[PEACEWORKS]

PEACE EDUCATION

STATE OF THE FIELD AND LESSONS LEARNED FROM USIP GRANTMAKING

Mari Fitzduff and Isabella Jean

United States Institute of Peace

About the Report

This report is a result of an initiative to reflect on developments, contributions, and prospects in specific areas where USIP grantmaking has been concentrated. The authors were commissioned to review the state of the field, to identify the lessons learned, and to contemplate future directions of work in the area of peace education, with reference to USIP grantmaking.

About the Author

Mari Fitzduff is professor and director of the international Master of Arts Program in Coexistence and Conflict at Brandeis University. She held a chair of conflict studies at the University of Ulster, where she was director of UNU/INCORE. She also served as chief executive of the Northern Ireland Community Relations Council. She has worked on programs addressing conflict issues in many countries and is called on as an international expert by many governments and international organizations. Isabella Jean is an adjunct lecturer at Brandeis University's Heller School of Management, where she teaches Introduction to Design, Monitoring and Evaluation of Coexistence Interventions.

Cover photo: Members of a civic education workshop conducted by USIP in Abyei, Sudan. Photo by Jeff Krentel.

The views expressed in this report are those of the authors alone. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Institute of Peace, and do not represent official positions of the United States Government.

United States Institute of Peace
2301 Constitution Ave., NW
Washington, D.C. 20037

Phone: 202.457.1700
Fax: 202.429.6063
E-mail: usip_requests@usip.org
Web: www.usip.org

Peaceworks No. 74

First published 2011

© 2011 by the United States Institute of Peace

CONTENTS

PEACEWORKS • SEPTEMBER 2011 • NO. 74

Introduction ... 5
Growth of the Peacebuilding Field ... 5
Leading Models in the Field of Peacebuilding ... 6
Peace Education: Taking Stock of Diverse Approaches ... 8
Existing and Emerging Challenges ... 16
Conclusion and Recommendations ... 24

[Although no one recipe for an effective peace education intervention is a clear winner,…the most successful interventions involve buy-in from leaders and a suitable alignment of policies, institutions, and resources.]

Summary

- Over the last several decades, the field of peacebuilding has progressively formalized, leading to the development of academic programs, training, advocacy, and practice on peace and conflict issues.
- Several leading models have emerged, including peace education, which effectively incorporates other approaches that focus on the psycho-cultural, structural, and institutional dimensions of conflict.
- The evolution of peace education reflects input from numerous disciplines, forms of pedagogy, and underlying theories of conflict and change—all of which present challenges for defining its boundaries and assessing its impact.
- The main areas of related work include developing instructional content, preparing teachers, pursuing the structural and policy changes required to mainstream peace education, promoting initiatives at the community level, and engaging in public awareness campaigns.
- Experience indicates that the viability and long-term effectiveness of peace education interventions hinge on increasing capacity, adopting a strategy of instruction that covers a wide array of topics and reaches a range of constituencies, altering mentalities about learning as well as worldviews, and providing systemic support together with appropriate institutions and resources on a sustained basis.
- Key issues going forward include achieving greater clarity and consensus in terminology and goals, ensuring space for and capitalizing on indigenous methods, demonstrating tangible impact yet finding a constructive balance between activism- and evidence-based justification, complementing other tools of conflict resolution and peacebuilding, scaling up and replicating successful interventions, and providing expert assistance and conducting rigorous assessments essential to translating theory into effective practice.
- The USIP Grant Program should continue its support for peace education initiatives, devote more attention to building the capacity of grantees, engage in sophisticated evaluation, and consolidate and disseminate the insights from their projects. It should also build deeper relationships between grantees and other parts of the Institute.

Introduction

Since 1986, the Grant Program of the United States Institute of Peace (USIP) has made more than 2,100 grants and invested roughly $86 million in support of research, education, training, media, and public diplomacy by individuals and organizations engaged in efforts to understand, prevent, manage, and resolve violent conflict.[1] This report, in turn, was commissioned as one of a series of assessments designed to reflect on particular areas where USIP grantmaking has focused, evaluate the contributions of this funding support, and draw out lessons from the context and experiences. In initiating this activity, Steven Heydemann, then the USIP vice president for grants, explained the rationale as follows:

> As we look forward, and reflect on how the Grant Program can most effectively contribute to the further development of this field, we view it as necessary to take stock of what has been achieved to date: to assess the state of the field in areas in which the Institute has made a significant investment; to understand where progress has been made, and where important gaps remain; to map the conceptual and organizational landscape of key areas of work within the field, identify the models that inform the practices used by nonprofit organizations in these areas, evaluate the efficacy of various models, and understand better why some work and others do not.

As a starting point, in September 2009 we facilitated a consultative meeting, "The State of the Field of Peace Education," with former and current USIP grantees. Participants—who included peacebuilding and peace education experts, academics, researchers, and staff from USIP and other organizations in the United States, Costa Rica, Israel, Kenya, Lebanon, Macedonia, Philippines, Sudan, the United Kingdom, and the West Bank—discussed the current challenges and opportunities facing the field of peacebuilding and peace education, assessed the successes and achievements of the field to date, and recommended ways to improve peace education practices.

This report combines the observations made at this meeting with research, survey responses, and interviews to outline the critical challenges and opportunities currently facing the field of peace education and those working on building peace around the world. These dimensions are considered in the wider context of a growing field of peacebuilding practice and attendant conceptual and strategic dilemmas. Among the issues highlighted are defining the boundaries and subsets of the field through shared and comprehensive terminology, articulating and testing theories of change, and searching for complementary and integrated approaches.

We first provide a brief history of the peacebuilding field and outline the leading models of practice, then focus more closely on peace education approaches, describe major challenges, and conclude with a set of recommendations to USIP.

A key conclusion, echoed by USIP grantees and in many current publications regarding the state of the field, is obvious: for peacebuilding and peace education to become more effective, the expertise and efforts of academia, practitioners, and the grantmaking and policy arenas must be combined to address the existing challenges.

For peacebuilding and peace education to become more effective, the expertise and efforts of academia, practitioners, and the grantmaking and policy arenas must be combined.

Growth of the Peacebuilding Field

The study and practice of nonmilitary approaches to resolving conflicts and war is a relatively new discipline that began only after World War II.[2] Initially, the practice took the form of peace advocacy, much of it associated with the Quakers, the Mennonites, the Brethren, and the work of Mohandas Gandhi. In the 1950s, however, a gradual aggregation of individuals, particularly in the United States, began to ask serious questions about how to address the continuing reemergence of violent conflicts throughout the world.[3] For scholars involved in

this work, the priority was to bring critical analysis and rigorous methodological approaches to their research in the hope of developing more generic theories that could be of broader use in preventing and better managing intrasocietal and international conflict and violence. Their ideas began to attract increasing interest, and both theory and practice grew and spread rapidly over the following decades.[4]

Today, hundreds of academic modules deal with peace, conflict, and conflict resolution at the undergraduate and graduate levels, including at least forty-six master's and fourteen PhD degree programs.[5] Yet the uncertainty about the field as a distinct discipline continues. A clear symptom is that many of these programs are variously housed within faculties of politics, sociology, history, law, anthropology, psychology and social psychology. As a result, they usually reflect these diverse disciplinary orientations in their priorities for research and teaching. Among the shortcomings of such programs is that most, apart from the long-standing programs in South Africa, are located in the more economically developed Western countries, though during the last decade programs have begun to emerge in other countries as well, particularly in areas of ongoing conflict.[6] Another shortcoming is that the majority of the relevant publications are printed in English, thus decreasing their engagement with the insights and learning partnerships of the non-English-speaking world.

Meanwhile, attention to peacebuilding issues has also increased significantly in the political realm. More and more governments and intergovernmental agencies have developed units that specifically address issues of conflict and peacebuilding.[7] In addition, at least forty-four internal units and departments within governments worldwide now deal with issues germane to the field such as equality, diversity, and coexistence.[8] Many aid and development agencies have similarly established units to deal with conflict and peacebuilding related to their work.[9] The continued growth, influence, and further resourcing of USIP, which was established and is funded by Congress, is another sign of such interest.

At least forty-four internal units and departments within governments worldwide now deal with issues germane to the field such as equality, diversity, and coexistence.

Meanwhile, the number of nongovernmental organizations involved in peace work has grown phenomenally. As one gauge, the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC), a worldwide alliance of civil society organizations, counts as members of its network more than a thousand local organizations around the world dealing with issues of intergroup and societal conflict.[10] The number of training institutes related to the field is also growing.[11] Increasingly, agencies are looking for conflict resolution and peacebuilding qualifications in staffing their programs in conflict areas. This trend is reinforced by a growing recognition of the validity and utility of these competencies and expertise.[12]

Leading Models in the Field of Peacebuilding

Given that peacebuilding is a relatively young field, it is not surprising that differing perspectives on how it should be conducted would flourish. In the main, however, peacebuilding has focused on psycho-cultural, structural, and institutional approaches, among which education for peace is one of the many methods that peacebuilding practitioners can employ when seeking to transform conflict-affected societies. A typology of these approaches and the work they involve is provided in appendix 1.[13] As both the conference and our consultation process revealed, the definition of what constitutes peace education is contested. Many of the participants viewed their work as incorporating—in actuality and to be successful—other approaches. Thus one cannot talk about peace education without reflecting as well on the variety of approaches.

Psycho-Cultural Approaches

One perspective highlights individuals, how they interpret their world, and the centrality of relationships in peacebuilding.[14] In this context, an emphasis is usually placed on identifying the fears and misperceptions that arise between communities, the lack of trust and its implications for political negotiations, and the need to foster interactions between the conflicting parties that are conducive to dialogue, compromise, and cooperation. In addition, proponents of this approach occasionally frame their theories with reference to issues such as aggression, motivation, and unconscious psychoanalytic forces.[15] The methods often include establishing contact and dialogue to change attitudes and perceptions; making efforts to facilitate mutual cultural, social, or religious understanding; promoting cultural pluralism; studying identity; addressing trauma, advocating a culture of peace; and ensuring joint interventions on issues of common concern across the dividing lines of conflict. The major rationales for such work are that it will change the attitudes of conflicted groups toward one another and help cultivate mutual respect.

Structural Approaches

An alternative approach is to focus on how the organization of society shapes action and explains conflict, violence, and warfare as arising from the environment in which people live. In particular, a standard logic holds that conflicts will arise when certain groups are excluded from social, economic, and cultural benefits that are available to other groups within a community, region, or nation.

Structural approaches to peacebuilding often include efforts at ensuring equal or shared access to employment, land, national resources, health care, education, and development, as well as religious, ethnic, and cultural equality, through legal, policy, and developmental measures. The major rationale for such work is that by changing the circumstances of inequality and exclusion, groups will be less likely to feel marginalized within their societies and therefore also less likely to use violence to try to change their situations.

Institutional Approaches

A third option is to develop formal means of diminishing potential for conflict, mitigating the effects when it arises, and achieving resolution. The myriad examples include inclusive political structures, agreements, frameworks, systems, and constitutions; nonpolitical legislatures; neutral security structures; weapon control mechanisms; independent media; vigorous and free civil society institutions; anticorruption processes; pluralist cultural institutions; human rights monitoring; and development agencies. The basic rationale is that institutions better able to avoid, manage, and resolve conflicts can decrease the incidence of violence.

Peace Education Approaches

A final option is to ensure the necessary learning, teaching, and skills development that is related to all of this work. Examples include training educators, community leaders, and grassroots groups in conflict resolution and alternative dispute resolution techniques; establishing school-based, community-based, and college-university programs and curricula development on peace and conflict resolution; and producing public outreach media programs that promote understanding between groups. The rationale is that fostering approaches to managing conflict without resorting to violence requires new learning and skills development to be successful.

Peace Education: Taking Stock of Diverse Approaches

Peace education has been influenced by multiple disciplines, theories, and pedagogical approaches. In addition, its practitioners continue to experiment with new content and innovative instructional methods, prepare educators, pursue mainstreaming their work, and engage in public outreach.

Defining and Developing the Field

The early origins of peace education can be traced to indigenous peacemaking traditions across the globe, which were later expanded by Christian, Islamic, Judaic, Buddhist, Baha'i, Quaker, and other religious scholars. Another general foundation is the belief many educators share that their work is critical to transforming the way societies manage conflict.[16] Peace education was further influenced by the growth of the antiwar and peace movements during the late nineteenth and much of the twentieth century.[17] More recently, peace education programs have proliferated at the elementary and secondary school levels and can now be found in many corners of the globe, conflict affected and postconflict societies among them.[18]

Peace educators have expanded the boundaries of their teaching and practice to move beyond the initial concentration on international issues to embrace subjects with significant domestic dimensions, such as citizenship, human rights, and democracy education.

Over the last several decades, peace educators in the United States and abroad have expanded the boundaries of their teaching and practice to move beyond the initial concentration on international issues, such as the prevention of war and nuclear proliferation, to embrace subjects with significant domestic dimensions, such as citizenship, human rights, and democracy education. As more community-based and school-based programs flourished in the United States, Europe, and across the globe, peace education came to encompass a range of activities from classroom teaching about peace and conflict dynamics to training of educators and developing hands-on skill-building in peacemaking, mediation, and conflict resolution.[19] A good indication of the diversity of practice and eclectic range of education initiatives is Smith's taxonomy of educational programs aimed at the prevention of conflict:

- *skills-based*—communication skills, interpersonal relations, and conflict-resolution techniques;
- *multicultural and intercultural*—diversity, mutual understanding, and interdependence;
- *human rights*—universal values, concepts of equality and justice, and the responsibilities of states;
- *civic education, citizenship, and education for democracy*—societal roles and responsibilities of the individual, and principles of democracy and participation; and
- *education for international development*—interdependence of peoples and societies in political, economic, social, and cultural terms.[20]

Smith further explains that defining citizenship in terms of human rights and civic responsibilities and going beyond simple "patriotic" models of citizenship that require uncritical loyalty to the nation-state are an attempt both to decouple the concept of citizenship from that of nationality and make it more difficult to mobilize political conflict around identity issues. Additionally, the relevance of education for international development programs for the prevention of conflict has been heightened by the impact of globalization and the events of September 11, 2001, as well as the link between global security and development assistance.[21]

These programs pose a challenge for those attempting to define and study the progress and achievements of peace education.[22] Debates continue on the undefined boundaries of the field, its shifting terminology and focuses, and the varied philosophies it exhibits.[23]

In part, this methodological pluralism is a by-product of being situated at the intersection of and drawing on other fields. For instance, some group peace education under educational research and theory. Others place it specifically within international education, which is concerned with global and intercultural cooperation, understanding, and cultural exchange.[24] Yet others argue that the more logical parent fields are peace research and peace studies.[25] All these arguments have merit and reinforce the wide-ranging, interdisciplinary character of peace education. The pluralism also reflects the wide range of conflicts around the world: "Even though their objectives may be similar, each society will set up a different form of peace education that is dependent upon the issues at large, conditions, and culture, as well as views and creativity of the educators."[26]

Developing Instructional Content

Many peace education initiatives are devoted to developing curricula and teaching resources, which are primarily used at the elementary and secondary school levels, but also in community-based or informal education programs.[27] These resources, such as the Learning to Abolish War module,[28] often incorporate issues with international dimensions, such as human security and disarmament, conflict transformation and peacemaking skills, and building a culture of peace. Teaching modules aim to foster the values underpinning the goal of education about peace (awareness and knowledge) and education for peace (skills and capacities). Over the last several decades, the continued rise in youth homicide, school violence, and bullying in the United States has prompted a rise in school-based and community-based programs that focus on promoting harmonious interactions among individuals.[29] These programs aim to prepare students to manage everyday conflict situations using interpersonal, conflict resolution, and peer-mediation skills based on principles of nonviolence and mutual respect.[30] Similarly, in postconflict countries where daily intercommunal tensions and violence remain even when peace agreements have been signed at the official level, educators are increasingly turning to teaching conflict resolution skills as early as preschool and elementary school.[31]

In postconflict countries where daily intercommunal tensions and violence remain even when peace agreements have been signed, educators are increasingly turning to teaching conflict resolution skills as early as preschool and elementary school.

History education is also attracting growing recognition as another critical element in an integrated school curriculum that recognizes multiple narratives and promotes critical thinking and empathy.[32] Of course, history as a discipline has traditionally been and remains dominated by accounts of wars, military conquests, and contradictory and often dominant narratives. Nonetheless, many peace educators believe that history instruction should be harnessed to advance coexistence, tolerance, and social justice. Teaching about peace by examining the difficulties of the past is seen as deeply related to the goal of building better societies and therefore closely linked to the goals of both civic-citizenship and human rights education. Despite agreement about the potential of history education for transformative pedagogy, consensus is scant regarding effective pedagogical methods for teaching about difficult issues of the past and what, in turn, needs to be removed from and added into history books.

Practitioners generally agree that peace education will not have a long-lasting transformative result if history continues to be taught using outdated pedagogical methods and biased materials. Several USIP-funded organizations worldwide promote innovative and inclusive history education by engaging the formal and informal education sectors and challenging the established norms in teacher preparation and curriculum development in school systems.[33] For example, Facing History and Ourselves, EUROCLIO, and the Al-Khatim Adlan Centre for Enlightenment (KHACE) in Sudan are all successfully engaging and influencing a variety of decision makers instrumental to reforming their national education systems. The work of

these grantees is admirable for many reasons, including their ability to sustain dialogue among peace practitioners and history educators and to bridge the gap between various disciplines and approaches.

History education reform and curricular revisions are highly political and controversial, especially in societies emerging from conflict. A number of thorny issues, such as structural inequalities and political and cultural exclusion of minorities, are often seen as too sensitive and are thus avoided by state educational institutions when developing textbook content. In addition, the challenges inherent in political reform in divided societies and the typical institutional obstacles to change are also present, exacerbating the difficulty of these efforts. Revised textbooks and curriculum guides are more useful when introduced in a setting with functioning institutions. To take one example, this is not the case for peace education efforts in the Palestinian territories, which in the current political climate are challenged by many factors, including the inability of key government institutions to function and provide proper support and follow-through.

Likewise, USIP grantees and staff observed that scholars and practitioners often inject the process of producing creative new materials with energy, financial support, and cooperation, but the subsequent results face extended scrutiny, delays, and frequent rejection by state or local education authorities. These concerns—whether new instructional material is influential, and if so in what contexts—also need to be understood and assessed against the backdrop of systemic reform efforts at school, district, or state levels.

A key consideration at the evaluation stage should be the prospects for adoption of educational content, which could be demonstrated by standing commitments from relevant authorities, institutions, teachers, and partner organizations.

Moreover, the observed challenges have a direct bearing on the types of projects funders should seek to support. In particular, a key consideration at the evaluation stage should be the prospects for adoption of educational content, which could be demonstrated by standing commitments from relevant authorities, institutions, teachers, and partner organizations. In the absence of such foundations, those who organize projects must have explicit and realistic plans to secure this sort of necessary buy-in. A further option is that certain funding could conceivably be channeled to projects specifically dedicated to content adoption to ensure that this stage of the process is not shortchanged.

Another weakness is the tendency to fund multiple similar projects to develop textbooks and curricula. This circumstance presents several issues. The likelihood of duplication and redundant effort is significant. The multiplication of teaching and training resources can also contribute to the problems described earlier, of too many variants and too few conventions that would accompany a coherent, consensus set of standards for pedagogy. Some customization to local contexts may be rational, but creating all-new textbooks and curricula in each instance should not be necessary. Instead, proven models can presumably be adapted as needed.

Thus focusing on content in isolation is problematic, especially without paying adequate attention to the efficiency and effectiveness of relevant institutions as well as to the likelihood of adoption and use in practice.

Preparing a New Cadre of Peace Educators

Although the content of instructional resources is critical, practitioners believe that format is equally important and often requires a fundamental change in the way teachers perceive and define their role, their instructional approach, and their relationship with the students. The instructional designs of many peace education programs therefore strive to go beyond basic lesson plans and supplementary teaching materials by helping to transform the process of teaching itself.

In particular, to create and sustain egalitarian, participatory, and inclusive learning environments, peace educators need to be capable of facilitating pedagogy rooted in critical consciousness, democratic engagement, self-reflection, critical thinking skills, interdisciplinary, inquiry-based, and experiential learning, and respect for differences among all members of a learning community.[34] Of course, these goals are germane to broader principles and practices of education. Yet the reality is that many peace education programs are initiated in societies where formal education systems do not put critical thinking skills and inquiry-based and experiential learning at their core. Rote memorization, regurgitation, deference to authority, and theoretical learning are mainstays throughout Africa, Asia, and eastern Europe. Peace educators who attended the USIP conference noted the challenges of integrating participatory and critical approaches into such rigid systems. In this sense, what is fundamental to and thus needed for effective peace education cannot be achieved without a more significant transformation of education.

Many peace education programs are initiated in societies where formal education systems do not put critical thinking skills and inquiry-based and experiential learning at their core.... Effective peace education cannot be achieved without a more significant transformation of education.

In turn, recognition is growing among those who contributed to this report, as well as in the peace education field, of the need for more funding and other support for teacher training programs. This is often cited as a necessary point of emphasis for societies emerging from authoritarian rule and violent conflict, not to mention those whose educational systems have the characteristics described. As one peace educator noted in an interview,

> Peace education efforts that are solely focused on creating new textbooks and materials miss the critical aspect of the work, which is to prepare educators who themselves model the values of peace and can create a peaceful classroom. The most successful programs are where the mindset of the teacher and the relationships in the learning community are transformed.

Likewise, a history educator argued that "spending a lot of time and resources on textbook creation is not effective. A well-trained teacher can use any resource at [his or her] disposal, but we have seen ineffective teachers not able to use fantastic resources." Thus agreement is broad that creation of more innovative classroom materials is useful only when educators are able to effectively use these resources.

At the same time, USIP grantees observed that the reality in many conflict-affected countries is that teacher training receives inadequate support, due to limited resources, and investments in such preparation programs are harder to sustain given the high rates of turnover among school personnel. According to USIP staff, however, experience shows that in some countries like Iraq, "if you can't get buy-in on curricular reform, it is easier to get teacher training going. In the end, equipping them with instructional skills helps prepare them to be resourceful with teaching materials, whether they have been revised or not." Training alone, therefore, may not be optimal and can encounter significant hurdles that affect its scope, efficiency, and even viability. Yet benefits are observed, including in difficult settings. Consequently, this may be the best available option, particularly as an initial intervention, given that it can be implemented quicker and begin to realize results and reach target audiences sooner.

As before, these insights are instructive for the allocation of grant funding. A key implication is that the balance of funding should be tilted more toward expanding and improving the training of peace educators and away from developing new content and curricula.

Mainstreaming Peace Education

Curricular reforms and teacher training are just some of the areas where peace educators and allied NGOs are pushing for change. Many argue that deeper structural transformation is typically required to reduce inequities inherent in educational systems, particularly in regard to the

distribution of resources and hiring policies where racial, ethnic, and linguistic minorities are concerned. Civil society efforts to mainstream peace education by advocating the development of national standards for education for peace, social inclusion, and diversity face difficulties related to shifting priorities and resistance to change among many government institutions.

Some initiatives aim to influence policymaking and induce systemic changes with a goal of mainstreaming peace education throughout formal school systems and otherwise transforming educational institutions. In particular, several prominent international organizations work to advance the role of peace education around the world:

- The United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) promotes peace education work through research, practice, and policymaking, as stated in its Integrated Framework of Action on Education for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy.[35]
- USIP works globally, implementing programs and training and funding individuals and nonprofit organizations worldwide, including in zones of conflict. USIP's projects, courses, publications, and grants all focus on further developing effective peace practices.
- The Hague Appeal for Peace and its Global Campaign for Peace Education (GCPE) aims to integrate peace education into schools and the informal community sector by working with teacher training institutions to introduce peace education into the standard preparation of teachers in elementary and secondary schools worldwide.[36]
- The International Peace Research Association (IPRA) and its Peace Education Commission (PEC) publishes the peer-reviewed Journal of Peace Education.[37]
- The Peace Education Center at the Columbia University Teacher's College runs an annual International Institute on Peace Education (IIPE).[38]

Over the last decade, UNESCO, GCPE, and UNICEF have spearheaded efforts by engaging ministries of education and other governmental institutions under the aegis of the UN International Decade for the Culture of Peace.

Meanwhile, local peace education organizations and educators have partnered with the UN and donor agencies to develop and implement context-specific, culturally appropriate, and innovative peace education curricula and in-service teacher training programs in divided and postconflict countries. In addition, a number of bilateral, multilateral, and foundation donors have invested resources in support of curricular reforms to address related issues of ethnic diversity and multiculturalism.

The challenges of mainstreaming peace education and peacebuilding issues into an overall curriculum, whether at the secondary school level or the college-university level, are being addressed with varying degrees of focus and success. Specifically, several key issues are often encountered. One is that more often than not, peace education is presented as a separate, add-on subject alongside the core subjects taught in schools and higher education academic establishments. As a result, peace education may tend to stay on the margins rather than be integrated as an essential or important complementary component of what students learn. Several workshop participants noted that their organizations continuously advocate for mainstreaming peace education into subjects such as history, civic education, social studies, and literature but recognized the limitations of civil society organizations affecting the policies of large governmental ministries. They added that a coordinated approach with other influential actors who often fund and advise national governments on education issues—such as the UN, donor governments, and OSCE—are needed.

Another issue for mainstreaming is sustainability: even assuming that peace education becomes an accepted part of a teaching curriculum, how can this status be maintained and further upgraded over time? USIP grantees and others we interviewed agreed that sustainability cannot be an afterthought but instead requires planning, especially where broader reforms are required. In this regard, political support for changes in the institutional framework and policies are critical. Otherwise, many peace education initiatives can become one-off, short-lived projects with limited outcomes. According to one USIP staff member, "enough curriculum materials have been created and can be adapted for new contexts, but much more remains to be done on building institutions." Some interviewees even suggested that ministry officials and school personnel ought to be trained if peace education is to be backed by better policies and reforms. The underlying logic is that change should ideally occur on multiple fronts to be truly viable and consequential over the long term. The process cannot work only from the ground up, training teachers and then relying on them as the foot soldiers and hoping the results of their efforts filter throughout the education system. Among other things, the inevitable turnover that occurs as teachers are hired, fired, and move on means that a cadre of trained teachers will not remain intact and that the new teachers who come in may not have been exposed to the same training. The process must therefore also involve a top-down shift in the mentality and actions of key decision makers who set policies and allocate resources that ensures a commitment to certain pedagogical approaches, curricula, and training.

Sustainability cannot be an afterthought but instead requires planning, especially where broader reforms are required.

In these respects, there have been important gains in some countries.[39] The experience of several former grantees working in postconflict societies shows that when institutional reforms are coupled with the incentive of donor funds and technical assistance, government ministries are more open to testing innovative curricula and dedicating resources for teacher training programs. They expressed concern, however, that when current levels of donor funding decrease, a significant drop in state support for peace-centered education reform is likely. This could suggest that a sincere commitment and political will are lacking. In some countries, these concerns are set against a reality in which state spending on education remains very low and large numbers of children do not attend school. As a result, at least part of the burden of injecting initiative and ensuring sustainability often falls on donors and peace educators. They must be prepared to take bold steps, typically without the certainty of favorable returns on investments of funding, and support and implement initiatives over the longer term. The success of these efforts also depends on finding and working constructively with credible local partners who are prepared to lend their support and help carry forward any momentum that develops.

In the process, civil society actors frequently assume significant responsibility for ensuring the survival of peace education programs, despite ongoing complications. As one former USIP grantee put it,

> Political changes in the government often mean changes in policies and laws and there is rarely a guarantee that commitment and implementation of programs will continue. If civil society leaves this work to the government, it will not get done and will lead to deterioration of the peace education achievements. After each national election, we feel that we have to start from the beginning. This seems futile sometimes but we can't let it affect the overall goal of transforming the way the future generation is educated about their country, the world and their role as citizens.

Community-Based Efforts

Given the ongoing challenges with scaling up and mainstreaming peace education at the national level, it should come as no surprise that many peace education programs originate infor-

mally at the community level. Among such programs are those initiated by nonprofit and community-based organizations that often work to engage the entire community and build their capacity as peer mediators, peer educators, and peacemakers at a local level. Related examples in postconflict societies include projects targeting ex-combatants and war-affected youth with informal education in livelihood skills, basic literacy and numeracy, stress management, health, democracy, good governance, and conflict management. Other community-based approaches span seminars, extracurricular training and workshops, dialogue sessions, youth camps, community events, and learning exchanges.

The wide variety of programming complicates assessment. On the one hand, some programs have demonstrated short-term changes in the awareness and use of conflict resolution skills. Projects by grantees such as Seeds of Peace International Peace Camp (and its follow-up alumni activities in Israel, Palestine, Egypt, Jordan, Pakistan, India, and Afghanistan), Al-Khatim Adlan Center for Enlightenment in Sudan, and Education for Peace's initiatives in Bosnia (Leadership for Peace for Community Leaders, Youth Peacebuilders Network) are a few representative examples. On the other hand, when these programs are not linked with broader initiatives at the national level, they often struggle with scaling up the work and sustaining its outcomes.

Public Education Efforts

Many civil society organizations use online, print, television, and digital media to educate the public about local and global peace and conflict issues. A number of organizations have invested resources in producing documentaries, children's programs, radio shows, CD-ROMs, and online modules on peacemaking and conflict prevention. For example, Search for Common Ground (SFCG) produced a children's television program in Macedonia that teaches children about diversity and peaceful intercommunal relations. An evaluation of the program found significant viewership and impact on both parent-child discussions of ethnicity and conflict and their attitudes towards interethnic relations but little impact on their behavior and views of whether the parents or their children could put the ideal principles into practice.[40] Although USIP did not fund this project, it did support a film series that SFCG organized to promote greater understanding of international conflict and peacebuilding among students at colleges and universities throughout the United States, featuring a wide variety of documentaries concerning conflict around the world. This is one of a number of public education projects that have received USIP grants, for activities both in the United States and abroad. In general, evaluations have shown that these projects can be effective in reaching large audiences, promoting awareness, and stimulating discussion and dialogue, though the extent of impact on attitudes and practices is less certain given limited assessment data on effectiveness.

At the same time, a number of educators interviewed for this report argued that mass education efforts designed and carried out without a deliberate connection to a classroom module do not ultimately achieve the pedagogical objectives underpinning peace education. According to one scholar,

> Such stand-alone media programs can be effective awareness-raising mechanisms, but ultimately they represent a passive form of education and do not provide the level of engagement, the opportunity for facilitated inquiry or reflection, or the skill building as peace education programs that utilize skilled educators and innovative curricula.

In practice, some resources have been designed to link to and supplement classroom-based and community-based peace education. Others argued that all forms of media should be used

to extend peace education to a much broader group of people, reaching beyond schoolchildren and university students to entire communities as well as to specific constituencies.

Promising Practices and Effective Models

The search for successful models of peace education, given the differing contexts and political realities in which these efforts take place, is complicated. As one former grantee said, "We have tried many approaches and I can't say one is best." At the same time, neither the projects we examined nor USIP itself has established baselines necessary for proper evaluation in this area. Without such a basis, speaking of best practices would be inappropriate, because the methods involved have not been proven successful in any definitive form. Although no one recipe for an effective peace education intervention is a clear winner, the conference participants and others we interviewed mentioned several elements as being useful for determining viability and success, as demonstrated through specific cases.

In particular, projects that focus on a narrow content area (for example, human rights) leave out critical components of comprehensive peace education. Interventions proposing textbook analysis and reform, without existing plans for teacher training modules, are seen as limited and unsustainable in addressing long-term peace education needs and objectives. As discussed earlier, improving teacher capacity and reorienting pedagogical approaches are often essential and may be areas where useful progress can be realistically achieved in the near term, even in the absence of a transformation in the educational system or the political environment. Yet the most successful interventions do involve buy-in from leaders and a suitable (re-)alignment of policies, institutions, and resources.

Improving teacher capacity and reorienting pedagogical approaches may be areas where useful progress can be realistically achieved even in the absence of a transformation in the educational system or the political environment.

Among the examples of promising practices highlighted by workshop participants is the Community Based Institute on Peace Education, implemented by Fundacion Escuela de Paz in Colombia. The institute focuses on teacher training and community development and engages the entire community, including teachers, students, parents, mayors, and other local government officials. In partnership with experienced educators (who design the pedagogical elements) and policymakers in the national government, the institute is working on both curriculum reform and training of local educators. Tony Jenkins, of the National Peace Academy and an adviser to this initiative, considers it successful because it has strengthened community relations and created a genuine support for peace education. The approach undertaken by Fundacion Escuela de Paz is sustainable because the peace education efforts are rooted in the local community and linked to national-level institutions. Part of this work was funded through a USIP grant that enabled the U.S.-based International Institute on Peace Education to provide guidance and technical assistance to this locally conceived and operated peace education effort. According to Jenkins, the involvement of his organization as an external partner and adviser legitimized the communal effort in the eyes of the national authorities, particularly during policy meetings that brought together local peace educators at the Colombian Ministry of Education.

Another example described during follow-up interviews with workshop participants is the Basque government's comprehensive Education Plan for Peace and Human Rights, jointly developed by the Basque Ministry of Education and the Human Rights office of the Department of Justice. Jenkins was involved as an expert adviser in training the policymakers responsible for implementing this plan. The plan, based primarily on informal education approaches, also includes provisions for school-focused programming as part of the broader Education for Coexistence, Peace and Human Rights Program. The program's main objective is to promote

the inclusion and practice of human rights in primary and secondary schools by using democratic practices and methodologies, developing appropriate guidelines and learning materials, and advancing the education and professional development of teachers and other personnel. To meet these goals, an observatory on coexistence was established in school centers, and a dedicated Department of Education unit was created to catalyze and coordinate efforts and to give proper follow-up support to schools. The policy document itself was based on an analysis of the human rights situation in the Basque region and produced as a result of a consultative process that engaged a range of governmental and civil-society organizations and strengthened their relationships during the development process.[41]

Several related questions that warrant further inquiry were raised during the consultative meeting and subsequent interviews:

- What else needs to happen for history education to be successful at achieving the broader goals of cultivating informed and responsive citizens?
- What conditions are favorable and necessary for scaling up promising history education and peace education pilot projects?
- What is the tipping point or moment of ripeness for some of these initiatives to pick up and flourish?
- What can peace practitioners do to stimulate a political and institutional environment open to change?
- How should implementers and donors measure success?
- In particular, when ministries of education refuse to take up approaches, material, and curricula, what can be said about the real and perceived value of such efforts?

Existing and Emerging Challenges

The continuing growth of the peace education field is exciting, but it faces debates about its effectiveness and potential paths of further development. The key issues include conceptual, theoretical, and methodological challenges, strategic considerations, and the theory-practice nexus. Unless these challenges are adequately addressed, they have the potential to significantly diminish and possibly derail the quality of work in the years ahead.

Conceptual, Theoretical, and Methodological Challenges

Peace education practitioners are facing many similar challenges that are also evident in the larger peacebuilding field, including delineating the boundaries of the field, testing the underlying assumptions about how peace comes about, and integrating the evidence on effective practice from non-Western as well Western experiences and perspectives. This section discusses these topics as they relate to the questions raised by peace education practitioners contributing to this report.

Terminology and Focus

One stumbling block is the lack of consensus about what to call the field. Many terms, such as *conflict transformation*, *coexistence*, *reconciliation*, and *shared society work*, are used either alongside or in lieu of *peace education*, in diverse ways that often denote varying objectives and strategies. The result is evident confusion between outcomes and methods, which are regularly conflated,

rather than treated as parts of a sequential process (for example, peace education as a means of pursuing conflict transformation). In addition, terminology changes with fashions and according to context.

For example, UNESCO widely uses peace education in all its general documents, but the terminology changes when its country offices collaborate with educational systems and government ministries that prefer other terms, such as peacebuilding in schools (eastern and southern Africa), education for peace (Rwanda), global education (the Middle East and north Africa), education for conflict resolution (Sri Lanka), and values for life (Egypt).[42]

Similar overlaps and lack of clarity are also evident in the academic domain, where program names are inconsistent: conflict analysis and resolution; conflict studies; peace and justice studies; conflict transformation, negotiation, and mediation; peace and conflict studies; violence prevention and response; coexistence studies. Such variation is fairly normal in the early stages of development of a field but it can also indicate theoretical and practical confusion and fuzziness about the boundaries of the field. Some practitioners welcome the conceptual and methodological pluralism that has flourished in the last two decades. Others argue that the lack of agreed terminology has the potential to limit the perceived usefulness of the work and the further development and marketing of the field.[43]

In addition, peace education is often defined in broad terms to better convey its multiple focuses, among them, human rights, civic education, and citizenship education.[44] This is especially true in the United States, where peace education is most commonly understood in the context of democratic participation and occurs primarily at the secondary school level. Internationally, peace education can be defined either narrowly or broadly and located at various levels depending on the local political realities. According to the staff of USIP's Academy for International Conflict Management and Peacebuilding, in Iraq, where democracy and peace are highly politicized terms, civic education and other terms are more appropriate descriptors for curriculum-focused interventions. The word peace itself is often problematic, because it has been used both in the name of nationalism and to placate segments of the population demanding social and political change. As a result, some perceive peacebuilding as a way to exclude structural issues in a conflict or as evidence of subservience or surrender to the power of another party or state.

Peace education is often defined in broad terms to better convey its multiple focuses, among them, human rights, civic education, and citizenship education.

USIP grantees agreed that a consensus about what to call the field of peace education might be difficult to achieve. Nonetheless, they felt that an agreement about its shared values and principles is feasible.

Theories of Change

Peace practitioners have come under increasing demands from funders and partners to articulate and test their theories of change (ToC), that is, the assumptions about how societal, organizational, and individual change is affected by real-world interventions.[45] Some of the commonly used theories of change (or theories of peacebuilding) aim for transformation at the individual level and building relationships between parties in conflict, whereas others focus on strengthening governance and state institutions, influencing political elites, changing public opinion, or building a culture of peace.[46] Much of the peacebuilding work is guided by multiple and related theories, and some peacebuilding interventions strive to achieve changes at several levels simultaneously.[47] One common trait is that theories are often implicit and assumed, and only rarely examined or tested.

The meta-theory underpinning peace education posits that education is a powerful way to transform society and build a just and peaceful future.

The meta-theory underpinning peace education posits that education is a powerful way to transform society and build a just and peaceful future.[48] The premise of models of individual-level peace education is that such change entails developing the critical thinking skills necessary to help people process information about local global events, both past and present, and the peacemaking skills necessary to help manage everyday conflicts. Peace education focused on structural and policy change is predicated on the logic that lasting behavioral change is a result of changes in the institutions that help shape the attitudes and behaviors of individuals.

Some peace education assumes that exposure to values of peace, or to the "other" (that is, projects informed by the contact hypothesis),[49] results in behavioral change. The long-standing critique of these models has been that, unlike critical thinking skills, which are consistently demonstrated to be important to the development of an informed and engaged citizenry, the link between improved interpersonal skills in conflict resolution and the positive transformation of intergroup conflict is at best tentative. In the experience of USIP grantees, peace workshops and dialogue projects induce short-term attitudinal changes, but these diminish over time. Most important, the impact of such results on the larger social and political context is "a drop in a bucket," as one scholar noted.

The demands to be explicit about the core theories that inform peace education, to examine the underlying assumptions about social change processes, and to trace how peacebuilding efforts succeed in reaching their stated objectives are challenging given the complexity and uncertainty of conflict environments.[50] Yet without such foundations, the field will continue to be hindered by a multitude of untested and unproven theories and approaches, some of which may be ineffectual and therefore wasteful, and even detrimental, including in ways directly contrary to their objectives or because of discounted or overlooked side effects. Testing theories of change requires an investment of time and expertise to identify and link conceptual knowledge with lessons learned. Such undertakings benefit greatly from collaboration among academics, researchers, and practitioners working at both international and local levels. Assumptions and hypotheses about what works and what does not should be complemented with real knowledge and evidence-based observations accumulated over the years.

USIP grantees suggested that the Grant Program could support this important learning process by funding more rigorous studies that evaluate the effectiveness of theories of change and approaches in achieving long-term sustainable results, that is, of peace education efforts in several select countries and contexts.

Predominance of Western Approaches

For obvious reasons having to do with available resources, Western models of theory and practice have dominated the development of the field. Some conference participants were concerned that peace education practice dominated by a Western worldview leads to poor context analysis and inappropriate interventions due to a lack of agreement with local groups as to the best strategies. One participant cited the example of DDR programs with child soldiers, which typically take little account of the ways in which local communities interact with children. Other participants commented on the way in which outsiders often failed to understand and take account of local systems of education. Bibliographies for the curricula used in the field draw almost entirely from traditional Western sources.[51] Yet a disjunct often exists between models developed within a primarily Western cultural framework and those that prevail elsewhere. For example, what is now taught in most programs as the suggested mode of mediation typically has little resonance in many cultures around the world. In many situations, using

Western models can actually damage indigenous models, which could in many cases be better employed, maintained, and further developed in the service of the goals of the field.[52]

Western attitudes and work styles are also evident in the interactions and relationships on the ground in conflict areas. Culturally sensitive peacebuilding practice is not a term one often encounters because the prevailing assumption is that peace practitioners would be attuned to the needs, attitudes, and behaviors of the people with whom they work. Some conference participants challenged this assumption, however, observing that asymmetrical power relations and cultural dominance frequently had negative effects on the relations between outsiders and insiders in conflict settings.

At the same time, such conflicts, and the resulting involvement of external actors and funders, frequently indicate an unfortunate failure of local peacebuilding mechanisms. Their capacity may simply have been inadequate to forestall disorder. In addition, local values are frequently contested within conflict contexts, in so far as they relate to underlying sources of contention such as the promotion of democracy, human rights, and gender equality.

More and more actors are entering the field of peacebuilding, bringing their own values and notions of focus and effectiveness to the work. Meanwhile, the field is on a learning path when it comes to engaging with, understanding, and appreciating local and indigenous approaches. USIP grantees were clear that respect for local capacity and knowledge is and should remain a core principle of peace education. In addition, given the developmental stage of the field, and its need to assemble best practices from creative undertakings all around the world, there is a need to ensure more inclusive, better-resourced, and equitable learning processes. These will add considerably to the strength, credibility, and effectiveness of the field.[53]

Strategic Challenges

Peace education practices that aim to bring about changes at the individual, organizational, and structural levels require planning, short-term and long-term strategy and tactics, and a well-designed and well-integrated approach that capitalizes on other ongoing societal change efforts. These strategic decisions are often influenced by external factors such as availability of funding, partners, and organizational and partner capacity, factors that are recognized as critical in advancing peace education as an organizational practice and a discipline.

Activism or an Evidence-Based Approach?

A notable element of the multifaceted nature of peace education is the tension between advocacy-focused and evidence-based approaches. Within the academic and practical realms, accommodation between these two approaches has been uneasy, as has been recognition that both have contributed to elevating the status and visibility of peace education.

This circumstance mirrors what has been observed about the peacebuilding field as a whole. The field has greatly benefitted from the energy of activists who have called for increased public attention to social change issues. Meanwhile, those espousing the evidence-based approach have, in their emphasis on being strategic and effective, increased the credibility of the field.

Similarly, peace education has historically been spearheaded by social activists and advocates for societal transformation through nonviolent action. Their approach often focuses on changing people as individuals, ending war in its totality, and using tactics such as civil disobedience—essentially working as outsiders and directly challenging the many institutions, governments, and systems deemed responsible for conflicts. In addition, activism-based peace

education efforts often tackle issues of global dimensions, thus complicating the task of measuring their success. Much of the peace education work during the Cold War focused on countering militarism and the arms race. Disarmament education promoted by UNESCO and individual peace educators in the 1980s was, in effect, an activist-based response to "resist propaganda for war and militarism."[54]

Contemporary peace education continues to consider activism an important form of engagement. Many of its original activist impulses, however, have been transformed by the growing realization that neither goodwill nor hope make a strategy, and that sustainable peace cannot be achieved at any level through activism alone. As one former grantee explained, "The energy from Darfur activism on college campuses is fueling more awareness around genocide prevention and the U.S. role in Sudan, which is good, but it is our direct work on the ground with key conflict stakeholders that could shift the conflict reality in Sudan."

Those who favor the evidence-based approach focus on conflict analysis, empirical evaluation, mapping changing structures and systems, and working pragmatically, sometimes as insiders with politicians, militaries, and paramilitaries. Peace educators committed to critical inquiry and reflective practice have long recognized the need for testing assumptions and gathering evidence to inform and improve practice. That the evidence-based approach is gaining ground is in no small measure due to the contribution of funding agencies that demand field-tested and practical interventions. An increasing share of peace education efforts is working strategically to influence and change institutional practices and policies by engaging with the institutions in an advisory capacity rather than merely petitioning them to infuse peace education values into their programs.

That the field has moved far from its early, primarily activist, approach and now favors evidence-based approaches . . . is a testimony to the growing maturity of the field.

That the field has moved far from its early, primarily activist approach and now favors evidence-based approaches, while defining and adopting program designs that match particular contexts, is a testimony to the growing maturity of the field.[55] Still, as discussions at the consultative meeting demonstrated, the search for effective strategies continues. One ongoing challenge is the tensions between the two approaches and their proponents, which are apparent within the field, as well as within organizations, networks, and partner agencies. Finding a balance—viewing advocacy and evidence as both necessary and complementary—can be difficult.

Peace Writ Large

In recent years, a major concern for the field has been how to achieve what is sometimes called peace writ large, the idea that disparate individual, organizational, and institutional activities are effective only insofar as they contribute to an overall strategy that has the capacity to significantly assist ending violent conflict or war and building a just and sustainable peace.[56] This means recognizing the need for work at different levels of society and linking activities across these levels to be most effective.

Yet many programs do not have the capacity to sustain and mainstream their work into the development of social structures and often fall apart in the face of ongoing contextual challenges or limitations.[57] Also, a conflicted society may have dozens of initiatives addressing issues of conflict that rarely connect each other, and therefore cannot aggregate into what is ultimately needed to prevent, moderate, or end violence.

Integrated Approaches

To ensure its success, sustainable peacebuilding almost always requires the assistance of the formal education system; economic, social, and community development; good governance; enabling national and international legislation; security reform; and so on. This conditionality has brought to the fore the idea of mainstreaming peacebuilding processes and peace education efforts within other domains.[58]

Yet the idea of such an integrated approach can be daunting to a field already overstretched by thin resources, not least because it may result in significant mission creep, which tends to be counterproductive.[59] In addition, the field often lacks the capacity or the confidence to ensure that such mainstreaming is effective.

To its credit, peace education, as an interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary field, frequently draws from other related sectors of work when it comes to instructional content. Yet peace educators often are not able to link the various levels of society at which goals are pitched, in part because they may not realize the importance of such an approach or may be intimidated by what it would entail. In this regard, several former grantees emphasized the need for devising both top-down and bottom-up approaches and linking them more effectively. For example, in Rwanda, the national peace and reconciliation policy implemented by the government is supported by a number of independent grassroots initiatives. In Bosnia, Education for Peace International (EfP) works in partnership with governments, foundations, NGOs, schools, and individuals to integrate peace education into the national curriculum.[60] The participants at the consultative meeting discussed that unless peace educators adapt a holistic approach to affecting social change that includes integrating and linking governmental level work with grassroots processes, even most concentrated peace education efforts will rarely be effective or sustainable.

Short- Versus Long-Term Activities

Another perennial issue for both practitioners and academics is one recently labeled as technical peacemaking rather than conflict transformation.[61] The concern here is that short-term, quick-fix processes—for example, one-off peacebuilding interventions focused on a single sector and dialogue workshops—do not deliver sustainable peace. Such activities are often not robust or sustained enough to address major problems of structural inequalities. Of course, this is an exacting standard, given that such inequalities are often difficult to remediate and slow to change, potentially requiring generations in the absence of a concerted set of interventions. Many peacebuilding activities, in turn, are arguably not robust or sustained enough even to budge attitudes, relationships, and policies in any lasting way. That said, in certain settings programs have conscientiously sought to address structural inequalities and achieved relatively rapid successes—Northern Ireland is one example. Thus the long term should not be ignored in favor of the short term. Instead, the ultimate objective of sustained change ought to be present as a clear intention of all peacebuilding interventions.

At the same time, it is important to acknowledge that interventions may hold different connotations for each side in a conflict. In particular, the conception of what is to be gained from peacebuilding work among groups that have considered themselves excluded from power is usually very different from what is perceived by those that have traditionally held it. For example, minorities who have been excluded will seek very different things from peacebuilding work, including new structures of equality and validation of diversity. Those holding power in these settings, on the other hand, will more often seek the absence of violence and better interpersonal relations as the outcomes of peacebuilding processes.[62] These sorts of disparities,

which ordinarily require a long-term process of structural change that is difficult to initiate let alone accomplish successfully, pose a significant challenge to the short-term work so often favored by groups and donors.

Scaling Up and Multiplier Effects

Peace education programs also struggle with the challenge of scaling up their efforts to achieve the type of transformative results at the societal level desired and often promised by those involved in peace education efforts.

When it comes to scaling up programs to the national level, USIP grantees and others interviewed see the lack of political will on the part of decision makers in official structures as a critical challenge. Participants at the consultative meeting discussed the need for practitioners to share strategies and tactics proven effective in influencing government institutions, given the real dearth of documented examples.

Debates about effective ways to multiply the work are often concerned with the need to turn participants of peace education programs into change agents.

When it comes to multiplying the work, many practitioners struggle to articulate measurable indicators for evaluating indirect by-products of their activities. Debates about effective ways to multiply the work are often concerned with the need to turn participants of peace education programs into change agents. Programs that engage a few dozen schoolchildren, teachers, and community members can have important effects on the immediate participants, but it is not clear how they affect larger intercommunal and intergroup conflicts. USIP grantees and staff raised questions about the participant selection criteria and process that often takes place when peace education projects are implemented at the community level. Are we selecting the right people? Are these kids change agents? Will they be able to take the new awareness and skills further and create the type of ripple effect through their schools, neighborhoods, and communities that would ensure a broader transformation? One USIP staff member argued that "USIP is very much in its infancy when it comes to scaling up its efforts and we could be more thoughtful and discriminating in selecting worthwhile and sustainable projects to support. The choice of participants and stakeholders is very important."

One of the recommendations to the Grant Program was to invest in programs that focus on building the capacity of adults who then are better equipped to influence young people. In the words of one former grantee, "To create long-term change, we need to support the people able to carry change and avoid putting the burden of change on young people."

The Theory-Practice Nexus

There is little doubt that peace practitioners want to be effective with their efforts. Ongoing initiatives to documenting knowledge and lessons learned about successes and setbacks in peacebuilding and peace education efforts, including evaluation on the part of many organizations, signal their commitment to effective capacity building. There is an increasing recognition that such capacity building needs to be supported at both local and national levels if organizations are to be more effectively engaged in peace education activities.

Capacity Building

As noted earlier, the number of formal institutions such as schools and universities addressing peace issues has increased significantly over the last two decades. Similarly, many more education and training programs are run by nonacademic organizations such as USIP. The International Institute on Peace Education (IIPE), initiated by Columbia University Teacher's

College and now organized by an international consortium, is one of several capacity-building and networking efforts attracting peace educators from around the world.[63] In addition, many other smaller organizations are constantly (re)developing training programs designed to increase the capacity of populations to deal more effectively with conflict.

Peace practitioners have long known that capacity building through training has its limits. As one participant noted,

> Implementation of social change through training is often fruitless; the truth is there is not much trickle down. Therefore, peer learning is often more effective, building a community of practice for people to realize for themselves what they need to do, not just rely on outsiders who will come to tell you what to do. Grants that help build communities of practice and collaborative networks create opportunities for capacity building of a higher order.

One participant at the USIP meeting, drawing from her extensive experience with community-based training, saw it this way: "There has been a real shift in the field when peace practitioners realized that going to Sudan with a five-day workshop is just training people to replicate that workshop, not really building capacity. It has to be longer term, perhaps working with a smaller amount of people, but over a longer period. This is both a realization and an opportunity to shift gears and do more effective work." Participants also noted that capacity-building efforts that take into account the context, conflict analysis, and relative capacity of any one program approach to deliver on sustainable peace are more effective.

Specific areas identified as needing more capacity building are monitoring and evaluation skills, negotiation skills required for working with government stakeholders and navigating the political sphere, and capacity building directed at educators implementing peace education modules directly in classrooms and communities. In addition, practitioners noted the importance of balancing the vital need for a competent and appropriate local community and voluntary capacity-activism for peacebuilding and peace education within conflicted areas, against the increasing trend toward professionalization of the field. As governments, IGOs, and NGOs build up their expert units focused on peace, they recognize the challenge of conducting their work in ways that effectively assist and complement local capacity and ownership of peacebuilding processes by community leaders who are not professional peacebuilders. Additionally, given the increase of consultants in the field, there is a need to ensure that they devote greater attention to developing local capacities so that external peacebuilding interventions do not become a substitute for local and regional capacity.

Governments, IGOs, and NGOs recognize the challenge of conducting their work in ways that effectively assist and complement local capacity and ownership of peacebuilding processes by community leaders who are not professional peacebuilders.

Monitoring, Evaluation, and Impact Assessment

Negotiating the theoretical and practical aspects of many of the challenges discussed will require significant attention to monitoring, evaluation, and impact assessment (M&E)—the importance of which has become more evident in the last decade. Despite some progress in addressing the gaps in evidence-gathering and impact assessment as well as the proliferation of related literature and workshops over the last few years, considerable work is still needed to develop conventions of practice.[64] Questions remain about the best ways for practitioners to balance generic and contextual lessons learned from assessments, which are conducted within particular settings with different driving factors, actors, and conflict dynamics.

Organizations are pressed to report on what reduces violence (and what does not) by funders who are increasingly wary of supporting programs that struggle to demonstrate lasting results. Concern is growing that if the field is unable to show its effectiveness, funders may lose faith and shift their resources to other pertinent subjects (climate change, anticorruption, and

so on). Some practitioners consider these pressures for accountability as important markers of the maturity of the field. Others recognize that they are accountable not only to the donors, but also to those for whom and with whom they design and implement interventions.

A recent desk study on existing evaluations of peace education programs and projects, commissioned by GPPAC's Peace Education Reference Group, highlights the dearth of good assessments. The study points out that much less attention is paid to evaluating the peace education approaches currently in practice than on defining the elements of peace education and developing practical tools. The report further notes that there is little consistency in the standards or methods used for evaluating peace education and conflict resolution education (PE/CRE) and that few of the available impact evaluations are usable for development of theory. The evaluations and related literature reviewed during the desk study emphasized the following challenges: "the variety of programming, selection of evaluation methods, the cost of evaluation, attribution of results (and concomitant unrealistic expectations about what PE/CRE can achieve), the perceived unreliability of evaluation methodologies and biases against qualitative methods—among others. In addition, some point out that while we have become much better at measuring cognitive areas of knowledge, testing of attitudes and values is a more recent development, and behavior measurement instruments need a lot of time, cost (and they are hard to do with larger groups of people)."[65]

Meanwhile, USIP grantees described the added challenge of designing evaluation processes to fit specific donor reporting demands while carrying on a parallel internally driven process informed by the desire to measure what is working in their own practice and in the field. Research, reflection, and documentation require serious time and staff commitment which take attention away from programmatic work. Organizations with sufficient resources set up separate M&E departments and are able to conduct internal and external evaluations to contribute to ongoing organizational learning.[66] By contrast, smaller organizations with limited budgets typically seek ways to increase their internal capacity and engage evaluation experts and funders in collaborative learning.

In terms of recommendations, USIP grantees urged fellow practitioners and funders to not complicate the search for usable evaluation measures and to avoid adversarial evaluation questions that lead to defensive reporting of outcomes. As one practitioner put it, "We can start by asking several key questions: Has the project achieved more good than harm? Does it stick, can it scale up, sustain itself? Has it built capacity?" A number of people thought USIP could play a critical role in educating grantees about evaluation by helping them ramp up their evaluation designs, which would strengthen the capacity of these organizations to do better work. One specific suggestion was for USIP to create an evaluation leadership team of select former grantees and external evaluation experts, who would receive a small stipend to mentor new grantees by providing phone and online support on program design, evaluation methods and developing strategic relationships. This team would create a community of practice among former and current grantees, as well as a peace education evaluation learning lab at USIP.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Peacebuilding is a rapidly developing multidimensional field whose practitioners are called on to advise on policies, devise new strategies, and lend their expertise on the ground in many conflict zones. The multitude of academic and professional programs preparing a new generation of peace practitioners and the rapid proliferation of peacebuilding units within governments, international organizations, and NGOs around the world is testimony to the perceived need

for the work they do and its integration into development, democracy, education, environment, and other sectors where long-lasting social change is sought. The growth of peacebuilding and peace education practice reflects the hard and dedicated work of the many researchers, activists, policymakers, practitioners, and donors who have posited theories, examined initiatives, initiated programs, resourced work, and increasingly, and more rigorously, monitored and evaluated achievements as well as limitations.

The USIP Grant Program has supported many of these outstanding peace practitioners and initiatives worldwide. The roster of funded projects shows a remarkable diversity of models, strategies, and approaches, including among others textbook analysis, teacher training, curriculum guides, modules on human rights education and democracy education, youth dialogue projects, and the development of post-conflict textbooks. Grantees appreciate how USIP recognizes that conflicts are multigenerational and hence require long-term solutions. The fact that the Grant Program does not change its country focus each year is a testament to its sustained commitment to support lasting change.

Virtually everyone we spoke with during and after the 2009 consultative meeting mentioned that one of the key strengths of the Grant Program is its ability to open doors and to enable projects to gain traction and recognition in challenging local contexts and institutional settings. USIP's reputation and its financial support have lent a measure of respect and credibility to projects that otherwise would not have received the required attention from local authorities, partners in the field, and other donors. This added traction is seen as invaluable, especially where barriers to institutional uptake and sustainability are deep-rooted.

Peace educators, however, continue to struggle with conceptual, strategic, and practice gaps that, if left unresolved, could weaken the field and decrease its capacity, effectiveness, and credibility in the eyes of communities, governments, partner organizations, and funding agencies. In that context, it is commendable that the Grant Program is compiling lessons learned to inform its future grantmaking and help focus and advance the work of peacebuilding and peace education.

To support these efforts, we have synthesized a set of recommendations from the discussions that took place at the consultative meeting, follow-up conversations with grantees and USIP staff, and the background research conducted in the preparation of this report. Specifically, the Grant Program should take the following steps:[67]

1. **Maintain its tradition of funding a significant number of creative peace education projects around the world.** As one former grantee noted, "I appreciate that USIP will take a chance on an organization and project and not just fund organizations and approaches that everybody else has funded." Without such risks, innovative solutions may not materialize. To this end, USIP can lead the way by continuing to seek out and test new approaches to peace education and documenting those that are effective.
2. **Advance peace education in the United States.**[68] Such work could benefit from an assessment of which approaches are most effectively engaging students, including by developing an incoming cadre of interested and informed practitioners and learners who can help take forward and support the future of peace education and its contribution to the overall field of peacebuilding.
3. **Require that all funded projects are situated within a coherent and comprehensive analysis of the relevant conflict context.** Such an analysis must effectively link to proposed program strategies. This means being clear about what objectives are sought, and why, and how they fit into the broader goals of peace education and peacebuilding. To be

eligible for support, organizations must continually examine their overall strategy and approach, seek feedback on program objectives, and reflect on how they suit the contexts in question. In turn, each funding proposal ought to be able to articulate not just why peace is important, but why the organization's particular intervention and strategy is important in a given context.

4. **Engage grantees and colleagues to design and test evaluation approaches for measuring the impact of peace education programs.** Evaluation approaches are still under development and require ongoing support. USIP can capitalize on its unique leverage to offer reflections and convene opportunities for other funders and grantees to reflect upon their work and its effectiveness. The Grant Program can also assist new grantee organizations that do not have experience with impact evaluations by linking them with former grantees that do.
5. **Extend efforts to enhance evaluation requirements for grantees.** Applicants should be required to supply a sound evaluation plan that clarifies what would constitute success and failure for their proposed intervention and enumerates measurable objectives.
6. **Support efforts in particular to test theories of change, document lessons learned, and disseminate the resulting insights, in ways that advance the field.** For this to be possible, applicants for funding need to be explicit about their theories and underlying assumptions for the interventions they propose.
7. **Continue to commission research that aims to produce options for policy and practice by engaging former grantees, peacebuilding experts, and USIP staff and experts in residence, as well as by tapping institutional resources and knowledge and consolidating existing USIP publications.** The resulting products would be valuable resources to make available to former and current grantees.[69] USIP could host an online clearinghouse of peace education projects it has supported, perhaps highlighting promising models. Such a venue would help bring practitioners together and allow them to explore firsthand the various approaches that have been tried and found useful.
8. **Seek additional ways to invest in building the capacity of grantee organizations, including collaborative evidence-based learning and research opportunities.** An important focus of these efforts would be to gather regular feedback from practitioners in the field and to better understand their concerns. One way to do so is to maintain an open dialogue with grantees about their ongoing needs in regard to strategic planning and thinking, institutional issues, monitoring and evaluation tools, and so on. Partnerships can also be cultivated by connecting organizations facing similar challenges.
9. **Avail itself of indigenous approaches to peacebuilding, peace education, and capacity building as well as encourage comparative learning processes in partnership with lesser resourced learning areas wherever possible.** Local ownership of peacebuilding processes is critical and, if not already present, should be encouraged and developed from the start of an intervention.
10. **Help scale up peace education work by funding promising local programs and appealing on their behalf at the national government level and with other donors.** Former and current grantees would like to see USIP engaged in more advocacy and promotion on their behalf, particularly with regard to the national governments of countries where USIP currently works, USAID country missions, and UN- and other donor-funded

initiatives seeking to engage local partner organizations. Such appeals would have to be carried out within the boundaries of USIP mandate, recognizing existing restrictions.

11. **Continue to support innovative approaches that recognize and effectively tap fields such as development, democracy building, security, education, environmental work, the arts, the private sector, and media.** Bridging fields this way could multiply peacebuilding outcomes.
12. **Request grantees to map out other relevant multifaceted and multilayered interventions taking place in local contexts and to seek out ways to collaborate and complement related efforts.** Few peacebuilding and peace education initiatives can deliver by themselves on sustainable peace. Evidence shows that similar or complementary interventions often take place side by side with little or no linkage.
13. **Address sustainability challenges up front by requiring applicants to outline their plans for integrating peace education work into local communities, schools, institutions, and policies.** One recommendation was to support projects that have demonstrated a willingness and ability to engage and influence policymakers, for example, grassroots peace education efforts that have national government stakeholders. Grantees could be asked to map out stakeholders and explain how they will be engaged for the proposed project to be successful and sustainable. In addition, support can be directed to projects that will make strategic connections with relevant ministries, schools, and community-based organizations.
14. **Avoid following funding fads and seek projects based on sound approaches that specify both short- and long-term goals.** One-off and short-term activities rarely deliver sustainable change, though they are useful to clarify and move forward on longer-term strategies. Short-term thinking is often blamed on short-term funding cycles. As one participant noted, "Usually funders have one-year cycles. But they ask, how will you sustain the work? It would be nice to see commitment and attention from funders for at least three to four years. Sustaining and measuring change over the long term requires commitment."

A recurring theme of both the consultation and the interviews cuts across several recommendations and warrants additional in-depth discussion: the idea that the Grant Program can further strengthen the institutional development and capacities of its grantees by maintaining relationships and serving as a learning partner to its grantees. Grantees and other USIP staff noted that maintaining relationships with organizations that receive funding or participate in USIP training programs, seminars, and other events leads to increased opportunities to collaborate and build on USIP investments. Former grantees should be recognized as resources and their expertise used to support new and prospective grantees. USIP can bridge existing knowledge gaps by maintaining an active network of grantees that can be relied on for opportunities to share lessons learned, tested strategies, and resources.

This facilitative and convening role will contribute to USIP's goal of institutional strengthening of its grantees. One former grantee suggested that

> USIP needs to redefine its relationship with its grantees and look at them as partners, engage them in shared assessments and networking. The September meeting and even this follow-up phone interview are examples of USIP's commitment to cultivate smarter grantees by bringing them together, engaging them in USIP learning processes and asking them to reflect on their practice.

Another added, “This would require a new commitment on the part of the Grant Program—to build relationships, not just to write checks.” Several people noted that this level of engagement with practitioners will increase USIP’s credibility by expanding its impact beyond project outcomes to improving and sustaining peace education work in these societies over the long run.

That USIP’s operational presence around the world is limited obviously makes relationship building and partnerships challenging, if only because of distance. As a result, USIP is also not well placed to closely monitor and ensure the sustainability of efforts on the ground. One USIP staff member argued, however, that

> strengthening capacities of our core partners, organizations that we see over and over again, is the best investment into sustainability that we can make given our institutional reality. Investing into long-term capacity building is worthy when you see your partners genuinely transform and improve their practice and become change agents in unexpected ways.

The Grant Program already seeks to build the capacity of grantees but is limited in doing so by the small number and particular competencies of its staff. One idea, therefore, would be for the Grant Program to draw regularly on other USIP staff when seeking to build the capacity of grantees. The Academy for International Conflict Management and Peacebuilding in particular has the expertise required to mentor and strengthen these organizations, especially through training.

More generally, the relationships with domestic and international partners should be seamlessly integrated across USIP departments. One approach is more active engagement between current grantees and USIP staff outside the Grant Program. Among other things, both staff and grantees stand to benefit from each other’s expertise, credibility, and influence within their respective networks, communities, and countries. Others noted that institutional obstacles within USIP and the Grant Program itself can restrict opportunities for more intensive collaboration with practitioners and organizations on the ground—for example, the restriction prohibiting the same project director from receiving more than one USIP grant at any given time. The argument was that this restriction effectively limits opportunities to build broader partnerships and to align grantmaking with the ongoing work of other departments as part of an overall strategy. Such coordination is evident in priority grant competitions, where organizations and project types can be more directly solicited and developed, taking into account the strategic plans of associated programs within the Institute. The annual grant competition, by contrast, is an open, unsolicited application process, in which relevant staff are consulted during the review process but have no direct role in establishing grantmaking priorities. Rethinking these rules and arrangements could allow for greater synchronization of objectives and effort, not to mention learning, across all of USIP’s departments, which would be expected to contribute to supporting and strengthening peace education work and the partnering of peace practitioners with USIP.

Appendix 1. Leading Models in the Field of Peacebuilding

Psycho-Cultural Usually concerned with changing attitudes, increasing understanding between groups, and improving relationships between people and groups. **Methods** ■ interpersonal contact and dialogue to change attitudes and perceptions ■ promoting social and cultural pluralism and mutual understanding ■ cooperative interventions on issues of common concern across groups ■ identity work ■ trauma counseling ■ promoting a culture of antiviolence ■ promoting coexistence and reconciliation through the arts	***Institutional*** Mainly concerned with developing political, governance, and other institutions to better manage conflict and thereby safeguard all psycho-cultural, structural, and peace education values. **Methods** ■ inclusive political systems, structures, agreements, and frameworks ■ neutral and inclusive security structures ■ mediation centers ■ weapon control mechanisms ■ free and inclusive media ■ inclusive constitutions ■ nonpolitical legislature ■ vigorous and free civil society institutions ■ anticorruption institutions ■ pluralist cultural institutions
Structural Mainly concerned with values of fairness, justice, and security in a society. **Methods** ■ equitable or shared access to employment, land, national resources, healthcare, and education ■ shared natural resources (such as water) ■ minority and gender equality ■ reintegration of prisoners and former combatants after war ■ development and conflict work ■ (all developed where possible on a shared or inclusive basis)	***Peace Education*** Usually concerned with imparting knowledge and developing skills for peacebuilding work. **Methods** ■ training teachers, grassroots groups, and activists in conflict resolution, mediation and alternative dispute resolution techniques ■ school and university programs on conflict resolution, coexistence, and the like ■ media programs that promote understanding between groups ■ curricula development for schools, universities, community groups, and the like ■ promoting human rights bills and norms and developing and monitoring implementation

Notes

1. The authors thank USIP for the opportunity to participate in this initiative and are grateful to Steven Heydemann and David Backer for their helpful input on earlier drafts.
2. A consultation in 2007 by an organization then known as the Alliance for Conflict Prevention and Resolution on the issue of terminology resulted in their adopting the term *peacebuilding* as the most favored term for the work in the field. The term is currently and widely used by practitioners, researchers, and funding agencies, to cover the range of initiatives designed to ensure that communities and societies can live more equitably and peacefully together, including peace education; conflict prevention, management, and resolution; postconflict and conflict transformation work; conflict sensitivity, reconciliation, coexistence, multiculturalism, pluralism, and shared societies efforts. When program approaches that primarily involve education, training and other pedagogical components are addressed and described, the term *peace education* is used. For further discussion of the diversity of terms used by peace practitioners, see the discussion of terminology.
3. Louis Kriesberg, "The Growth of the Conflict Resolution Field," in *Turbulent Peace*, edited by Chester Crocker, Fen Hampson, and Pamela Aall (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2001).
4. Mari Fitzduff, "Ending Wars: Developments, Theories and Practice," in *The Psychology of Resolving Global Conflicts*, edited by Mari Fitzduff and Chris Stout (Westport, CT: Praeger Press, 2006).
5. These statistics were compiled from several websites, including www.emu.edu/cjp/grad/masters-phd-programs, www.internationalpeaceandconflict.org/profiles/blog/show?id=780588%3ABlogPost%3A48733, www.internationalpeaceandconflict.org/profiles/blog/show?id=780588%3ABlogPost%3A155371&xgs=1, and http://internationalpeaceandconflict.ning.com/profiles/blogs/guide-to-phd-programs-in.
6. The last decade has seen programs developed in Costa Rica, Sri Lanka, Indonesia, India, Nigeria, and the Philippines, among other countries.
7. Examples include the U.S. State Department Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization, USAID's Conflict Management and Mitigation Unit, the United Nations Peacebuilding Fund, UNDP's Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery, and the United Kingdom's Department for International Development Humanitarian and Security Department.
8. Coexistence International, "Insiders and Outsiders: A Review of Policies that Recognize Diversity and Promote Inclusion and Coexistence" (report, Heller School for Social Policy and Management, Brandeis University, 2006), http://heller.brandeis.edu/academic/ma-coex/files/CI%20Resources/insidersoutsiders.pdf.
9. For example, Oxfam, CARE, Mercy Corps, World Vision, Action Aid, CAFOD, Helvetas, ACCORD, and the like.
10. See GPPAC News, www.gppac.net/page.php?id=1.
11. See Craig Zelizer, "Guide to Training Programs in Conflict Resolution and Related Fields," *Peace and Collaborative Development Network*, August 6, 2010, www.internationalpeaceandconflict.org/profiles/blogs/guide-to-training-programs-in.
12. See, for example, Peacebuilders' Forum, *Alliance for Peacebuilding*, www.allianceforpeacebuilding.org/?page=forum.
13. This typology was presented in a survey form to USIP grantees attending the September 2009 consultative meeting. Most participants categorized their work as falling under the psycho-cultural approach or the education and training approach.
14. John Paul Lederach, *The Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Building Peace* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).
15. Vamik Volkan, *The Need to Have Enemies and Allies: From Clinical Practice to International Relationships*, 2nd ed. (Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, 1996).
16. Peace education is sometimes referred to as or linked to conflict resolution education, peace and disarmament education, education for mutual understanding, education for international understanding, cooperation and peace, global education, citizenship or civic education, coexistence education, peace and human rights education, multicultural education, and so on.
17. Ian Harris, "History of Peace Education," in *2008 Encyclopedia of Peace Education*, (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 2008), www.tc.edu/centers/epe/PDF%20articles/Harris_ch2_22feb08.pdf.
18. For an excellent overview of peace education in zones of conflict, see Pamela Aall, Jeffrey Helsing and Alan Tidwell, "Addressing Conflict Through Education," in *Peacemaking in International Conflict: Methods & Techniques*, rev. ed., edited by William Zartman (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace, 2007).
19. For more discussion of various peace education models, see Kevin Kester, "Developing Peace Education Programs: Beyond Ethnocentrism and Violence," *Peace Prints: South Asian Journal of Peacebuilding* 1, no. 1 (Spring 2008): 1–28, www.wiscomp.org/pp-v1/Kevin_Kester.pdf.

20. Alan Smith, "Education for Diversity: Investing in Systemic Change Through Curriculum, Textbooks, and Teachers," in *Promoting Social Cohesion through Education: Case Studies and Tools for Using Textbooks and Curricula*, edited by Eluned Roberts-Schweitzer with Vincent Greaney and Kreszentia Duer (Washington, DC: World Bank, 2006).
21. Ibid.
22. A recent publication highlights the "marked absence of interdisciplinary and comparative research to guide academic development and inform practice" in peace education arena. For more, see Claire McGlynn, Zvi Bekerman, Michalinos Zembylas, and Tony Gallagher, eds., *Peace Education in Conflict and Post-Conflict Societies: Comparative Perspectives* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009). For a description of peace education programs around the world, see Leonisa Ardizzone, "Towards Global Understanding: The Transformative Role of Peace Education," *Current Issues in Comparative Education* 4, no. 2 (2002): 16–25.
23. James Page, "Philosophy of Peace Education," in *2008 Encyclopedia of Peace Education* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 2008), www.tc.edu/centers/epe/PDF%20articles/Philosophy%20of%20Peace%20Education.pdf. See also H.B. Danesh, "Towards an Integrative Theory of Peace Education," *Journal of Peace Education* 3, no. 1 (2006): 55–78.
24. Robin Burns, "Comparative and International Education and Peace Education," in *2008 Encyclopedia of Peace Education* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 2008), www.tc.edu/centers/epe/PDF%20articles/Burns_ch14_22feb08.pdf.
25. See Peace Education Center, "The Need and Rationale for Peace Education," www.tc.columbia.edu/Peaceed/philosophy.htm.
26. Daniel Bar-Tal, "The Elusive Nature of Peace Education," in *Peace Education: The Concepts, Principles, and Practices Around the World*, edited by Gavriel Salomon and Baruch Nevo (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2002), 35.
27. For example, see the list of classroom materials published by the Peace Education Foundation and used in 20,000 school around the world, including the series titled "Peacemaking Skills for Little Kids" (http://store.peaceeducation.org).
28. Betty Reardon and Alicia Cabezudo, *Learning to Abolish War: Teaching Toward a Culture of Peace*, *Book 1: Rationale for and Approaches to Peace Education* (New York: Hague Appeal for Peace, 2002), www.haguepeace.org/resources/book2/English1.pdf.
29. For further discussion of peace education in terms of its content, form, and organizational structure, see Magnus Haavelsrud, "Conceptual Perspectives in Peace Education," in *2008 Encyclopedia of Peace Education* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 2008), www.tc.edu/centers/epe/PDF%20articles/Haavelsrud_ch7_22feb08.pdf.
30. Among these organizations are Educators for Social Responsibility (ESR), which works to transform schools into safe, caring, and equitable spaces, and Peace First (formerly Peace Games), which teaches students conflict resolution and civic engagement skills across the United States and, more recently, in Israel, West Bank, and other locations.
31. Sara Clarke-Habibi, "Transforming Worldviews: The Case of Education for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina," *Journal of Transformative Education* 3, no. 1 (January 2005): 33–56. See also Teachers Without Borders, "New Program: Peace Education," www.teacherswithoutborders.org/blog/new-program-peace-education.
32. Elizabeth Cole and Judy Barsalou, "Unite or Divide? The Challenges of Teaching History in Societies Emerging from Violent Conflict" (United States Institute of Peace Special Report 163, 2006), www.usip.org/files/resources/sr163.pdf.
33. See Facing History and Ourselves, "National Professional Development and Evaluation Project," www.facinghistory.org/eval/npdep; EUROCLIO, www.euroclio.eu (accessed June 8, 2011).
34. Lesley Bartlett, "Paulo Freire and Peace Education," in *2008 Encyclopedia of Peace Education* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 2008), www.tc.edu/centers/epe/PDF%20articles/Bartlett_ch5_22feb08.pdf.
35. See "Declaration of the 44th Session of the International Conference on Education" (Geneva: UNESCO, November 1995), www.unesco.org/education/nfsunesco/pdf/REV_74_E.PDF.
36. See "Global Campaign for Peace Education," *Hague Appeal for Peace*, www.haguepeace.org/index.php?action=pe.
37. More information about the journal and how it defines peace education is available in the *Journal of Peace Education* (Routledge), www.tandf.co.uk/journals/titles/17400201.asp).
38. See Peace Education Center, "News & Upcoming Events," www.tc.columbia.edu/PeaceEd/.
39. See GCPE's website for examples of policy documents and high-level recommendations supporting peace education in the Balkans, Basque country, Israel, the Palestinian Territories, and Sri Lanka.
40. Emery Brusset and Ralf Otto, "Evaluation of Nashe Maalo: Design, Implementation and Outcomes of Social Transformation Through the Media" (evaluation conducted on behalf of Search for Common Ground, December 23, 2004), www.sfcg.org/sfcg/evaluations/nash2004.pdf.

41. For more information about this and other promising practices, see OSCE's "Human Rights Education in the School Systems of Europe, Central Asia and North America: A Compendium of Good Practice" (Warsaw: OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, 2009), www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/CompendiumHRE.pdf. A similar compendium on good practice in peace education does not exist.
42. The term peace education is now generally seen as a subset of a larger peace and conflict field, encompassing peacebuilding in schools, at local community level, and occasionally in universities. Yet this was not always the case. For example, a decade ago, Betty Reardon noted the links between peace education and conflict resolution training, disarmament education, education for the prevention of war, environmental education, global education, human rights education, multicultural education, nuclear education, and world-order studies. See Betty Reardon, "Peace Education: A Review and Projection," in *International Companion to Education*, edited by Bob Moon, Miriam Ben-Peretz and Sally Brown (New York: Routledge, 2000). In Israel, the term also denotes work that is community based and not just in schools or universities.
43. Lisa Schirch, "Strategic Peacebuilding: State of the Field," *Peace Prints: South Asian Journal of Peacebuilding* 1, no. 1 (Spring 2008): 1–17, www.wiscomp.org/pp-v1/Lisa_Schirch.pdf.
44. For more on why peace education should be defined broadly, see Gavriel Salomon and Ed Cairns, "Peace Education: Setting the Scene," in *Handbook on Peace Education*, edited by Gavriel Salomon and Ed Cairns (New York: Psychology Press, 2009).
45. A theory of change describes a program's explicit (espoused theories) and implicit (theories in use) answers to these questions. It refers to how practitioners believe, generally, individual, inter-group, social, and systemic change happens and their actions, specifically, will produce positive results. See Ilana Shapiro, "Extending the Framework of Inquiry: Theories of Change in Conflict Interventions" (report, Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management, Berlin, 2006), 3.
46. For a longer list of common theories of change with sample methods please see *Encouraging Effective Evaluation of Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Activities: Toward DAC Guidance* (Paris: OECD DAC, 2008), 86–87, www.oecd.org/dataoecd/52/3/39660852.pdf.
47. Cheyanne Church and Mark Rogers, *Designing for Results: Integrating Monitoring and Evaluation in Conflict Transformation Programmes* (Washington, DC: Search for Common Ground, 2006), www.sfcg.org/programmes/ilr/ilt_manualpage.html.
48. Bartlett, "Paulo Freire and Peace Education."
49. For an overview of work related to this hypothesis, see Nicole Tausch, Jared Kenworthy, and Miles Hewstone, "Intergroup Contact and the Improvement of Intergroup Relations, in *The Psychology of Resolving Global Conflicts*, edited by Mari Fitzduff and Chris Stout (Westport, CT: Praeger Press, 2005).
50. Ilana Shapiro, "Theories of Practice and Change in Ethnic Conflict Interventions," in *The Psychology of Resolving Global Conflicts*, edited by Mari Fitzduff and Chris Stout (Westport, CT: Praeger Press, 2005).
51. See, for example, Catherine Morris, ed., "Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding: A Selected Bibliography," www.peacemakers.ca/bibliography, and the resources posted by the Peacebuilding Initiative, www.peacebuildinginitiative.org/index.cfm?pageId=1682.
52. See Christopher Moore, *The Mediation Process: Practical Strategies for Resolving Conflict,* 3rd ed. (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 2003); Bagshaw Dale, "Alternatives to the Judicial Mess: Suggesting Mediation," in *Strengthening Governance through Access to Justice*, edited by Amita Sing and Nasin Aslam Zahid (New Delhi: PHI Learning, 2008); Kevin Avruch, *Culture and Conflict Resolution* (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1998); Mohammed Abu Nimer, "Conflict Resolution Approaches: Western and Middle Eastern Lessons and Possibilities," *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 55, no. 1 (January 1996): 35–52.
53. One of the most influential organizations working in the area is CDA Collaborative Learning Projects, especially via their *Reflecting Peace Practice* program. See www.cdainc.com/cdawww/project_profile.php?pid=RPP&pname=Reflecting%20Peace%20Practice. In addition, see their STEPS project, which has visited communities in thirteen countries (Afghanistan, Bosnia twice, Burkina Faso, Colombia, Fiji, India, Kosovo, Mozambique, Nigeria, Philippines, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka) to examine how communities avoid participating in conflict in the face of extreme pressure to join the violence ongoing in their particular situation, www.cdainc.com/cdawww/project_profile.php?pid=STEPS&pname=Steps%20Towards%20Conflict%20Prevention. Also, see Coexistence International, "Publications: Focus and Country Studies," www.brandeis.edu/coexistence/pubs/publications.html.
54. Carl Mirra, "Countering Militarism through Peace Education," in *2008 Encyclopedia of Peace Education* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 2008), www.tc.edu/centers/epe/PDF%20articles/Mirra_ch11_22feb08.pdf.
55. The same can be said about the environmental field, which has moved from activism into full-scale research and teaching programs in which participants study and argue about the evidence for phenomena like climate change.
56. See CDA Collaborative Learning Project's Reflecting Peace Practice program, www.cdainc.com/cdawww/project_profile.php?pid=RPP&pname=Reflecting%20on%20Peace%20Practice.

57. Gavriel Salomon, "Four Major Challenges Facing Peace Education in Regions of Intractable Conflict," http://peach.haifa.ac.il/index.php?title=Salomon%2C_Gavriel.
58. Craig Zelizer, "Guide to Conflict Mainstreaming," *International Peace and Conflict*, www.internationalpeaceandconflict.org/profiles/blogs/guide-to-conflict.
59. The integrated approach has also been called the complementarity or meta approach. For more on this notion, see the work of Coexistence International, as well as Robert Ricigliano, "Networks of Effective Action: Implementing an Integrated Approach to Peacebuilding," *Security Dialogue* 34, no. 4 (2003): 445–62; and Mari Fitzduff, "Meta Conflict Resolution," (Beyond Intractability Knowledge Base Essay, 2004), www.beyondintractability.org/essay/meta-conflict-resolution/.
60. For more details on the organization, see www.efpinternational.org (accessed June 8, 2011).
61. Simon Fisher and Lada Zimina, "Just Wasting Our Time? Provocative Thoughts for Peacebuilders," in *Berghof Handbook for Conflict Transformation* (Berlin: Berghof Conflict Research, 2010), www.berghof-handbook.net/uploads/download/dialogue7_fishzim_lead.pdf.
62. Gavriel Salomon, "Recent Research Findings by the Center for Research on Peace Education," (Haifa: Center for Research on Peace Education, 2009), http://peach.haifa.ac.il/images/f/fa/Summary_of_our_findings.pdf.
63. IIPE's 2009 annual institute, held in Hungary, was titled "Human Rights Learning as Peace Education: Pursuing Democracy in a Time of Crisis." The 2010 institute, held in Colombia, was titled "Learning to Read the World from Multiple Perspectives: Peace Education toward Diversity and Inclusion."
64. See Church and Rogers, *Designing for Results*. See also Social Impact, *Fragile States and Peacebuilding Programs: Practical Tools For Improving Program Performance and Results* (Arlington, VA: Social Impact, 2007), www.socialimpact.com/resource-center/downloads/fragilestates.pdf; OECD Development Cooperation Directorate, *Encouraging Effective Evaluation of Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding Activities: Towards DAC Guidance* (unclassified OECD document DCD(2007)3, September 11, 2007), www.adb.org/documents/papers/dac-guidance/approach-dac-guidance.pdf.
65. Global PE/CRE Research Evaluation Project, "2009 Report for GPPAC Peace Education Reference Group." Available on request.
66. See Search for Common Ground, "Evaluations," www.sfcg.org/sfcg/sfcg_evaluations.html.
67. A more general recommendation is that USIP should adopt consistent definitions of terminology (for example, peace education, conflict resolution education, peace studies, civic education, human rights education, peacebuilding) currently in use by various of its departments, to help define the boundaries of peace education work supported by USIP's grants.
68. For example, one of the U.S.-based approaches USIP has funded in the past involves educating young people about foreign policy issues.
69. See Pamela Aall, Jeffrey Helsing and Alan Tidwell, "Addressing Conflict Through Education" in *Peacemaking in International Conflict*. Various issues of USIP's *PeaceWatch* and *Peaceworks* publications that are dedicated to peace education illustrate examples of promising practice.

About the Institute

The United States Institute of Peace is an independent, nonpartisan institution established and funded by Congress. Its goals are to help prevent and resolve violent conflicts, promote postconflict peacebuilding, and increase conflict management tools, capacity, and intellectual capital worldwide. The Institute does this by empowering others with knowledge, skills, and resources, as well as by its direct involvement in conflict zones around the globe.

Board of Directors

J. Robinson West (Chair), Chairman, PFC Energy, Washington, DC • **George E. Moose** (Vice Chairman), Adjunct Professor of Practice, The George Washington University, Washington, DC • **Judy Ansley,** Former Assistant to the President and Deputy National Security Advisor under George W. Bush, Washington, DC • **Anne H. Cahn,** Former Scholar in Residence, American University, Washington, DC • **Chester A. Crocker,** James R. Schlesinger Professor of Strategic Studies, School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, Washington, DC • **Kerry Kennedy,** President, Robert F. Kennedy Center for Justice and Human Rights, Washington, DC • **Ikram U. Khan,** President, Quality Care Consultants, LLC., Las Vegas, NV • **Stephen D. Krasner,** Graham H. Stuart Professor of International Relations at Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA • **John A. Lancaster,** Former Executive Director, International Council on Independent Living, Potsdam, NY • **Jeremy A. Rabkin,** Professor of Law, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA • **Judy Van Rest,** Executive Vice President, International Republican Institute, Washington, DC • **Nancy Zirkin,** Executive Vice President, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, Washington, DC

Members Ex Officio

Michael H. Posner, Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor • **James N. Miller,** Principle Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy • **Ann E. Rondeau,** Vice Admiral, U.S. Navy; President, National Defense University • **Richard H. Solomon,** President, United States Institute of Peace (nonvoting)

This report is the result of an initiative to reflect on developments in specific areas where USIP grantmaking has been concentrated. It focuses on peace education, which has been the subject of dozens of USIP grant-funded projects. The authors were commissioned to review the state of the field, to identify lessons learned, and to contemplate future directions of work in the field, with reference to USIP grantmaking. The analysis describes the growth of and the leading models in the field of peacebuilding, the diverse approaches to peace education, and the existing and emerging challenges. The conclusion then offers a series of recommendations for future grantmaking.

Related Links

- *Civic Education and Peacebuilding* by Daniel H. Levine and Linda S. Bishai (Special Report, September 2010)
- *Graduate Education and Professional Practice in International Peace and Conflict* by Nike Carstarphen, Craig Zelizer, Robert Harris, and David J. Smith (Special Report, August 2010)
- *Crescent and Dove: Peace and Conflict Resolution in Islam,* ed. Qamar ul-Huda (USIP Press, 2010)
- *Gender, Conflict, and Peacebuilding: State of the Field and Lessons Learned from USIP Grantmaking* by Kimberly Theidon and Kelly Phenicie with Elizabeth Murray (Peaceworks, September 2011).

PEACEWORKS

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE • 2301 CONSTITUTION AVE., NW • WASHINGTON, DC 20037 • USIP.ORG