for peace. In recent years, Nepal and Uganda passed national mandates to introduce conflict resolution programs into school courses. The Indian government has developed policies (i.e. NCERT) requiring schools to include peace education programs in their curricula. The Solomon Islands, Nepal, and Costa Rica all established government ministries and departments of peace. There has been positive growth in the field of peace education, yet there is still much to be done. Are EIU and peace education programs effective? How do administrators and educators monitor and evaluate such programs? Many peace educators (Nevo and Brem, 2002; Harris, 2003, 2008; Danesh, 2008) argue that greater program evaluation is needed to ensure that EIU programs are effectively achieving their goals. The overarching goal of EIU and peace education is the nurturance of more peaceful students, and ultimately the transformation of mindsets and political, economic, cultural and ecological systems that maintain the presence of social inequality and cultures of violence.

This chapter on evaluating the APCEIU 2009 EIU program approaches evaluation in terms of realizing program objectives and assessing curriculum and instructional methods. The evaluation is conducted through the identification of EIU indicators and participants’ formative and summative evaluations of the APCEIU 2009 training-of-trainers program. The chapter will first describe EIU program indicators, followed by a description of the APCEIU training program. Finally, the chapter presents a case study analysis of evaluation data from the APCEIU 2009 training workshops.
EIU PROGRAM GOALS AND INDICATORS

This section outlines program goals, indicators, and enabling conditions for successful EIU programs, focusing on the cultivation of knowledge, values, skills, and behaviors conducive to fostering sustainable cultures of peace. The goals for the APCEIU training program are to prepare educators to effectively design, develop and facilitate trainings in their own local contexts with critical conceptual understandings and pedagogical skills of EIU. The program additionally aims to expose international educators to the Korean Peninsula and political economy of the country, while also providing opportunities for networking among teacher educators in the Asia-Pacific region (APCEIU, n.d.).


> The ultimate goal of education for peace, human rights and democracy is the development in every individual of a sense of universal values and types of behavior [author’s italics] on which a culture of peace is predicated. It is possible to identify even in different socio-cultural contexts values that are likely to be universally recognized…Education must develop the ability of non-violent conflict-resolution. It should therefore promote also the development of inner peace in the minds of students so that they can establish more firmly the qualities of tolerance, compassion, sharing and caring.

These goals are translated programmatically through guiding principles and peace pedagogy for EIU. Some guiding principles of education for peace and international understanding programs may be extrapolated from a documentary analysis of existing education for peace programs, including the Hague Appeal for Peace (1999), the Flower-Petal Model of Peace Education (Toh and Cawagas, 1991; Toh, 2004), the Integral Model (Brenes, 2004), the EURED Teacher-Training Model for Peace Education (EURED, 2002), and the United Nations University for Peace MA program in Peace Education (Jenkins, 2004), as well as UNESCO recommendations on EIU (1974, 1995). According to these documents, EIU is:
• Comprehensive in scope
• Conceptually designed
• A holistic approach to education
• Learner-centered
• Dialogical
• Inquiry-based
• Values exploration
• Linking local and global issues
• Identifying root causes of violence

• Studying national and international humanitarian and human rights instruments
• Envisioning alternative futures and new forms of security
• Gender sensitive
• Cultivating peacebuilding and conflict management skills
• Critical empowerment for personal and social action
• Transformative learning

The principles ensure a comprehensive and holistic EIU program aiming to cultivate a culture of peace through reflection on personal values and behaviors, recognition of conflict-management mechanisms at varying levels of society, and engendering among participants a commitment to non-violent resolution of conflicts. The APCEIU program is founded on many of these guiding principles, with special focus given to holistic understanding, dialogue, values-formation, and critical empowerment. Toh and Cawagas (1991) explain these four pedagogical principles of critical and transformative peace education.

*Holistic understanding* refers to interconnections between various themes of peace, conflict, violence, and nonviolence, recognizing that the exploration of root causes and possible solutions to social and political enigmas demands a comprehensive approach to problem-solving. In other words, EIU as holistic education claims that the resolution of conflicts, such as environmental degradation, is necessitated by a holistic approach to revealing the root causes of ecological destruction and structural violence. EIU educators understand that environmental degradation is caused by myriad contributing factors, including war, border disputes, corporate interests, unsustainable consumer habits and excessive travel, among other possible root causes. Consequently, to alleviate environmental degradation societies ultimately need to abolish war
and change greedy corporate and personal habits. Organizationally, holism refers to a whole-school approach to education for international understanding that calls for EIU lessons to be taught across disciplines and included in personal relationships and school structures among and between educators, administrators, students, parents, and community members.

*Dialogue* refers epistemologically to rethinking what education is and how it is conducted. EIU seeks to create horizontal relationships in learning situations where all learners are at once student and teacher, and where the teacher is at once teacher and student. Dialogue as an intentional pedagogy attempts to avert indoctrination through “hidden curriculum” (Apple, 1971) and fosters a “learning community” (Jenkins, 2007) committed to talking about critical contemporary issues and resolving inter-group conflict through dialogue. Dialogue as a method of instruction exemplifies peacemaking in practice, though methodologically practitioners must consider the cultural context in which they are working when facilitating dialogue. Cultural codes, such as high-context and low-context cultures, may impede dialogue in particular settings.

*Values-formation* in education departs from the platform that education is never values-free (Freire, 1970). Much contemporary education, many peace educators would argue, is education to prepare learners for the market economy, free-trade and deterministic consumerism, as well as fatalistic education to train learners that ‘this is the way the world is’ (i.e. “modernized” and “developed”). EIU, on the other hand, intends to explore a plethora of possibilities for life today beyond models of modernization and dependency, including participatory democracy, participatory budgeting, and other possibilities students may create (explored through futures-envisioning activities with learners). EIU educators are honest about their role in cultivating values of respect, empathy, humility, compassion, and nonviolence.

*Critical empowerment* refers to taking action after dialogue to effect critical change in schools and communities toward a culture of peace. “Critical change” differentiates “action” (e.g. giving money to foundations without critically engaging with personal habits) from necessary and important steps toward “social transformation” (e.g. changing personal and group behaviors that underscore inequality and violence). Critical empowerment deliberatively and peacefully poses and responds to the questions: Where are we now? Where do we want to go? How do we get
there? At the heart of answering these questions are criteria for solutions that demand action toward the common good and increased social justice.

These guiding principles for EIU and peace education are manifest in learning objectives for the training workshops. Betty Reardon (2001) charts specific means (e.g. pedagogy) and outcomes (e.g. values, skills) of peace education training. Her matrix of education for peace in a gender perspective indicates the values, capacities, skills, and knowledge to be nurtured through teaching and learning for peace. Reardon’s model (2001, pp. 158-160; see Figure 1 below) emphasizes active pedagogies for fostering such learning. This showcases the emphasis peace educators give to pedagogy, as well as the content of peace education, and the aim of fostering specific characteristics among learners, such as respect for cultural diversity, knowledge of the history and values of another culture, the use of gender-inclusive language, and the avoidance of gender stereotyping.

**FIGURE 1.**

*EIU Matrix of Education for Cultural Integrity and Gender Equality*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Capacities</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Pedagogy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural integrity/diversity</td>
<td>Respect for cultural difference and role of culture in human identity and fulfillment</td>
<td>Cultural proficiency</td>
<td>Cultural interpretation</td>
<td>Knowledge of the history, values, worldviews and beliefs of another culture</td>
<td>Readings about and discussion of other cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of and ability to function positively in one or several other cultures</td>
<td>Social skills in another culture</td>
<td>Knowledge and understanding of myths of origin and meaning of another culture</td>
<td>Cultural interpretations of the arts and literature of other peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Converse in another language</td>
<td>Taking the perspective of another culture</td>
<td>Knowledge of origins and formation of gender roles</td>
<td>Gender interpretation of literature and films of other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural variations in gender roles and</td>
<td>Keeping journals on personal gender experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Readings in gender studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to the equal value of women and men rooted in the value of universal human dignity</td>
<td>Commitment to the equal value of women and men rooted in the value of universal human dignity</td>
<td>Gender sensitivity</td>
<td>See issues and problems from perspectives of both men and women, boys and girls</td>
<td>Knowledge of origins and formation of gender roles</td>
<td>Readings in gender studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Gender equality**

Belief that gender balance should prevail in all social institutions and human relationships based on concept of complementarity and differences between men and women. Avoidance of gender stereotyping and limiting human achievement on basis of sex as a form of injustice. Seeking partnerships between men and women based on complementarity and mutual enhancement. Stereotypes; observe their inaccuracies and limitations. Use of gender-inclusive language for general references to human beings Analyze differences, similarities and complementarities in a cultural context. Perceptions of masculine and feminine. Negative consequences of devaluing or repressing one gender of privileging one—specific knowledge of oppression of women. Positive consequences of equality, mutuality, and complementarity. And women’s issues. Study of women’s movements and international standards on women’s rights. Role-plays of 'gender incidents' from both perspectives.

As Reardon’s chart focuses on values, skills, capacities and knowledge to be learned through the process of involvement in peace education programs, it may also be used as a tool to measure whether participants have noticeably adopted the values and dispositions of respect, love, equity, and empathy that EIU aims to instill. Educators may assess whether learners display capacities to translate these attitudes into nonviolent action, cooperation, dialogue, and active listening through participant observation, interviews, and pre- and post-tests. A similar strategy was used to assess the learning and changes among participants in the 2009 APCEIU training workshops. These methods of evaluation and the outcomes are discussed in length in the latter part of this thesis.

To assess changes in attitudes and behaviors, educators might also employ student reflections, observations, and school records to help identify whether attitudinal and behavioral changes have taken place over time. Fountain (1999) states that EIU evaluation measures might include surveys, questionnaires, interviews, focus groups, observations, and reviews of school records. These data collection methods focus on qualitative and ethnographic methods and techniques of evaluation. Such methods are appropriate to evaluate more comprehensively students’ sustained attitudinal and behavioral changes possibly due to participation in EIU programs.
This approach to assessment emphasizes active and participatory pedagogy as a means of teaching, learning and participatory research (Dewey, 1916; Reardon and Cabezudo, 2002). It is a type of pedagogy and participatory research most likely to assist in the observational assessment of participants. Concerning attitudinal and behavioral changes, many scholars emphasize that EIU pedagogy seeks to be critical, empowering, and transformative (Hicks, 1988; Toh and Cawagas, 1991; O’Sullivan, 1999). That is, EIU may radically change the lens through which learners perceive their world and consequently their sense of agency and aspirations within it. Cyclically, a renewed sense of personal agency may eventually lead to social change and reconfigurations of political and economic structures.

Pertaining to attitudinal and behavioral changes, Fountain (1999) continues a list of peace education indicators similar to Reardon, but with a focus on attitudes (see Figure 2). In Fountain’s chart, program goals, outcomes and indicators are differentiated in that goals refer to the overall aim of the program, outcomes refer to observable behaviors among participants, and indicators describe measurable actions. The indicators here are listed under the sub-headings knowledge, skills, and attitudes. These indicators inform ultimately the behavioral norms that EIU seeks to inculcate (also expressed in the 1995 Declaration and integrated framework of action on education for peace, human rights and democracy).

**FIGURE 2.**

*EIU Aims, Outcomes and Indicators (Adapted from Fountain, 1999, p. 36)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>SKILLS</th>
<th>ATTITUDES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aims:</strong> Understanding causes and effects of conflict</td>
<td><strong>Aims:</strong> Improved communication and conflict analysis skills</td>
<td><strong>Aims:</strong> Development of respect, empathy, and compassion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes:</strong> Student will be able to identify likely causes of conflict in the world, particularly in their lives, and envision alternative futures</td>
<td><strong>Outcomes:</strong> Students will demonstrate effective dialogue and active listening</td>
<td><strong>Outcomes:</strong> Students will demonstrate attitudes of respect and acceptance of peoples who are different from them in terms of multiple forms of identity, i.e. race, ethnicity, gender, nationality, sexual orientation, class, and disability differences, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators:</strong> Students will be able to identify multiple causes of a conflict</td>
<td><strong>Indicators:</strong> Students will be able to demonstrate accurate paraphrasing techniques</td>
<td><strong>Indicators:</strong> Students will work effectively in diverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They will be able to list various</td>
<td>Students will avoid debate and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
causes of conflict, including conflicts over resources, conflicts over values and beliefs, conflicts of aggression

Students will be able to explain their reasoning for why they believe a certain conflict has arisen/escalated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>persuasive speech when speaking</th>
<th>groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They will listen openly and respectfully, avoiding debate when students state beliefs that challenge their own, when appropriate</td>
<td>Students will refrain from using stereotypes in their speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will ask open-ended questions</td>
<td>Students will counter discriminatory statements by others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will stay on topic</td>
<td>They will discuss contributions of diverse groups to their community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will use respectful body language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fountain’s indicators (1999) above clearly outline some of the actions expected from students as they participate in EIU programs, and conversely indicates whether or not a program has been successful in realizing its goals – if these behavioral indicators are witnessed among students during and after the program (measured against pre-tests and pre-observations of the EIU program). This emphasis on behaviors, the cultivation of dispositions for nonviolence, and inner peace is reflected in the six thematic areas of EIU (as described in Toh, 2004), which served as guiding tenets of the 2009 APCEIU training workshops. This section has addressed the programmatic design, pedagogical principles and attitudinal and behavioral goals of EIU as indicators for education for peace programs. Hereafter, a description of the 2009 APCEIU program is outlined.

**DESCRIPTION OF THE APCEIU 2009 TRAINING PROGRAM**

The 2009 APCEIU training program was conducted in Seoul and Inchon, South Korea, September 4-13, 2009. During the workshops, participants were introduced to educational theories, literature, methodologies, and conceptual and normative frameworks of the field of education for international understanding and peace (see UNESCO, 1974, 1995; UN, 1999). The educators were asked to identify areas in their own professional practice in which they could train other teachers on the philosophy and practice of peace education. The objective of the training program was to raise dialogue and cooperation among teacher-trainers for the
development of training programs and policies related to EIU. Ultimately, the goal is for these informed educators to begin infusing peace, international understanding, and nonviolent education concepts and practices into their institutes and teacher-training programs in the home countries. Funding for the program was provided by the United Nations Development Program.

The APCEIU training program was directed by a Secretariat in consultation with education consultants and in collaboration with interns and volunteers from local universities. Consultation meetings were conducted by APCEIU in May 2009 in Seoul, and in June 2009 in Bangkok. During these meetings the education team drafted the scope and responsibilities of the workshops in accordance with expected outcomes set by APCEIU. Consultants and resource-persons for the training program included Swee-hin Toh of the United Nations University for Peace in Costa Rica, Francis Daehoon Lee of the NGO Asian Regional Exchange for New Alternatives, Joy De Leo of the Australian Council for Private Education and Training, Lea Espellardo of the Philippines Educational Theatre Association, and Kevin Kester of Northwestern University’s Civic Education Project in Evanston, Illinois, USA. It was collaboratively decided at these consultation meetings that Toh’s (2004) framework on EIU would be the guiding conceptual document for the training program. Toh’s framework organizes EIU training around six themes:

- Education for disarmament and peace
- Human rights
- Social justice
- Sustainability
- Intercultural understanding
- Inner peace

This framework accordingly necessitated the development of evaluation tools that reflects the six themes. The evaluation tools are discussed hereafter.
Participants of the training program included educators and policy-makers from 24 Asia-Pacific countries. There were 42 educators in total. The educators are associated with International Organizations, Ministries of Education, National Institutes of Education, Universities, NGOs, and Secondary and Primary Schools. A sampling of the participants reveals the varied experience and levels at which the educators work. The participants included the Secretary-General of UNESCO in Afghanistan, the Assistant Secretary-General of UNESCO in Pakistan, the Palau Minister of Education/Chairman of the Palau National Commission for UNESCO, participants from the China National Institute for Educational Research, University of the South Pacific (Fiji), Miriam College (Philippines), Nanyang Technological University (Singapore), University of Dhaka (Bangladesh) and Korea University (Seoul). The majority of educators (15) are from teacher education institutes, 12 are from Ministries of Education, 9 from schools and 6 from International Organizations. The educators are between the ages of 25-60 and occupy positions of educational leadership in their home countries. Participants’ home countries are listed here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Institution/Institute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Afghanistan (2 participants) -</td>
<td>(UNESCO affiliates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Bangladesh (1) -</td>
<td>(Institute of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Bhutan (2) -</td>
<td>(Ministry of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>China (1) -</td>
<td>(China National Institute for Educational Research)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Fiji (1) -</td>
<td>(University of South Pacific)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Indonesia (2) -</td>
<td>(Ministry of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Iran (1) -</td>
<td>(Ministry of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan (1) -</td>
<td>(Foundation for Tolerance International)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Laos (2) -</td>
<td>(Ministry of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Malaysia (2) -</td>
<td>(Ministry of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Maldives (1) -</td>
<td>(Education Development Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Mongolia (2) -</td>
<td>(Mongolian State University; Ministry of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Myanmar (1) -</td>
<td>(Sagaing Institute of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Pakistan (2) -</td>
<td>(National Commission for UNESCO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Palau (1) -</td>
<td>(Minister of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea (1) -</td>
<td>(Ministry of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Philippines (2) -</td>
<td>(Leyte Normal University; Miriam College Teacher Institute)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Republic of Korea (6) -</td>
<td>(Korea University)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ORGANIZATION OF APCEIU WORKSHOPS

The program was organized around opening and closing ceremonies with a keynote speaker, Post-Modernist theorist Homi Bhabha of Harvard University, and included workshops on the six themes of EIU. There were also field visits to the South Korean Ministry of Education, the De-Militarized Zone (DMZ), local schools, a forum on textbook analysis, action plan workshops, and cultural tours of South Korea. The program is outlined here:

I. Opening Ceremony:
Welcome Speeches – Director, APCEIU; Representative from the Ministry of Education, Republic of Korea
Keynote Speech – Post-Modernist Scholar, Homi Bhabha, Harvard University

II. Thematic Sessions:
1.1. Introduction to EIU I
1.2. Introduction to EIU II
2.1. Basics of Human Rights that Educators in the 21st Century Should Know
2.2. Special Workshop on Children’s Rights – with Jacqueline Bhabha, Harvard University
2.3. Educating for Human Dignity, Rights and Responsibilities
3.1. Development and Globalization for the Common Good
3.2. Education for Global and Local Justice: Another World is Possible I
3.3. Education and Global and Local Justice: Another World is Possible II
4.1. Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Understanding I
4.2. Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Understanding II
5.0. Spirituality of Peace: Learning from the Wisdom of Diverse Cultures and Civilizations
6.1. Whole-School Approach and Critical Empowerment
6.2. Pedagogical Methods and Skills
6.3. Curriculum Mapping
7.1. Education for Disarmament, Non-Violence and Conflict Transformation I
7.2. Education for Disarmament, Non-Violence and Conflict Transformation II
7.3. Education for Disarmament, Non-Violence, and Conflict Transformation III: Special Focus on Korean Context
8.1. Education for Sustainable Development
8.2. Incorporating ESD into Formal Education

III. Field Visits:
1.0. Seoul Global High School
2.0. Ministry of Education, Science and Technology
3.1. De-Militarized Zone (DMZ) Peace-Life Valley visit
3.2. Organic Farming and Participatory Community Development at DMZ Peace-Life Valley; Observation of Summer School for Rural-Urban Collaboration in Education
3.3. Biodiversity in the Swamp

IV. Cultural Experiences:
1.0. Korean Night – exhibit of Korean food, song, dance, and children’s games
2.0. Cultural Night – display and exchange of information, song and dances of the participant’s countries
3.0. Visit to Insadong – center for traditional Korean culture and art
4.0. Seoul city tour
Developmentally, the thematic sessions were generally organized into pairings to allow for an exploration of the thematic topic, e.g., human rights, social and economic justice, and disarmament in the first session. Session two focused on infusing the thematic content into educational practice and programmatic design. As the participants are teacher-educators and educational policy-makers, the second session allowed for reflection on how to integrate EIU concepts into the practitioner’s daily functions.

Field visits served to reify learning through “seeing EIU in action” at local schools and in community projects. The cultural activities provided a platform for sharing and networking among workshop participants, which the participants noted as a formidable part of the training. Additionally, the preparation of possible local projects and action plans assisted in conceptually transferring concepts and practices of EIU from the Korean context to the educator’s home context. Each participant of the training program left APCEIU and Korea with an EIU project to be implemented in the home country. After returning home, participants continued to develop their EIU projects and remained in contact with APCEIU, and with me.

PRE-PROGRAM QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

The evaluation of the EIU program consisted of pre-tests, formative and summative evaluations assessing participants’ understandings of EIU goals, content, pedagogy, and workshop learning within the realm of the six themes of EIU. Adapting the indicators of EIU from Reardon (2001), EURED (2002), Fountain (1999), UNICEF (1995), and the criteria set out by Churchill and Omari (1981) (noting the emphasis on knowledge, attitudes, and skills), and drawing on the author’s experience with the development and evaluation of education for peace programs in Japan, South Korea, and the United States (Kester, 2008), I evaluated the impact of the 2009 APCEIU training program on participants. To do so, I developed assessment tools (described in further detail hereafter) in collaboration with Swee-hin Toh and APCEIU Education Program Director Eom Jeongmin. Pre-program questionnaires were collected in July 2009.
The pre-program questionnaires, including background information and the seven questions concerning the participants’ interest and previous experience in EIU, revealed:

**Background information:**


2. *Affiliations* — Secretary-General of UNESCO in Afghanistan, UN Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA), Assistant Secretary-General of UNESCO in Pakistan, Palau Minister of Education/Chairman of the Palau National Commission for UNESCO, China National Institute for Educational Research, University of the South Pacific (Fiji), Miriam College (Philippines), Nanyang Technological University (Singapore), University of Dhaka (Bangladesh), Korea University, among others.

3. *Categories of institutions* — International organizations, Ministries of Education, national institutes of education, Universities, NGOs, primary and secondary schools

**Responses to the seven questions:**

1. *Understanding of EIU* — EIU concerns “education planners’ capacities to manage social changes within their educational context through curriculum development in their respective countries,” “holistic, challenging and multidimensional initiatives in fostering tolerance,” “holistic approaches to education,” “respect for fundamental human right,” “issues such as human rights, women’s rights, sustainable development, protection of natural resources, gender equity, civic rights, social equity…,” “educating a citizen of peace who feels responsibility not only for his/her own life but also for his/her country and the world as a whole,” “sustainability,” “engage people in becoming active citizens that can make informed decisions,” “cooperation,” “understanding other people,” “holism,” “strengthening teachers’ beliefs,” and “a global perspective, cross-cultural awareness and global systems.”
2. **Issues of interest relevant to EIU** — 1. Human Rights (17 of 29 respondents confirmed an interest in Human Rights); 2. Peace (23 respondents confirmed an interest in Peace); 3. Globalization and Social Equity (18 confirmed an interest in Globalization); 4. Non-Violence and Disarmament Education (11 confirmed an interest in Disarmament); 5. Education for Sustainable Development (26 confirmed an interest in ESD); 6. Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Understanding (25 confirmed an interest in Intercultural Understanding); and 7. Dialogue across Civilizations (13 confirmed an interest in Dialogue across Civilizations).

3. **Previous activities related to EIU** — Curriculum development, training teachers, conducting negotiations and mediations between conflicting parties on a local and regional scale, organization of peace camps at pre-service training programs, UNESCO club coordinator, teaching course on values education, previous participation in APCEIU programs.

4. **Expected learning / skills developed** — Knowledge on thematic areas, pedagogical skills and tips, teaching and learning resources, examples of good practices, exposure to Korean context, networking with Korean colleagues.

5. **Areas reflecting EIU in home country** — National curriculum guidelines, textbooks, teacher training, conferences, relevant books and DVDs.

6. **Teacher education system in home country** — “Teacher education system is guided by the government and is divided into pre-service education, secondary teacher-training schools, and in-service education institutes and training schools. There are national guidelines in pre-service education curriculum.” “10% of teacher-training is given to methods and more than 75% to content.” “In Kyrgyzstan there are universities with pedagogical departments for elementary school and for high school, there are majors such as mathematics, philology, or social sciences with pedagogical education simultaneously. Pre-service education for teachers in Kyrgyzstan is provided by the
Institute of Teachers’ Education Improvement. Annually teachers improve their qualification in their particular fields.” “The Malaysian education system adopts a highly holistic approach. Apart from content knowledge, we also give emphasis on moral values and attitude to instill tolerance and acceptance towards diversity among people not only in Malaysia, but people of the world.”

7. **Overall expectations of the workshop** — “To learn about the education systems of other countries,” “networking among teacher education colleagues,” “learning about the thematic issues of EIU,” “ability to confidently promote EIU through trainings in my district whereby building a network of educators committed to the promotion of EIU,” “to learn about the success stories in the fields of non-violence and peace,” “to understand EIU better and be prepared to help my faculty as well as our teacher education students and the other teachers in our region to have a better grasp of EIU,” “share many thoughts and practical examples with each other,” “to enhance my knowledge, methods teaching and cooperation with other countries on EIU.”

**PRE-PROGRAM CONCLUSIONS**

Possible conclusions from the pre-program questionnaires include that many of the educators perceive EIU as focused on “holism,” “sustainability,” “human rights,” and “responsibility,” and, correspondingly, more teacher-educators are concerned with modules for Education for Sustainable Development and Intercultural Understanding than other facets of the program. Information from the pre-program questionnaires allowed trainers to understand where the educators were intellectually situated in regards to EIU and what common ground existed between the various teacher-educators and their approaches to training. The pre-program questionnaires indicated a wealth of experience with which participants entered training. This assisted in fostering cultural and professional exchange at a level that many educators appreciated and expressed a desire for.
FORMATIVE AND SUMMATIVE EVALUATION RESULTS

This section is an analysis of the formative and summative evaluation results of the 2009 APCEIU training program, with concluding remarks by the author.27 There were a high number of questionnaires returned by participants during the training sessions (e.g. the average return was 28 of 42, which equates a 67% return). This indicates the participants’ strong interest in participating in the feedback process to improve the program, and is perhaps also reflective of the relative ease of returning evaluations to program personnel during the workshops. Evaluations were collected every second day to allow for necessary adaptations of the training program per participants’ comments and suggestions. The points being evaluated include:

Formative Evaluations (Days 1-8):

1. Content and Process
   a. I understood the objectives of the session
   b. Content was relevant to my needs

2. Learning Gained for Thematic Sessions
   a. I gained knowledge on the theme
   b. I want to learn more
   c. I am confident that I could lead a session on EIU at home

3. Suggestions for Improvement
   a. An open-ended question for detailed responses

Summative Program Evaluation (Days 1-10):

1. Community Ethos
   a. Selection of EIU participants
   b. Opening ceremony
   c. Developing a learning community
   d. Other aspects

27 Charts in this section are used with APCEIU permission.
2. Curriculum
   a. Program goals
   b. Workshops & activities
   c. Course readings, resources

3. Program Components
   a. Field visits
   b. Cultural activities
   c. Textbook analysis forum
   d. Action plan

4. Residential Life
   a. Instructional facilities
   b. Housing and residential facilities
   c. Other aspects

5. Personal Outcomes
   a. Experiences that I enjoyed
   b. How I am beginning to think differently
   c. What do I hope to do differently in my training
   d. What will I explore further after this training
   e. What I gained a deeper understanding of

6. Overall Assessment of Program
   a. What worked best about the APCEIU EIU-training program overall?
   b. What parts of the program or curriculum seemed to work most effectively with participants’ interest, skills, and ability levels?
   c. What parts of the program or curriculum seemed to work least effectively?
   d. To what extent did participants and staff contribute to building and supporting an inclusive community?
### UNESCO-APCEIU Teacher-Educators’ Training Program

**Evaluation for Day 1 & 2**

**Themes:** *Introduction to Education for International Understanding (EIU), Education for Human Dignity, Rights and Responsibilities*

Please circle the appropriate response for each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content and Process</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I understood the objectives of the days’ sessions.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The content was relevant to my needs.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am satisfied with the amount of interaction between facilitators and participants.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am satisfied with the amount of interaction among participants.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learnings Gained (Introduction to Education for International Understanding)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. The keynote speech of Homi Bhabha was engaging and relevant.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The EIU overview has better prepared me for upcoming thematic sessions on EIU.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am more informed on the purposes and objectives of EIU.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am more confident that I could facilitate a session on EIU at home.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learnings Gained (Education for Human Dignity, Rights, and Responsibilities)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. I have been introduced to new human rights instruments and concepts.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The special workshop on Children’s Rights by Jacqueline Bhabha was helpful.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I want to learn more about applying Human Rights tools in teacher-education programs.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am more confident that I could facilitate a session on Education for Human Dignity, Rights, and Responsibilities at home.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any suggestions for program improvement that you would like to share:
Conclusions: The majority of participants were satisfied with the content, process and learning gained in training sessions 1 & 2. Points that teachers expressed the greatest satisfaction with included “increased confidence that they could facilitate a session on EIU at home”, a desire “to learn more about applying human rights tools in teacher-education programs”, and “increased confidence that they could facilitate a session on education for human dignity, rights, and responsibilities at home.” This points to the participants’ interest in conducting similar training programs on EIU in their home contexts and highlights their interest in the general themes of EIU.

(33 of 42 evaluations were returned for Days 1 & 2)
### UNESCO-APCEIU Teacher-Educators’ Training Program
#### Evaluation for Day 3 & 4

**Themes:** Education for Global and Local Justice, Education for Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Understanding

Please circle the appropriate response for each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content and Process</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I understood the objectives of the days’ sessions.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The content was relevant to my needs.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am satisfied with the amount of interaction between and among participants and facilitators.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am satisfied with living arrangements at the UNESCO Peace Center.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The living space fosters a strong community and encourages intercultural understanding.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learnings Gained (Education for Global and Local Justice)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learnings Gained</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. I learned more about globalization, social equity, and cultural diversity.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I gained knowledge about the effects of globalization on North/South contexts.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I realized the importance of education to contribute to social justice.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I want to apply what I learned in my own training programs.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am more confident that I could facilitate a session on Education for Global and Local Justice at home.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learnings Gained (Education for Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Understanding)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learnings Gained</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. I learned more about cultural diversity and intercultural understanding.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I gained knowledge on how to foster intercultural understanding through education programs.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The forum on textbook analysis was helpful.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I want to apply what I learned in my own training programs.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I am more confident that I could facilitate a session on Education for Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Understanding at home.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any suggestions for program improvement that you would like to share:
Conclusions: The majority of participants were satisfied with the content, process and learning gained in training sessions 3 & 4. Participants were most interested in “applying what they learned [on education for global and local justice, and education for cultural diversity and intercultural understanding] in their own training programs” and “learning more about cultural diversity and intercultural understanding.” The educators’ inclinations toward intercultural understanding were integral to the success of the cultural nights and other cultural festivities during the workshops.
### Content and Process

1. I understood the objectives of the days’ sessions.  
   | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Total |
   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 9 | 24 |
2. The content was relevant to my needs.  
   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 8 | 24 |
3. I am satisfied with the amount of interaction among participants.  
   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 11 | 24 |
4. The living and learning space promotes dialogue and professional exchange.  
   | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 10 | 24 |
   | 0 | 0 | 1 | 57 | 38 | 96 |

### Learnings Gained (Spirituality of Peace)

5. I learned more about the role of spirituality in fostering multiple levels of peace.  
   | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 9 | 24 |
6. I gained insights into the wisdom of diverse cultures.  
   | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 8 | 24 |
7. I am seeing more the importance of values within EIU.  
   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 13 | 24 |
8. I am more confident that I could facilitate a session on Spirituality of Peace at home.  
   | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 9 | 24 |
9. The field visit to Seoul Global High School provided insight into EIU in practice in schools and curriculum.  
   | 0 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 7 | 24 |
10. The field visit to the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology provided insight into EIU in educational policy and systems.  
    | 1 | 2 | 7 | 9 | 5 | 24 |
    | 1 | 2 | 15 | 75 | 51 | 144 |

### Learnings Gained (Education for Disarmament, Non-violence and Conflict Transformation)

11. I am more familiar with the methods and skills of EIU pedagogy (active, participatory, dialogical).  
    | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 9 | 24 |
12. The pedagogy and skills taught are useful and relevant to my teaching / training context.  
    | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 8 | 24 |
13. I feel that I could effectively carry out training on the whole-school approach to education.  
    | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 7 | 24 |
14. I learned more about disarmament, non-violence, and conflict transformation.  
    | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 7 | 24 |
15. I am more confident that I could facilitate a session on Education for Disarmament, Non-violence, and Conflict Transformation at home.  
    | 0 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 5 | 24 |
    | 0 | 0 | 10 | 74 | 36 | 120 |
(24 of 42 evaluations were returned for Days 5 & 6)

**Conclusions:** The majority of participants were satisfied with the content, process and learning gained in training sessions 5 & 6. During these sessions, participants expressed that their greatest learning was in “seeing more the importance of values within EIU.” This learning was formulated within the context of discussions and role-plays concerning spirituality within peace work and education for disarmament and non-violence. The training on spirituality of peace emphasized, among other things, inner peace, equanimity, reflection, and global values that support cultures of peace and/or systems of violence. The discussions were grounded in the lived experiences of participants (e.g. maintaining calmness in spite of the speed and chaos of modern life, deadlines and increased job responsibilities), which stimulated thoughtful dialogue on values in education.
UNESCO-APCEIU Teacher-Educators’ Training Program
Evaluation for Day 7 & 8

**Theme:** Education for Sustainable Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content and Process</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I understood the objectives of the days’ sessions.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The content was relevant to my needs.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The holism of EIU is being clearly illustrated.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I have identified specific educational focus areas in my training in which I can integrate EIU principles and objectives.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am satisfied with the program thus far.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learnings Gained (Education for Sustainable Development)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. I learned more about education for sustainable development.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I have gained skills relevant to training on education for sustainable development.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The field visit to DMZ Peace-Life Valley was relevant and helped me better understand the substance and methodology of education for sustainable development.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am satisfied with the 2-day field visit to DMZ Peace-Valley.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The dialogue with local community members was meaningful.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I am more confident that I could facilitate a session on Education for Sustainable Development at home.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learnings Gained (Education for Disarmament, Non-violence, and Conflict Transformation: Special Focus on Korean Context)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. I gained insights into challenges facing EIU educators in Korea.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I gained insights into opportunities for EIU in Korea and see space in my professional practice to transfer this learning to my context.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I learned more about contextualizing disarmament, non-violence, and conflict transformation within a specific social, political, and economic learning environment.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I am more confident that I could facilitate a session on Education for Disarmament, Non-violence and Conflict Transformation specific to my region at home.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Conclusions: Most participants were satisfied with days 7 & 8 of the program. Participants expressed the greatest satisfaction with “understanding objectives of the days’ sessions,” “learning more about education for sustainable development,” “gaining skills relevant to training on education for sustainable development,” satisfaction with the relevance of the field visit to DMZ Peace-Life Valley that “helped participants better understand the substance and methodology of education for sustainable development,” and the “dialogue with local community members.”

In fact, the results from day 7 & 8 evaluations indicate that participants were most satisfied with this session of the program. This could be indicative of the training itself or reflective of the fact that most educators in the program were already most interested in the theme of Education for
Sustainable Development (as shown in the pre-program questionnaires, in which 26 of 29 respondents indicated an interest in ESD).

**UNESCO-APCEIU Teacher-Educators' Training Program**

**Program Evaluation**

*Please carefully consider each of the following areas, and respond with specific strengths and suggestions for improvement on any or all of the topics below. However, do not feel obligated to comment on every detail if you have nothing to say about a topic. We're looking to know what you think we've done well, and what we could improve upon for future participants.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY ETHOS</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Areas for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection of EIU Participants</td>
<td>- Variety of background and expertise</td>
<td>- Some people had limitation in communicating in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Active</td>
<td>- More countries to be represented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Gender balance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Good selection; fair representation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Good range of participants from different institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Diverse and open minded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening Ceremony</td>
<td>- Simple and good</td>
<td>- Avoid too many speeches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Well organized programme for the opening ceremony</td>
<td>- Symbolic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Meeting with diplomats and participants from the same country</td>
<td>- Include some performances depicting Culture of Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Good to include leading professors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a learning community</td>
<td>- Good atmosphere in learnings</td>
<td>- Little more time for personal interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Excellent idea; must continue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cohesive community of learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The programme was well planned, organized and implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Aspects (Please specify)</td>
<td>Seriousness, efficiency, punctuality, everyone has been so much pampered.</td>
<td>Providing time to programs orientation clearly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CURRICULUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Goals &amp; Learning Objectives</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Areas for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Clear and achievable</td>
<td>- Lack of programme orientation; it would be better if participants have known objectives and goals in advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- It was relevant and would be to students</td>
<td>- State the objectives before each session (debrief)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Very realistic</td>
<td>- Give more time for interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teaching/learning strategies are well-prepared and presented</td>
<td>- Better linkages between different sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops &amp; Activities</td>
<td>- Very active, well-organized, interesting and fun.</td>
<td>- More reflection to do networking with other participants (allow more time for interaction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Variety was present and resources were available</td>
<td>- Pay attention to the time on road and travel time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Creative and enriching</td>
<td>- Some are too “dazzy” and took up too much time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Readings, Resources</td>
<td>- Lots of resources and materials</td>
<td>- If possible, send readings via e-mail to read in advance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Valuable and useful</td>
<td>- Copies of readings to be posted on website. No need to handout printed copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Effective for understanding EIU</td>
<td>- Should give materials before the session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Relevant to subjects</td>
<td>- Too many readings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PROGRAM COMPONENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Visits</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Areas for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seoul Global High School, Ministry</td>
<td>- Inspiring and innovative</td>
<td>- If we had gone for a night to a local school, it would have been better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Ed.,</td>
<td>- Provided insight of EIU in action</td>
<td>- Maybe should spend more time in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- “Utopia” school; interview with students</td>
<td>- Common and general schools (Pre and secondary should be included)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Excellent idea; must be included in all future programmes</td>
<td>- More time for discussions with students. Facility tour was not necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Knowledge of Korean school culture</td>
<td>- Need to visit a non-elite school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Educative &amp; Informative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Visits</td>
<td>- Informative, background of Korean education</td>
<td>- The introduction could have been prepared on paper instead of visiting the Ministry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education, Science &amp;</td>
<td>- Just a visit is okay</td>
<td>- More interactive in presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>- Effective for the programme</td>
<td>- Nothing to do with the foreign people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Should be specific on EIU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Visits</td>
<td>DMZ Peace-Life Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- It was very good chance to visit DMZ and Peace-Life Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Informative and enriching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Giving more insights on ED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Good initiative; must include in all later programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Very enlightening once in a lifetime opportunity for me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Realistic and emotional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Maybe should cut the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Actual/real villages/rural areas need to be included for comparison (1 day is okay for DMZ Peace-Life Valley)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Activities</td>
<td>Korean Night, Cultural Night</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Everyone was exciting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Memorable and good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Enable understanding of different cultures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cultural diversity, intercultural understanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Strengthened the relationship of the participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Please give more time for the activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum on Textbook Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Present in varied context and give many interesting observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Giving the chance to study textbooks from various countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Excellent inclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Learning of curriculums of different cultures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Gave information about what other countries are doing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- It would been better if it was allocated for one day; to see how EIU is integrated in the curriculum in different countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- If time allows, country representatives should be allowed to talk about their curriculum before the analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Should focus on the topic/theme of the session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To be better organized with few countries to present their whole process with weakness and strengths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Plan on EIU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sharing the idea from different perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A teaser for a “real” action plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Limit of time makes us very rush</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Must have monitoring by APCEIU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNesco Peace Center &amp; Residential Life</td>
<td>Strengths</td>
<td>Areas for Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Instructional Facilities             | **-Excellent and classrooms were interactive**  
**-Conductive environment, resources were readily available**  
**-Good accommodation** | **-Need to follow up for continuity and sustainability** |
| Classrooms, computers                |           |                       |
| Housing & Residential Facilities     | **-Very clean and great food**  
**-Comfortable, warm, healthy, and friendly**  
**-Gave participants convenience** | **-More computers should be placed in the internet café** |
| Room, food service, space            |           |                       |
| Other Aspects (Please Specify)       | **-Interns and volunteers**  
**-Staff and instructors were very friendly, helpful, kind, full of understanding**  
**-Very well planned** | **-Ned more organized coordination**  
**-The visit to pizza place was not necessary.** |

**Personal Outcomes**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPERIENCES that I enjoyed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Meeting with a few staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fruitful learning along the sessions, especially trip to DMZ Peace-Life Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Group Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Establishing a good network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Learning about other cultures, religions and making friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Learning from each other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How I am beginning to THINK differently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- There are many linkages between six dimensions of EIU and it’s a good entry point to promote EIU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- According to the globalization; non-violent culture, inculcating EIU concepts in my life first from today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Development and the aim of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Include EIU activities into our teacher training program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Need to train, education, concretize people, students on EIU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Better understanding of EIU – more specific understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I never really had the experience of conflict and division. And I thought about its consequences. Now I know that conflicts really change people’s perceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Enhanced the topic on peace, environmental education and women and gender issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do I hope to DO differently in my training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Constructing approach of equity and equivalence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Integrating EIU perspective to my existing works on ESD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Because I am a different person from a different culture and have got a bigger view and a vision together with a mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Change methodology, obtain new approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Revisit the existing programs to accommodate EIU activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rephrase concept of respect for multiculturalism into EIU framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Effective planning and implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Respect more, tolerate and accept differences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What I will EXPLORE further</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Integrating EIU and ESD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Explore &quot;myself&quot; “Who am I”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Deeper understanding of EIU and practice it in daily life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Education for disarmament, non-violence and conflict transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Incorporating and inspiring the essence of EIU in teacher education curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review and update peace/learning strategies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I gained a deeper understanding of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Globalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Human rights, Human Rights education, Cultural Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Education for dignity, rights and responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Globalization and vision and concepts of EIU and non-violent culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Peace, sustainable development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I developed / improved the following skills:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Religious, cultures and school programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- EIU and ESD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Education for global and local, education for human dignity, rights and responsibility, education for cultural diversity and intercultural, curriculum, relationships, education for sustainable development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extra notes, surprises, confirmations, predictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The APCEIU Training is very important to support the program preparing in my institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Very warm and atmosphere among friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Exercises and role play, discussion with different person from other countries opened my inner eyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reinforce my observation on working etiquette in some participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Excellent team.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OVERALL ASSESSMENT

* What worked best about the UNESCO-APCEIU EIU-training program overall?
  - Using time schedule was excellent
  - Resource person, facilitators and APCEIU staff
  - Planning for the future to enhance peace and harmony in the hearts of younger generation
  - The program includes theory and practice! Site visits provided priceless experience
  - Action Plan could express the degree of participants’ understanding on EIU
  - Sticking to scheduled activities despite minor changes
  - Objectives, approaches, methodologies and training activities
  - The Workshop Programmes and schedule was well-planned and well-coordinated and managed with equally competent resource persons.
  - The selection of participants, accommodation, and field visits.

* What parts of the program or curriculum seemed to work most effectively with participants’ interests, skills, and ability levels?
  - Education global and local justice
  - Pedagogical methods
  - Education for Culture of Peace and Education for global and local justice
  - Action plan; Exercises after a talk
  - Brainstorming and discussions on creative pedagogy
  - EIU games, ESD, intercultural Understanding
  - Sharing their experiences
  - Brainstorming, different creative activities
  - Textbook forum and Action plan sessions
  - The Programme on six themes of EIU obviously seem to work most effectively with participants’ interests, skills and ability levels.

* What parts of the program or curriculum seemed to work least effectively?
  - Conflict Transformation
  - Visit to MEST
  - Talk by Mr. Bhabha
  - Length of training. Training load; no half day breaks after 3 or 4 days
  - We have not done enough debating because of the limited time.
  - Food and religion

* To what extent did participants and staff contribute to building and supporting an inclusive community?
  - To develop perception which are positive to what all of us work
Conclusions: In the final program evaluation, participants highlighted several strengths and weaknesses of the program. Workshop designers and facilitators may use these notes to better design future programs. The strengths and weaknesses of the program, as identified by the teacher-educators who participated in the program, are:

**Strengths:**
- The active and experiential nature of the workshop sessions
- Gender balance among participants and facilitators
- Strong organization and well-planned workshops
- Satisfaction with affective aspects of the program
• Cross-cultural exchanges among and between participants
• Emphasis on critical thinking skills in the workshops
• The use of creative pedagogy

**Weaknesses:**
• Limited English abilities [of some participants] which inhibits conversation and dialogue among participants
• A need for more participant interaction during the training [this pertains to both interaction initiated by participants themselves and interaction facilitated by the EIU session trainers]
• A desire for more time for textbook analysis and action plan preparation
• A desire for more space and time for cultural activities, such as the culture night and Korean social
• Avoid holding training programs during religious observances (e.g. Ramadan) because of constraints placed on participants during these holidays

The overall sentiment expressed in the formative and summative evaluations by participants of the training program was positive. Though several constructive suggestions for improvement have been given, the general understanding is that the APCEIU EIU-training program is valuable and successful. It would be beneficial for all involved and for educators in the Asia-Pacific region if the project were to continue. As one participant stated, the program is: “A gigantic effort to create a better world. Good work and good luck!”

In Chapter 6, I will examine through a qualitative questionnaire the program impact on participants eight months after training. The findings will be mapped against pre-program questionnaires and formative and summative evaluations to chart actual philosophical and pedagogical changes in the participants’ work within home countries and educational institutions.
CHAPTER 6

Eight Months Later:
Assessing the Medium-Term Impact of the APCEIU Training Program

_Establishing lasting peace is the work of education. All politics can do is keep us out of war._

-- Maria Montessori

INTRODUCTION TO FOLLOW-UP REPORT

Eight months after the completion of the APCEIU program at which the pre- and post-evaluations were collected at the training in Seoul, a second set of questionnaires was sent to each of the 42 participants from the 2009 training program. Of the 42 teacher-educators involved in the training, 14 educators responded to the questionnaire. The 14 professionals are teacher-educators and educational researchers from across the Asia-Pacific, representing South Korea (2), China (1), Vietnam (2), Philippines (1), Indonesia (2), Singapore (1), Thailand (1), Myanmar (1), Bangladesh (1), Pakistan (1), and Papua New Guinea (1). This calculates to a 33% response rate among the educators at the training. Data was collected from May to August 2010 through a series of email exchanges. In the initial contact after eight months, I sent the full questionnaire (Appendix B) to all participants. Only two responded. So the questionnaire was altered to include only questions 1, 12, and 14 from the original and was sent again in email text to each educator. Twelve additional educators replied. For this reason, participant responses in this chapter include only these three questions from the original.

A 33% response rate among the participants, while somewhat predictable, is lower than I expected. It may be indicative of linguistic challenges of working across multiple borders with educators whose primary language is not English (the language of APCEIU peace education training and research), or it could represent the degree of usefulness and/or satisfaction with the program in the medium-term. It could also be due to any number of other factors, including, but not limited to, technological access, or low motivation to participate in the study. It could also be
that others are busy implementing the new ideas. Of the 14 educators who did reply, each spoke positively about the APCEIU training. The respondents are eight women and six men.

Nonetheless, in responding to the questionnaire, the 14 participants provided crucial data from which to gauge cautious insights into the program’s effects on training participants. The educators highlighted three primary areas of their post-training activities in the field of peace education: (1) the effect of the program on personal and professional growth, (2) subsequent teaching of relevant programs, and (3) planned future involvement in peace education. Analyzing the data, I see among these participants an intense satisfaction with the program, as well as an expansive effect on their professional inclination toward peace education in their locales through oral promotion, programmatic design, and the development of new research interests related to education for peace. It could also be according to this continued interest in the field that they chose to respond to the research questionnaire. If this is the case, one could argue conversely (and cautiously) that the other 28 educators displayed a decreasing interest in the discipline following the September 2009 training. I note, however, that it is typical to have lower response-rates after events as opposed to on-site. In other words, the attrition rate may display a natural phenomenon instead of a structural weakness.

Specific responses to the questionnaire follow verbatim. They are ordered at random according to geographical proximity to Korea.

THE FOURTEEN PARTICIPANTS’ RESPONSES

I. Participant from South Korea

1. What has been the effect, if any, of the 2009 APCEIU EIU program on you personally and/or professionally?

   It was a great chance to learn about the clear concepts of EIU and activities for understanding EIU in the real world. The clear teaching made it easy for me to deliver EIU themes in later projects. Also it was a time to learn how difficult it is to create an
equal level of understanding among participants from different countries. Therefore, I would say the EIU program was managed very well all the time with open communication and respect by the facilitators, staff, and participants due to a diversity of cultures and personal situations.

2. Have you taught any workshops on EIU (or developed policy related to EIU) since returning from the APCEIU training program? If so, who have been the participants in the training programs (or what was the policy)?

Yes, I have delivered EIU workshops to youth groups – junior/high school students and after-school teachers in the community.

3. Do you have any plans to continue working with EIU-related projects in the future? If so, what are some of those potential projects? With whom will you be working?

Among the Korean participants in 2009 we were actually encouraged to set up a NGO because of our participation in the EIU workshops. Fortunately, we are all very excited about this and have had regular monthly meetings since March 2010. As a non-profit, non-governmental organization, we hope the NGO will be formally launched in early 2011 for schoolteachers, professionals, community educators and peacebuilders. It will serve as a center for various workshops and voluntary activities for international understanding. We envision an international society that promotes and guarantees access to education that is eco-harmonic, peaceful, gender sensitive, human-rights centered and self-empowering of one’s own culture.

We will provide educational services to a diverse set of people in South/North East Asian countries: national/international schoolteachers, students in primary/secondary level, and community members. All kinds of services will be focused on enhancing their capabilities – knowledge, skills, attitudes, practices and aspirations as EIU educators. Our training workshops for teachers will be geared toward developing their capability to respond to the needs in formal school settings. Later on, aside from regularly organizing seminars and conferences, facilitating sharing of experiences among educators/teachers
and publishing manuals, we hope the NGO will bring about significant changes in the way many schools/communities conduct their own EIU education activities.

II. Participant from South Korea

1. What has been the effect, if any, of the 2009 APCEIU EIU program on you personally and/or professionally?

   Personally, I became more aware of my consumption in relation to environmental and developmental issues. Since the 2009 EIU workshops, I have used my bike and public transportation more frequently. Also, I've tried to be an ethical consumer, buying local foods, fair trade goods, and independent brand goods.

   Professionally, I'm doing research on Thai mothers who are marriage immigrants. It's about how Thai mothers teach the Thai language and culture to their Thai-Korean children.

2. Have you taught any workshops on EIU (or developed policy related to EIU) since returning from the APCEIU training program? If so, who have been the participants in the training programs (or what was the policy)?

   I applied some of the teaching methods to my lectures of undergrads and elementary teachers. I integrated aesthetic and kinesthetic activities into my lectures on children's human rights.

3. Do you have any plans to continue working with EIU-related projects in the future? If so, what are some of those potential projects? With whom will you be working?

   Yes, I'll definitely work with EIU-related projects. With teachers and librarians, I'd like to make a reading program around EIU themes.
III. Participant from China

1. What has been the effect, if any, of the program on you personally and/or professionally?

The program has influenced me both personally and professionally. First, I began to pay close attention to the news of the world, especially Asia-Pacific countries. When I heard the news of the recent violence in southern Kyrgyzstan, I was so sad because I missed my APCEIU roommate from Kyrgyzstan. I wanted to write to her to know if she was safe. She is the President of a Tolerance Foundation, and I remember what she said. She said, “No violence; No war; No revolution.” When I visited the World Expo 2010 in Shanghai, I was missing my many friends from the different countries at APCEIU. Second, I am planning to do some research on moral education to communicate with people for peace.

2. Have you taught any workshops on EIU (or developed policy related to EIU) since returning from the APCEIU training program? If so, who have been the participants in the training programs (or what was the policy)?

No. I’m a researcher. I didn't have the chance to teach or develop policy. I just wrote some papers on EIU.

3. Do you have any plans to continue working with EIU-related projects in the future? If so, what are some of those potential projects? With whom will you be working?

I’m going to do research on inner peace. I think inner peace is very important.

IV. Participant from Vietnam

1. What has been the effect, if any, of the 2009 APCEIU EIU program on you personally and/or professionally?
The APCEIU program has affected my thinking and teaching methods.

2. Have you taught any workshops on EIU (or developed policy related to EIU) since returning from the APCEIU training program? If so, who have been the participants in the training programs (or what was the policy)?

I have trained my students and teachers from secondary schools on Education for Sustainable Development and Education for International Understanding in my university (Hanoi National University of Education) and Centre (CEREPROD).

3. Do you have any plans to continue working with EIU-related projects in the future? If so, what are some of those potential projects? With whom will you be working?

I am going to work and research EIU issues in the education system in Vietnam concerning courses, pupils and teachers.

V. Participant from Vietnam

1. What has been the effect, if any, of the program in you personally and or professionally?

The program has effected me professionally. After participating in the APCEIU 2009 workshop, Peace Education (PE) and EIU has became my main research interests, and I will pay attention to these areas.

2. Have you taught any workshops on EIU (or developed policy related to EIU) since returning from the APCEIU training program? If so, who have been the participants in the training programs (or what was the policy)?

No, I haven't taught any workshops on EIU or developed policy to EIU.
3. Do you have any plans to continue working with EIU-related projects in the future? If so, what are some of those potential projects? With whom will you be working?

In the future we would like to start working with EIU-related projects, for example strengthening EIU activities for students at Hanoi National University of Education, if we get funding from national or international sponsors.

VI. Participant from the Philippines
1. What has been the effect, if any, of the 2009 APCEIU EIU program on you personally and/or professionally?

The 2009 APCIEU Training has really opened my eyes on the many great tasks all of us must still do to open the eyes of everyone (faculty, students, community) on the importance of international understanding, especially here in the Philippines.

2. Have you taught any workshops on EIU (or developed policy relating to EIU) since returning from the APCEIU training program? If so, who have been the participants in the training programs (or what was the policy)?

There were initial workshops done in Leyte Normal University with pre-service teachers and sharing done with selected faculty.

3. Do you have any plans to continue working with EIU-related projects in the future? If so, what are some of those potential projects? With whom will you be working?

There will be continuous workshops for faculty of state colleges and universities in Region 8 as part of trainings planned to educate them on education for sustainable development.
VII. Participant from Indonesia

1. What has been the effect, if any, of the 2009 APCEIU EIU program on you personally and/or professionally?

   The APCEIU 2009 Program has totally effected my mindset. Today and in the future, the world needs learning activities and education based around a human rights approach.

2. Have you taught any workshops on EIU (or developed policy relating to EIU) since returning from the APCEIU training program? If so, who have been the participants in the training programs (or what was the policy)?

   We have tried to create a training program for E-9 (nine developing countries in Asia). In October, these programs will be executed by my institution (Centre of Development and Empowerment Teacher and Education Personnel of Medan).

3. Do you have any plans to continue working with EIU-related projects in the future? If so, what are some of those potential projects? With whom will you be working?

   Always, and in the future, I am very pleased to work with APCEIU projects, especially to help me implement my ideas. Currently, I have established a foundation (Karunia Prestasi Foundation for Education). This Foundation is committed to an agenda assisting the Purilieus regions of North Sumatra, which reside outside of traditional access to global information networking like telephones and the internet. At the current moment, telecommunications reach 60% of the total region of North Sumatra. We aim to ensure that educational information, e.g. scholarships, education funding, and research from all regions of the world reach all citizens in these regions, so that the countryside and borderline areas of North Sumatra might learn from information directly. Therefore our team, formed in districts and sub-districts, wants to rebuild the information networking system aimed at that region. We also perceive the information systems as a resource for nearby regions.
In developing and staging our programs we work with organizations in Indonesia and abroad. These include:

- Universities in North Sumatra (Medan State University & North Sumatra University)
- Specialized Training & Vocational Partners (Centre of Development and Empowerment Teacher and Personnel)
- Stakeholders and professional associations
- Academic institutions and institutions of applied research
- Consultancy firms and freelance experts
- Parliamentary members

Below is a list of projects in the field of activities which Karunia Prestasi has conducted in the past few years.

- Journalist training in Medan
- Publishing APCEIU Information
- Publishing information about the Monbusho (Japanese Government) Scholarship
- Publishing information about the 2010 CDETP Training Program
- Publishing 50 Scientific papers, handouts, and tutorials by teachers and experts
- Publishing educational regulations

VIII. Participant from Indonesia

1. What has been the effect, if any, of the 2009 APCEIU EIU program on you personally and/or professionally?

Personally I had the opportunity to meet important UNESCO people, and I learned that they are mostly very tolerant and soft-spoken. I have to learn from them sometimes. I have many new friends and I have even invited two of them to Indonesia to be keynote speakers.

Professionally, I learned how to conduct workshops of EIU.
2. Have you taught any workshops on EIU (or developed policy related to EIU) since returning from the APCEIU training program? If so, who have been the participants in the training programs (or what was the policy)?

Yes, I am teaching EIU, especially for environmental issues. I am still applying for funding. Next year, I hope I can hold a national workshop myself.

3. Do you have any plans to continue working with EIU-related projects in the future? If so, what are some of those potential projects? With whom will you be working?

Yes, I hope EIU can support me to conduct research/case-studies and to conduct workshops/seminars in Indonesia. I hope to continue working together with the facilitators and colleagues I met during the workshop in Korea.

IX. Participant from Singapore

1. What has been the effect, if any, of the 2009 APCEIU EIU program on you personally and/or professionally?

I became more aware of EIU issues, particularly of how EIU can and should be included in teacher education programs.

2. Have you taught any workshops on EIU (or developed policy related to EIU) since returning from the APCEIU training program? If so, who have been the participants in the training programs (or what was the policy)?

No. However, EIU concepts have been discussed and used in our program and curriculum review and development.
3. Do you have any plans to continue working with EIU-related projects in the future? If so, what are some of those potential projects? With whom will you be working?

A colleague from my university will attend the APCEIU workshop this year. We will continue to find ways to incorporate EIU concepts into the teacher education program.

X. Participant from Thailand

1. What has been the effect, if any, of the 2009 APCEIU EIU program on you personally and/or professionally?

I have introduced the six approaches to EIU to my colleagues (i.e. faculty members) through the Research and Development Centre meeting on innovative measures for education for sustainable development. At the personal level, my learning experiences on EIU from the 9th APCEIU workshop last year have affected my academic interests. I have been personally studying issues and concepts of peace, non-violence and conflict resolution, especially during the political conflict in Bangkok from March to May 2010 in Thailand when hatred and violence were strongly developed by the government, soldiers, protesters and other civilians.

2. Have you taught any workshops on EIU (or developed policy related to EIU) since returning from the APCEIU training program? If so, who have been the participants in the training programs (or what was the policy)?

EIU approaches have been integrated into my classes on Innovation in Teaching Social Studies, Seminar in Secondary Education and Society & Education for Sustainability. For example the approaches of EIU have been used as a core theme for students’ projects on ‘Innovation Development in Teaching Social Studies’ that focused on the One ASEAN policy in lower secondary school. Also, my colleagues and I introduced the topic on “How to help students live together peacefully in a diverse society.” We introduced this
to a class in the Seminar in Secondary Education for 5th year students who are completing their teaching practicum in the schools.

3. Do you have any plans to continue working with EIU-related projects in the future? If so, what are some of those potential projects? With whom will you be working?

With my own interest and the mission of the center where I am Director, I am now preparing to propose a new course on ‘Education for a Culture of Peace and Sustainability.’ Moreover last month, another staff member of our center was supported by APCEIU to attend the 10th APCEIU workshop. Now we are developing some proposals for EIU implementation to be presented to the administration for consideration. We hope to integrate education for sustainable development and education for international understanding approaches into pre-service teacher curriculum and national standards.

XI. Participant from Myanmar

1. What has been the effect, if any, of the program on you personally and/or professionally?

The APCEIU 2009 program gave me a lot of insights for my profession.

2. Have you taught any workshops on EIU (or developed policy related to EIU) since returning from the APCEIU training program? If so, who have been the participants in the training programs (or what was the policy)?

I gave a seminar on EIU at my institution after returning from the program. Teaching staff and students attended the workshop. We also planted trees in our campus for greening.

3. Do you have any plans to continue working with EIU-related projects in the future? If so, what are some of those potential projects? With whom will you be working?
I hope to hold workshops on EIU and participate in projects concerning sustainability with the help of my friends.

XII. Participant from Bangladesh
1. What has been the effect, if any, of the program on you personally and/or professionally?

   The effect of the APCEIU EIU training workshops has been positive both personally and professionally. As a teacher I have become a preacher of peace, love, happiness and tolerance. Now I emphasize more on my students to be more loving, caring, tolerant, and respectful to others irrespective of their caste, creed, class, ability or faith both at local, national and also international level.

2. Have you taught any workshops on EIU (or developed policy related to EIU) since returning from the APCEIU training program? If so, who have been the participants in the training programs (or what was the policy)?

   At the institutional level I have incorporated EIU as a component into our undergraduate curriculum along with education for sustainable development, and I trained Master Trainers under a training-of-trainers program for secondary school teachers. I have not organized any separate EIU-related workshops yet, but I have been in close contact with the Ministry of Education to integrate peace education in the national curriculum.

3. Do you have any plans to continue working with EIU-related projects in the future? If so, what are some of those potential projects? With whom will you be working?

   The Institute for Educational Research that I work for has a plan to work with any education project open to collaboration. In our university we have a peace and conflicts department, world religions department that we are closely connected to on these issues.
XIII. Participant from Pakistan

1. What has been the effect, if any, of the program on you personally and/or professionally?

The APCEIU program helped me to understand better the concepts of EIU, peaceful coexistence and the importance of integration of those concepts in the school curricula.

2. Have you taught any workshops on EIU (or developed policy related to EIU) since returning from the APCEIU training program? If so, who have been the participants in the training programs (or what was the policy)?

Human Rights Curriculum already existed in Pakistan. Though I have not conducted any workshop specifically on EIU since the APCEIU training, I am personally ensuring that EIU concepts are integrated into new textbooks during their review and approval processes. I did conduct three training workshops relevant to EIU: two on HIV/AIDS education and one on Developing Curriculum Implementation Frameworks in the past couple of months. In these workshops, I tried to highlight EIU concepts learned at the APCEIU training.

3. Do you have any plans to continue working with EIU-related projects in the future? If so, what are some of those potential projects? With whom will you be working?

I recently contributed one article to the APCEIU magazine "SangSaeng", issue #27 of May 2010, “New Themes in Pakistan’s School Curricula: Promoting EIU, Sustainable Development, and Peaceful Co-existence.” I will continue to write such articles and papers for international conferences in future.

XIV. Participant from Papua New Guinea

1. What has been the effect, if any, of the program on you personally and/or professionally?
We take for granted a lot of the things as they occur or happen without going further in-depth to understand why things happen the way they do or why people act a certain way. By participating in APCEIU and getting to know people from diverse cultures, languages, and countries, I began to understand that the world is not what the media (both print & electronic) portray it to be. I now see people in different countries as individuals – who they are – and not as groups, such as race groups, religious groups, etc.

2. Have you taught any workshops on EIU (or developed policy related to EIU) since returning from the APCEIU training program? If so, who have been the participants in the training programs (or what was the policy)?

   Not in a formally organized session but face-to-face and in groups during staff meetings, official work visits, etc.

3. Do you have any plans to continue working with EIU-related projects in the future? If so, what are some of those potential projects? With whom will you be working?

   EIU skills and programs are of vital importance if we want to see peace prevail in this world. Whatever big or small way I can, as a teacher educator in charge of training new teachers, I will continue to teach anything and everything to do with promoting peace and harmony in this world.

THE MULTIPLYING EFFECT

The responses showcase a multiplying effect of the program on the educators. UNDP agrees. The agency concluded in their Project Final Review Report, *Capacity Building of Teacher Trainers in Asia-Pacific for the Achievement of MDGs* (2009), that among the key successes of the program is the “multiplying effect through [the] training-of-trainers program and successful selection of competent participants”:
While the beneficiaries of the Asia-Pacific Training Workshop were forty-two educators only, their high competency, professional profile and network, strengthened by the training-of-trainers program of this project, are making the multiplying effect. As the participants are carrying out training workshops for their colleagues and teachers in their countries, indirect beneficiaries of this project are expected to multiply. To maximize this multiplying effect, [APCEIU] plans to conduct a systematic monitoring and support program from next year on. (p. 19)

In the UNDP study, several educators shared their continued work in the field. Following up with participants, UNDP recorded (2009, p. 24) multiple activities the participants have conducted since the program. Some participants reported projects to APCEIU, beyond what has been reported to me. They are:

- A feasibility study to incorporate EIU into school curriculum and instruction being planned in the Republic of Palau
- EIU elements incorporated into existing teacher training workshops in Malaysia
- EIU objectives recommended to be included in the educational policy framework in Bangladesh
- A series of seminars and workshops to be presented with colleagues and local educators in Bhutan, Vietnam, Philippines and Thailand
- EIU article contribution to Faculty Newsletter at The University of the South Pacific, Fiji

Two additional empirical examples of the impact of peace education training, in supplement to the experience of the 14 educators from APCEIU, include two educators (one from the United Nations University for Peace MA Program in Peace Education, and the other a participant in the 2009 APCEIU training) who have initiated, organized and directed institutes working on peace, conflict and development in South Asia. The UN University for Peace educator established a non-profit organization conducting educator training and non-violent activist initiatives in response to issues of peace and conflict in India. This educator was also co-author of a national textbook on peace education following the passing of the 2005 NCERT national curriculum

---

28 These examples are shared with permission from the individuals in reference.
framework, a national mandate by the Indian government dictating that all public schools must include peace education in their curricula. The APCEIU educator, on the other hand, started a professional networking site for educators interested in issues of peace and development in Pakistan and Central Asia. These examples, along with the several Seoul educators who are involved in the design and development of a new teacher-training institute with the objective of training other educators in the philosophical principles and pedagogical methods of peace education, are indicative of Schugurensky’s (2003) ‘expansive hypothesis’.

The 14 participants have provided specific cases of the impact of the training program on their own ontological and pedagogical changes. They are all positive responses. These stories supply insight into the influence of the training program’s multiplying effect on educators.

In Chapter 7, I summarize the empirical study, synthesize the data findings from Chapters 5 and 6, note limitations of the research, and offer recommendations for educators interested in designing future peace education training programs.
CHAPTER 7

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

Peace cannot be achieved through violence,
it can only be attained through understanding.

-- Ralph Waldo Emerson

SUMMARY OF CHAPTERS

In the introduction to this thesis, I located APCEIU within the political economy of the Asia-Pacific and located myself within the research, as educator, trainer, life-long learner, and activist. This research practice is consistent with Freire’s (1970) description of the educator as learner and with feminist methodology that endeavors to transcend Cartesian dualisms to merge the personal and political (Mies, 1983; McNay, 1992; hooks, 1990; Grewal and Kaplan, 1994). Later in the study (in Chapter 3) I also placed myself within an anti-oppressive research tradition (Smith, 1999; Sandoval, 2000; Brown and Strega, 2005). Chapter 1 set the stage for the exploration of peace education and evaluation research that followed.

In Chapter 2, I described peace education, particularly a values-based approach to the field, and outlined a brief history of the practice. Furthermore, I sought to introduce the transformative social justice approach that many programs contain (Galtung, 1975; Reardon, 1988; O’Sullivan, 1999; Brenes, 2004; Jenkins, 2007). The chapter takes the reader on a journey through contemporary debates animating the field of peace education, including negative and positive peace, patriarchy, violence as a natural human phenomenon, peace education and peace activism. Peace education networks and associations, and principles of ecological and personal peace, were also discussed. These debates are then related to anti-oppressive research methods in Chapter 3 and conceptual frameworks for peace education in Chapter 4.
In Chapter 3, I integrated peace education evaluation procedures (Churchill and Omari, 1981) with anti-oppressive research methodologies (Smith, 1999; Sandoval, 2000). This I hope generates a critical approach to conventional qualitative assessments of peace programs. I would argue that my approach to the program evaluation of APCEIU’s workshops is generally the approach accepted and utilized by practitioners in the field (see Fountain, 1999; Nevo and Brem, 2002; Harris, 2003, 2008; Danesh, 2008; as well as my personal conversation with Harris, 2009). In this case, reflecting on the limitations of such choices for evaluation and introducing critical anti-oppressive measurements could benefit many educators searching for evaluation tools and techniques for peace education. I believe that Chapter 3 offers new insights into the practice of peace education program evaluation.

Throughout Chapter 4, I outlined various conceptual models of peace education and academic programs (UNESCO, 1974, 1995; Delors, 1996; Burns and Aspelagh, 1996). The chapter highlighted the Learning to Abolish War model of peace education (Reardon and Cabezudo, 2002) and the Flower-Petal Model (Toh, 2004). The latter half of the chapter focused on the practices of peace education at Teachers College Columbia University and the United Nations University for Peace (Jenkins, 2004). In both cases, I described the programs and listed course content. The content of these programs provide benchmarks in understanding the organization of the APCEIU program and other training programs for peace education.

In Chapter 5, I presented materials gathered from the training workshops in Seoul and publications from APCEIU and UNDP (2009). I coded and analyzed the documents to extrapolate participants’ immediate attitudinal and behavioral changes as a result of participating in the program, as well as their reflections on the training itself. My conclusions from the documentary analysis are presented hereafter.

In Chapter 6, I exhibited data taken from the follow-up questionnaires sent to participants eight months after training. The responses of 14 participants are included in the chapter and indicate a successful program and medium-term impact on many of the educators.
In the concluding section that follows, I will compare findings from the pre-program questionnaires and summative evaluations (completed immediately following the program in September 2009) to the follow-up questionnaire. Final conclusions and recommendations I abstract from the data are presented thereafter.

**PRE-PROGRAM FINDINGS**

The pre-program questionnaires demonstrated that many of the educators perceive EIU as focused on “holism,” “sustainability,” “human rights,” and “responsibility.” Consequently, more of the educators were concerned with modules for Education for Sustainable Development and Intercultural Understanding during the training. Interestingly, these conclusions are also reflected in the formative and summative evaluation results. Gathering this information prior to the program gave facilitators insights into where the educators were intellectually situated in regards to peace education. What was discovered in the pre-program questionnaire, and also supported in the summative program evaluation, was that the wealth of experience with which participants entered training helped foster cultural and professional exchange at a level that many educators appreciated and expressed a desire for. In the final evaluation, participants stated that the diverse community (intentionally created by program directors and consultants in the process of selecting participants) was one of the most profound aspects of the comprehensive training program. From this I infer that a diverse community of participants is key to developing a successful peace education program that emphasizes intercultural understanding, and necessary for meeting the expectations of educators entering the training.29

**IMMEDIATE IMPACT ON EDUCATORS**

In the immediate impact analysis from the summative evaluations, the educators cited their interest in pedagogical and structural aspects of the training. Participants also stated their desire

---

29 This is of course an ideal situation and could encounter logistical complications when conducting training programs in rural regions or more homogeneous nations. In this case, successful coordination of a heterogeneous program would depend largely on the material and financial resources of the training institute to “import” diversity.
for more community interaction. To facilitate this bonding they suggested selecting participants with strong English capacities, encouraging facilitators to allocate more time to interactive exercises, providing space for greater intercultural presentations. Finally, participants pleaded with program administration to avoid hosting the workshops on religious holidays, particularly the observance of Ramadan. This latter point would allow greater participation from all members of the community and would be a manifestation of intercultural awareness and respect. During the 2009 training, which was held during Ramadan, several educators were fasting and cited the religious observance as a critical point that inhibited them from full participation in the workshops. During the 2010 APCEIU training program, administrators respected this request. I expect that this consideration will continue.

Other positive and negative aspects of the program that participants noted in the summative evaluations, include:

**Positive aspects:**
- Active and experiential learning
- The gender balance among participants
- Affective learning that complements cognitive lessons
- Cross-cultural exchange opportunities
- The development of critical thinking skills
- Use of creative pedagogy

**Challenges:**
- Limited English abilities of some educators
- The need for more participant interaction during and between sessions
- More time for textbook analysis and action plan preparation
- More cultural activities
- Avoid training during religious observances

I believe it is the impact cited above, both positive and negative, that served as the impetus for many of the educators to continue working with peace education, particularly those who chose to
conceive and organize their own institutes. In the experience of studying and evaluating the program teacher-educators were provided with ideas for their own projects. During training, a number of educators ‘borrowed’ the evaluation tools designed for APCEIU to be used in their own programs. Even at this early stage they were showing an interest in relating peace education and the training back to their professions.

I conclude from the analysis of the summative evaluations that teacher-educators were satisfied with their involvement in the APCEIU training. Most participants showed satisfaction with and an interest in the following aspects of the program:

- Establishing networks and intercultural exchange during training
- Integrating personal and professional experience into the training sessions as a mode to explore reflexive praxis in the workshops
- Integrating peace education into their existing work at home
- Experimenting with new and innovative teaching styles
- Re-imaging concepts of multiculturalism
- Transforming personal behaviors pertaining to respect and tolerance

Additionally, many participants stated that they were intrigued by the focus on conflict as positive transformation rather than negative tension to be avoided. This transformative perspective to conflict alters the way educators approach training, insomuch as participants begin to think of peace education not only as an attempt to resolve or mitigate conflict but to embrace it, learn from it and potentially transform cultures in the process. The participants expressed an enhanced sense of the links between peace, environmental education and women and gender issues. Using the data contained herein future workshop creators and education consultants could better design peace education workshops.

MEDIUM-TERM IMPACT ON EDUCATORS

The 14 educators who responded in May-August 2010 emphasized particular ontological changes they experienced through the training. They also indicated subsequent professional
development opportunities and personal practices influenced by their participation in the 2009 APCEIU program. These three factors relate roughly to worldviews, pedagogical techniques, and research. Pertaining to ontological changes (self-identified by the educators), they expressed new perspectives on ‘environmentalism’, ‘peace concepts and the integration of these concepts into school curricula’, ‘increased interest in world events’, and ‘enhanced understanding of multiculturalism’, all changes that resulted from their time with APCEIU. This data also corresponds with the pre-program findings that revealed many participants’ interests in ecology and multiculturalism.

In terms of professional development, in the follow-up questionnaire educators described their satisfaction with the networking opportunities of the training that continued beyond the program. They highlighted the impact of the program on their research interests (ecology; moral education; inner peace; difficulties faced by Thai-Korean mothers living in Thailand) and declared an interest in creating peace education reading lists for other educators. One participant cited his newfound practice of introducing colleagues to the field. In two particular instances, educators noted success in helping peers secure a position in the 2010 APCEIU training program. This data expands upon the pre- and post-program findings with published research the educators have completed since the end of training. One educator in particular published an article on ‘sustainability, peace and international education in Pakistan’ with APCEIU’s in-house journal, SangSaeng.

Pertaining to the educators’ professional practices, several stated increased interest in teaching peace education related courses, specifically on environmental issues and conflict management. Others said they are applying the participatory teaching methods learned at APCEIU to their own instruction. Another is integrating peace education concepts into Pakistani national textbooks, and one is working to create new peace education programs for pre-service teachers at Hanoi National University of Education. These comments especially accentuate how participants have integrated the learning from APCEIU’s training program into their practices through new courses, thematic research foci, and the inclusion of peace themes in national textbooks.
From this, I conclude that the multiplying effect of the APCEIU training impacted at least 14 of the 42 participants, a 33% success rate – substantial for such a small program. All the educators who did respond found the training helpful, as discussed herein. This reflects the ‘expansive hypothesis’ of Schugurensky (2003), the findings of Lerner and Schugurensky (2007), and the peace education evaluation findings of Nevo and Brem (2002). The Nevo and Brem (ibid) study concludes that peace education programs focusing on intercultural understanding are more successful than programs attempting to reduce violence in schools and communities, and furthermore that shorter programs tend to be more successful than longer programs. Perhaps this partially explains the relative success of the APCEIU training. It also offers critical points for consideration when developing programs.

CONCLUSIONS

As expressed in Chapter 1, participatory democratic approaches to education, like peace education, create an academic environment whereby people learn citizenship and peaceful activism through their participation in the program (see Mill, 1862; Rousseau, 1968; Pateman, 1970; Mansbridge, 1997; Merrifield, 2001; Schugurensky, 2004). According to Pateman (1970, p. 45): “The theory of participatory democracy argues that the experience of participation in some way leaves the individual better psychologically equipped to undertake further participation in the future.” Lerner and Schugurensky (2007), in their examination of a participatory budgeting project in Rosario, Argentina, empirically found that such programs do have a positive impact on participants, and those participants take the lessons forward into other dimensions of their lives.

Teacher-training programs might also result in such positive effects on participants. The educators participating in this study, for example, through their experience with peace education training at the APCEIU program, articulated their sense of increased professional preparedness and psychological motivation to direct peace education training programs after the conclusion of the APCEIU training. At least 14 of the educators went on to do so in some aspect.
Accordingly, this study has revealed the impact of APCEIU training on teacher-educators. Hereafter, I hope peace educators will use this study to further explore the impact of peace education training programs on participants, both educators and students, to substantiate the need for peace education training programs. In my future studies I intend to use this research as a platform for delving into a longitudinal study assessing the long-term impact of peace education training. I plan to remain in contact with these same educators to attempt to record sustained changes among them (due to APCEIU training) in the next 2-5 years. I also propose in further studies to compare the data contained herein to graduates of other peace education training programs, such as Teachers College Columbia University’s Peace Education Program and the Peace Education MA Program at the United Nations University for Peace. Comparing the data will serve to further illuminate the influence of these programs on educational policy and training, and it will potentially provide peace educators additional success stories.

**LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

Throughout the research I have clearly identified my interest in the field of peace education, my relationship with the organizations and programs under study, and my close connection to many of the research participants. In this, I am expressing my acknowledgement that the data and findings contained herein are subjective, as opposed to the usually sought after “objectivity” and “neutrality” of positivist research. Yet, as I accept educators and researchers are political actors and the site of education itself a political space, I did not aim herein to produce objective generalized knowledge, rather to describe through an exploratory study the potential impact on teacher-educators participating in peace education training programs, so that these findings might assist others educators in more effectively designing, developing and implementing peace education programs in the future. My findings, while modest, display the effect of one peace education training program on 42 teacher-educators and researchers from across the Asia-Pacific, a diverse community, and particularly the medium-term impact of that program on 14 educators eight months later.
This research does not suggest that every participant in the peace education training program will go on to educate for peace, perhaps become an activist, or even apply the learning from the programs. What it does suggest is that many educators from APCEIU will continue with the learning. Indeed, the data indicate that after taking the course participants experienced deep worldview shifts and began to implement the learning into curricula, both institutional and national, and that some have even started the initial stages of establishing peace education training centers of their own. I posit that the APCEIU training program is not merely a vehicle through which educators channel their interest in peace education but is a catalyst for Asia-Pacific educator networks and capacity-building toward cultures of peace.

Furthermore, while there are numerous non-conventional and anti-oppressive tools for conducting participant assessments in learning settings, including journals, reflective essays, group presentations, and problem-solving activities, I have found that conducting a meta-evaluation of a program and its impact on participants presents challenges beyond pedagogical classroom techniques. Progressive peace education classroom pedagogy, as I have written elsewhere (Kester, 2008), assists in transformative education that focuses on individual and group growth rather than conformity to standards dictated by the educator. However, in some respects, I have directed the study of the impact on educators too much. I would have preferred more participation and cooperation in the development of the evaluation from other facilitators at APCEIU and from the participants themselves. This would have cultivated a more participatory study. It was primarily due to time constraints that the study did not employ more participatory methods, such as participatory action research. This is not so much a failure of the study but a lesson learned. Having summarized and discussed the limitations of the study, I now present recommendations for future training programs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, I would like to make three recommendations for future practice. First, I recommend that designers and facilitators continue to host the EIU training program in various countries throughout the Asia-Pacific region while giving considerable
thought to not conducting the program during religious holidays (e.g. Ramadan). Second, I recommended that formative and summative program evaluations be conducted each year and compared to previous assessments to monitor extensive program developments longitudinally. Finally, to encourage maximum participant engagement with the field of peace education, I recommend that follow-up questionnaires be collected from participants to chart the long-term impact of the EIU-training program on participating teacher-educators and policy-makers.

Also, pertaining to the evaluation of the impact of peace education programs, I would encourage future program designers to include at least two additional components in their programs. First, I believe it is necessary that the participants themselves explore through a dialogical process how they would define and measure the success of both the APCEIU program and future programs they will host in their home countries. This would illuminate for all involved the multiple perspectives on what success might mean for a training program. For example, does program success equate contributions to new literature in the field, or publications for the participants? Does success lead to the development of workshops or courses on peace education in universities? Does personal transformation constitute a successful program? How would the participants benchmark their own achievements in peace education? Evaluation itself might become a method of peacebuilding.

To facilitate such a discussion, I would suggest the inclusion of a module on program evaluation in the overall training program, perhaps near the end of training. This module could include an introduction to the various methods of evaluation used in other peace education programs around the world. It could then assess the relevance of the models to the Asia-Pacific context, leading participants to brainstorm and develop a culturally relevant model. As well, in this same session, the facilitators would open discussion on how one defines and measures a successful program. This approach is much more participatory and offers an opportunity to learn about the process of evaluation through doing. Furthermore, such an approach would minimize a top-down assessment and increase diverse perspectives on the subject. Harry Mika (2002) writes in the abstract to his article on evaluation as peacebuilding:
An evaluation approach that is collaborative and elicitive may well serve as a catalyst for transforming relationships of power, standing in stark contrast to more conventional and staid evaluation practices that are technical in nature and actuarial in intent. Election of an orientation is the most decisive and strategic choice that is made in approaching evaluation and articulating value imperatives in fieldwork, coloring as it surely does the pragmatic stages of evaluation and good practice for the peacebuilder. (p. 339).

Concerning diversity, I also believe consultants and facilitators must ensure an environment respectful of diverse identities and worldviews, as we did at APCEIU, including an intellectual community with heterogeneous perspectives on peace education. It seems that the presentation of peace education themes and methodology might sometimes become dogmatic or too “universalized.” The notion of a universal peace education is surely antithetical to the principles and objectives of a multidisciplinary and global field. For example, when presenting models of peace education, facilitators should discuss the models as ‘one model’, or ‘a model’, not ‘the model’ and ensure that participants are aware of the many disparate frameworks that exist for the conceptualization of programs. Otherwise, trainers risk preaching one particular perspective on the field.

Finally, I remind trainers of the importance of community-building modules and activities at the beginning of training. Though learning games and community-building activities may take valuable classroom time from presenting concepts, the process is indispensable to fostering a trusting and respectful community open to the intellectual experimentation that occurs in peace education training. Progressive peace education training workshops might center on critical thought surrounding post-modernism, post-structuralism, post-colonialism, and decolonization processes, among other approaches. To enter into this critical dialogue with the self and others, it is helpful if participants have developed a sense of trust and experimentation among each other. Echoing what participants have stated in the questionnaires, I conclude that the use of creative pedagogy and development of open learning communities are perhaps the most important elements of successful programs.
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APPENDIX A. Formative and Summative Evaluations at APCEIU Training, September 2009

UNESCO-APCEIU Teacher-Educators’ Training Program
Evaluation for Day 1 & 2

*Themes: Introduction to Education for International Understanding (EIU), Education for Human Dignity, Rights and Responsibilities*

Please circle the appropriate response for each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content and Process</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I understood the objectives of the days’ sessions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The content was relevant to my needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am satisfied with the amount of interaction between facilitators and participants.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am satisfied with the amount of interaction among participants.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learnings Gained (Introduction to Education for International Understanding)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. The keynote speech of Homi Bhabha was engaging and relevant.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The EIU overview has better prepared me for upcoming thematic sessions on EIU.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am more informed on the purposes and objectives of EIU.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am more confident that I could facilitate a session on EIU at home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learnings Gained (Education for Human Dignity, Rights, and Responsibilities)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. I have been introduced to new human rights instruments and concepts.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The special workshop on Children’s Rights by Jacqueline Bhabha was helpful.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I want to learn more about applying Human Rights tools in teacher-education programs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am more confident that I could facilitate a session on Education for Human Dignity, Rights, and Responsibilities at home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any suggestions for program improvement that you would like to share:
UNESCO-APCEIU Teacher-Educators’ Training Program

Evaluation for Day 3 & 4

Themes: Education for Global and Local Justice, Education for Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Understanding

Please circle the appropriate response for each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content and Process</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I understood the objectives of the days’ sessions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The content was relevant to my needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am satisfied with the amount of interaction between and among participants and facilitators.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am satisfied with living arrangements at the UNESCO Peace Center.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The living space fosters a strong community and encourages intercultural understanding.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learnings Gained (Education for Global and Local Justice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. I learned more about globalization, social equity, and cultural diversity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I gained knowledge about the effects of globalization on North/South contexts.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I realized the importance of education to contribute to social justice.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I want to apply what I learned in my own training programs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am more confident that I could facilitate a session on Education for Global and Local Justice at home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learnings Gained (Education for Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Understanding)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. I learned more about cultural diversity and intercultural understanding.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I gained knowledge on how to foster intercultural understanding through education programs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The forum on textbook analysis was helpful.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I want to apply what I learned in my own training programs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I am more confident that I could facilitate a session on Education for Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Understanding at home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any suggestions for program improvement that you would like to share:
UNESCO-APCEIU Teacher-Educators’ Training Program
Evaluation for Day 5 & 6

**Theme(s):** Spirituality of Peace, Education for Disarmament, Non-violence, and Conflict Transformation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content and Process</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I understood the objectives of the days’ sessions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The content was relevant to my needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am satisfied with the amount of interaction among participants.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The living and learning space promotes dialogue and professional exchange.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learnings Gained (Spirituality of Peace)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. I learned more about the role of spirituality in fostering multiple levels of peace.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I gained insights into the wisdom of diverse cultures.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am seeing more the importance of values within EIU.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am more confident that I could facilitate a session on Spirituality of Peace at home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The field visit to Seoul Global High School provided insight into EIU in practice in schools and curriculum.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The field visit to the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology provided insight into EIU in educational policy and systems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learnings Gained (Education for Disarmament, Non-violence and Conflict Transformation)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. I am more familiar with the methods and skills of EIU pedagogy (active, participatory, dialogical).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The pedagogy and skills taught are useful and relevant to my teaching / training context.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I feel that I could effectively carry out training on the whole-school approach to education.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I learned more about disarmament, non-violence, and conflict transformation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I am more confident that I could facilitate a session on Education for Disarmament, Non-violence, and Conflict Transformation at home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any suggestions for program improvement that you would like to share:
# UNESCO-APCEIU Teacher-Educators’ Training Program

## Evaluation for Day 7 & 8

**Theme:** *Education for Sustainable Development*

Please circle the appropriate response for each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content and Process</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I understood the objectives of the days’ sessions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The content was relevant to my needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The holism of EIU is being clearly illustrated.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I have identified specific educational focus areas in my training in which I can integrate EIU principles and objectives.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am satisfied with the program thus far.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learnings Gained (Education for Sustainable Development)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. I learned more about education for sustainable development.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I have gained skills relevant to training on education for sustainable development.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The field visit to DMZ Peace-Life Valley was relevant and helped me better understand the substance and methodology of education for sustainable development.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am satisfied with the 2-day field visit to DMZ Peace-Valley.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The dialogue with local community members was meaningful.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I am more confident that I could facilitate a session on Education for Sustainable Development at home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learnings Gained (Education for Disarmament, Non-violence, and Conflict Transformation: Special Focus on Korean Context)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. I gained insights into challenges facing EIU educators in Korea.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I gained insights into opportunities for EIU in Korea and see space in my professional practice to transfer this learning to my context.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I learned more about contextualizing disarmament, non-violence, and conflict transformation within a specific social, political, and economic learning environment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I am more confident that I could facilitate a session on Education for Disarmament, Non-violence and Conflict Transformation specific to my region at home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any suggestions for program improvement that you would like to share:
UNESCO-APCEIU Teacher-Educators’ Training Program
Program Evaluation

Please carefully consider each of the following areas, and respond with specific strengths and suggestions for improvement on any or all of the topics below. However, do not feel obligated to comment on every detail if you have nothing to say about a topic. We’re looking to know what you think we’ve done well, and what we could improve upon for future participants.

### COMMUNITY ETHOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Areas for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection of EIU Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening Ceremony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APCEIU Introduction and Program Overview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a learning community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CURRICULUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Areas for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Goals &amp; Learning Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops &amp; Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Readings, Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROGRAM COMPONENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Areas for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Seoul Global High School, Ministry of Ed., DMZ Peace-Eco Valley</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Korean Night, Cultural Night, Visit to Samcheongdong, Dialogue with Community Members</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Forum on Textbook Analysis / Curriculum Mapping

Action Plan on EIU

**UNESCO PEACE CENTER & RESIDENTIAL LIFE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Areas for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Instructional Facilities  
*Classrooms, computers* |                      |
| Housing & Residential Facilities  
*Room, food service, space* |                      |
| Participants, Site Culture & Community |                      |

**PERSONAL OUTCOMES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPERIENCES that I enjoyed</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How I am beginning to THINK differently</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do I hope to DO differently in my training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What I will EXPLORE further</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I gained a deeper understanding of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I developed / improved the following skills:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra notes, surprises, confirmations, predictions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OVERALL ASSESSMENT

What worked best about the UNESCO-APCEIU EIU-training program overall?

What parts of the program or curriculum seemed to work most effectively with participants’ interests, skills, and ability levels?

What parts of the program or curriculum seemed to work least effectively?

We want the community in the EIU program to be inclusive of different races, cultures, ages, sexual orientations, abilities, national origins, genders, and religions. To what extent did participants and staff contribute to building and supporting an inclusive community?

Anything else you would like to comment on that hasn’t been specifically mentioned yet?

(Optional)

Name _____________________________

Thank you for your active participation and energy throughout the session!
APPENDIX B. APCEIU Participants’ Questionnaire, Medium-Term Impact, May-August 2010

Demographic Information
*Please circle (or if taking via email, bold) the relevant answer(s).*

**Sex**
- Female
- Male
- Transsexual

**Age**
- 18 – 29
- 30 – 39
- 40 – 49
- 50 – 59
- 60 +

**Educator’s Highest Degree Obtained**
- Bachelors
- Masters
- Doctorate
- Post-doctorate

**Type of Educational Position**
- Government Official
- UNESCO Affiliate
- University Professor
- Teacher-Trainer
- School Administrator
- Classroom Teacher
- Other: ______________

**Teaching Level**
- Higher Education
- Community Centre
- High School
- Middle School
- Elementary School

**Outcomes of Training Workshops**

1. How did the program affect you personally and/or professionally?

2. How are you beginning to think differently about issues of international understanding, peace and cooperation?
3. What are you doing differently in your training programs since your participation in the EIU workshops?


4. What techniques and ideas are you exploring further?


5. Through the workshops you gained a deeper understanding of what concepts and methods?


6. What skills did you develop through the training program?
7. What worked best about the APCEIU EIU-training workshops overall?

8. What parts of the program or curriculum seemed to work most effectively with participants’ interests, skills, and ability levels?

9. What parts of the program or curriculum seemed to work least effectively?

10. Anything else you would like to comment on that hasn’t been specifically mentioned yet?
Current Practice Influenced by Participation in EIU Training Workshops

11. Have you followed-up on the Action Plan developed at the 2009 APCEIU Training Workshops? And, if so, what did that follow-up project look like?

12. Have you taught any workshops on EIU since returning from the APCEIU training program? If so, who have been the participants in the training programs (e.g. teachers, teacher-trainers, administrators)?

13. Have those workshops seemed to have an impact on the participants? Could you describe that impact?

14. Do you have any plans to continue working with EIU-related projects in the future? If so, what are some of those potential projects? With whom will you be working?

15. Any final points you would like to make concerning the impact of the 2009 APCEIU Training Program?
Open-ended responses

16. Could you write questions for further investigation that may not have been asked?

17. Please share a story, or stories, of new programs you have started in relation to education for peace and international understanding?

Thank you. This study is being completed in partial fulfillment of a Master of Arts degree in Adult Education and Community Development at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, Canada.
May 5, 2010

C/O UNESCO Asia-Pacific Center of Education for International Understanding
UNESCO House #1007
50-14 Myeong-dong 2-ga, Jung-gu
Seoul, Republic of Korea 100-810

Request For Administrative Consent to Conduct Research In Your Organization, Pertaining to An In-Depth Evaluation of the 2009 APCEIU Training Workshops

To APCEIU,

I would be grateful if your organization could participate in a research project I am currently undertaking as part of the requirements for completion of a Master of Arts Degree in Adult Education and Community Development and Comparative, International and Development Education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, Canada, under the supervision of Dr. Daniel Schugurensky.

The purpose of this study is to examine the role of APCEIU under the auspices of UNESCO in providing peace education training workshops to teacher-educators in the Asia-Pacific region and the impact of these training workshops on the educators and their respective agencies. I am hoping to identify the medium-term changes, if any, in an educator’s ontology and professional practices resulting from participation in the APCEIU 2009 Asia-Pacific Training Workshop.

I will also be completing a documentary analysis to learn how APCEIU developed, for example: its goals and missions for peace and education for international understanding; types of programs and activities undertaken; funding sources; the participants and resource-persons impacted, and the center’s conceptual and theoretical understandings of peace and cooperation. This study will greatly broaden my knowledge and understanding of peace education within East Asia, and will contribute to the field of peace education by providing empirical evidence of the medium-term impact of peace education.

This research will involve questionnaires, documentary analysis, and reflections on my own participation in the workshops. As such, I would like to send qualitative and open-ended questionnaires to all 42 participants of the 2009 APCEIU EIU Training Workshops, conducted from September 4-13, 2009, in Seoul and Inchon, Republic of Korea. The questionnaires will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. I hope to distribute the questionnaires and collect the data in May 2010, which corresponds with an eight-month interval between the training workshops and the study. Data collected will be coded to maintain confidentiality, and a final report will be sent to your organization, and to the participants, to be reviewed before publication. Please complete the attached consent form and mail it to me as soon as possible.
Thank you for your support and cooperation in this endeavor. If you have any questions about this research, please contact myself (kevin.kester@utoronto.ca), or my research supervisor, Dr Daniel Schugurensky (dschugurensky@oise.utoronto.ca). If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research, contact the University of Toronto Office of Research Ethics (ethics.review@utoronto.ca, or 416-946-3273).

Respectfully,

Kevin Kester
MA student
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the
University of Toronto
Program Coordinator, Transformative Learning Centre
Phone: (416) 978-0785
Email: kevin.kester@utoronto.ca

Dr. Daniel Schugurensky
Professor
Department of Adult Education and Community Development
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the
University of Toronto
Phone: (416) 978-0812
Email: dschugurensky@oise.utoronto.ca
May ______, 2010

Kevin Kester, MA Student
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the
University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 3L1
kevin.kester@utoronto.ca

RE: Administrative Consent Form

Dear Kevin Kester,

I would like to acknowledge receipt of your information letter dated May 5, 2010, requesting my organization to participate in your research project for your Master of Arts Degree in Adult Education and Community Development and Comparative, International and Development Education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, Canada.

I hereby confirm my approval / disapproval (please circle one option) of your request and agree / do not agree (please circle on option) that the information provided by my organization be used for the purpose of this study. I have kept a copy of this consent form for my records.

NAME: ____________________________________________

SIGNATURE: ________________________________________

DATE: ____________________________, 2010

ADDRESS: _______________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________
APPENDIX D. Letter of Consent for Participants

May 5, 2010

C/O UNESCO Asia-Pacific Center of Education for International Understanding
UNESCO House #1007
50-14 Myeong-dong 2-ga, Jung-gu
Seoul, Republic of Korea 100-810

Request To Participate In A Research Study On The Impact of Peace Education Training

Dear Sir/ Madam,

I would be grateful if you could participate in a research project I am currently undertaking as part of the requirements for completion of a Master of Arts Degree in Adult Education and Community Development and Comparative, International and Development Education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, Canada, under the supervision of Dr. Daniel Schugurensky.

The purpose of this study is to examine the role of APCEIU under the auspices of UNESCO in providing peace education training workshops to teacher-educators in the Asia-Pacific region and the impact of these training workshops on the educators and their respective agencies. I am hoping to identify the medium-term changes, if any, in an educator’s ontology and professional practices resulting from participation in the APCEIU 2009 Asia-Pacific Training Workshop.

I am particularly interested to learn how you became involved in peace education, or education for international understanding, and how you perceive, for example: the goals and missions of peace education; what types of programs and activities you undertake at your agency, both prior to and following the APCEIU 2009 Training Workshop; and what the overall impact of the Training Workshop was on your professional practice. This study will greatly broaden my knowledge and understanding of peace education from an East Asian perspective, through the lens of a policy-making and training organization, and will contribute to the field of peace education by providing empirical evidence of the medium-term impact of peace education.

This research will involve a questionnaire and documentary analysis from the 2009 Training Workshop. I would like to send you a questionnaire in May 2010, which corresponds with a six-month interval between the training workshops and the study, pertaining to your participation in the Training Workshop. The questionnaire will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. Data collected will be coded to maintain confidentiality. However, because the program included at most two participants from each country, it may be possible for those familiar with the project to identify you according to country of origin. Accordingly, I will only identify your country of origin sparingly, and if the information being provided could cause you harm in any way, I will either not identify your country or omit that data from the research entirely. To ensure that you are not harmed through the research, I will send you a draft of the report for your review before final publication. Additionally, you may withdraw from the process at any time without any consequences. Please complete the attached consent form and mail it to me as soon as possible.
Thank you for your support and cooperation in this endeavor. If you have any questions about this research, please contact myself (kevin.kester@utoronto.ca), or my research supervisor, Dr Daniel Schugurensky (dschugurensky@oise.utoronto.ca). If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this research, contact the University of Toronto Office of Research Ethics (ethics.review@utoronto.ca, or 416-946-3273).

Respectfully,

Kevin Kester
MA student
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the
University of Toronto
Student Representative, Transformative Learning Centre
Phone: (416) 978-0785
Email: kevin.kester@utoronto.ca

Dr. Daniel Schugurensky
Professor
Department of Adult Education and Community Development
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the
University of Toronto
Phone: (416) 978-0812
Email: dschugurensky@oise.utoronto.ca
May ______, 2010

Kevin Kester, MA Student
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the
University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 3L1
kevin.kester@utoronto.ca

RE: Research Study Consent Form

Dear Kevin Kester,

I would like to acknowledge receipt of your information letter dated May 5, 2010, requesting my participation in your research project for your Master of Arts Degree in Adult Education and Community Development and Comparative, International and Development Education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, Canada.

I hereby confirm my approval of your request and agree that the information I provide be used for the purpose of this study. I have kept a copy of this consent form for my records.

NAME: ________________________________

SIGNATURE: ____________________________

DATE: _________________________________, 2010

ADDRESS:
____________________________________

____________________________________

____________________________________

____________________________________
APPENDIX E. Permission to Use Copyrighted Material

August 30, 2010

Re: Permission to Reuse Copyrighted Material in my Master’s Thesis

Dear Ross Ryan, Editor of Peace and Conflict Review, University for Peace:

I am a University of Toronto graduate student completing my Master’s thesis entitled “Assessing the Impact of Peace Education Training Programs: A Case Study of UNESCO-APCEIU.” My thesis will be available via the U of T Libraries in digital formats, for reference, study and/or copy for scholarly purposes. I will also be granting Library and Archives Canada and ProQuest/UMI a non-exclusive license to reproduce, loan, distribute, or sell single copies of my thesis by any means and in any form or format. These rights will in no way restrict republication of the material in any other form by you or by others authorized by you.


Please confirm in writing or by email that these arrangements meet with your approval.

Sincerely,

Kevin Kester
MA student
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto
Student Representative, Transformative Learning Centre
Phone: (416) 978-0785
Email: kevin.kester@utoronto.ca

[Email response dated September 2, 2010]

Hi Kevin,

Yes, you have permission to reuse your paper from the Review.

All the best,

Ross Ryan
Managing Editor, Peace and Conflict Review
editor@review.upeace.org