

Peace Education Pedagogy: A Strategy to Build Peaceful Schooling

Riswanda Setiadi, Iliandra

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia

Abstract

Violent behaviors and conflicts in our schools are increasingly intensified. This situation can be deemed as an anomaly as education actually contains a message of peace and encourages students to be able to live in harmony. The strategy allegedly effective in building the culture of peace in our schools is through peace education, despite various ways of interpreting the word "peace". This paper discusses the conception of peace education, violent acts and conflicts in the world of education, the definition of peace in a psychological perspective, the position and urgency of peace education, and peace education pedagogy to build the culture of peace. Peace is a construction of complex behaviors ranging from the intrapersonal to global spectrum levels. Peace education should be applied by a transformative pedagogy that requires all school stakeholders to construct a mindset of peace for the sake of peaceful schooling.

Keywords: peace, peace education, peace education pedagogy

1. INTRODUCTION

The four pillars of education have become a kind of general belief in the world of education. But there are barely deep discourses that have analyzed the objective reality of each pillar due to excessive narrative dominance regarding academic achievement but neglecting dimensions of human authenticity. This phenomenon pertains to moral and spiritual responsibility of education for raising humanitarian issues and how students live side by side and care for others. Dishonesty acknowledges that there is an educational crisis that raises rhetorical questions, whether education will be a solution or a source of problems in the constellation of issues of peaceful living. In an optimistic viewpoint, educational thinkers dare to expressly live a peaceful and harmonious life as a pillar of excellence in the future.

Experts have signaled about anomalies in education, one of which is Shapiro (2010) who stated that education when it was hit by a crisis, precisely the crisis accountability which is marked by the strengthening of "culture of testing" and the decline of "cultural literacy". Contemporary culture of education emphasizes individuality, separate from others. What does it mean by success is individual achievement and achievement through competition and comparison with others. Continual emphasis on the individual will give birth to loneliness, separation and conflict. Not excessive Delors (1996) states that learning to live together with others is one of the main issues of education today.

Student's violent acts and the like are real examples of the antithesis of the pillars for living peacefully. The latest issue is the case of violence suffered by Audrey which led to pros and cons in society. Student fights are one form of student

conflict accompanied by violence, destruction, persecution, and even murder. There were 161 violent acts against school children as of May 30, 2018. Violence in education ranks the 4th after cases of pornography and cyber-crime. The Jabodetabek area is the region with the most cases, as many as 21 percent, followed by West Java, Bali, Yogyakarta, Lombok (KPAI, 2018). Data from the International Center for Research on Women (ICRW) shows that in 2015 as many as 84% of students in Indonesia claimed to have experienced violence at school. As many as 22% of students admitted to having experienced violence by teachers and school officials, even as many as 75% of students claimed to have committed acts of violence in school. UNICEF data show that one in three girls and one in four boys in Indonesia have experienced violent acts.

Exposure to violence contributes to academic decline and increased problematic behavior or loss of learning focus (Fusco & Fantuzzo, 2009); intrapersonal, interpersonal and academic limitations (Kim, Talbazyasot, & Cicchetti, 2009), academic performance (Close, 2005) in the long term it can cause trauma and deviant behavior; poor prosocial behavior and increased personal problems (Sternberg, Lamb, Guterman, & Abbott, 2006). Students who experience conflict tend to use violence to solve it. They are unable to resolve constructively. In many cases, conflicts between students are resolved by parties who have authority, such as teachers, principals, parents, even the police. The involvement of the authorities in resolving conflicts between students occurs because in many cases students do not know how to resolve conflicts in constructive ways.

On a macro scale, the Indonesian people are not trained and educated to resolve conflicts constructively so that they often end in destruction without solving the main problem (Bunyamin, 2004). Education that fails to equip people with

the ability to live peacefully is not truly meaningful education. This departs from the historical fact that education does not automatically bring the message of peace, democracy, and respect for the rights and welfare of others. An alternative strategy for developing a culture of peace is through education of peace in personal and structural levels.

2. MEANING AND SPECTRUM OF PEACE

Peace has become an interesting issue and study for various disciplines, such as philosophy, sociology, anthropology, psychology, and education. Basically it is one of the individual's need, such as happiness, justice, and health. Defining peace is not easy, as sometimes peace can only be understood when there is no peace. In the Webster's Third New International Dictionary, peace is defined as "freedom from civil clamor and confusion" and positively as a condition of "a state of public quiet". Another lexical meaning of peace is "mental or spiritual condition marked by freedom from disquieting or oppressive thought or emotional. The third meaning is peaceful based on Webster as "a tranquil state of freedom from outside disturbances and harassment". Furthermore, peace also means "absence of activity and noise: deep stillness or positive inner peace". Finally, peace can mean "one that makes, gives, or plays tranquility". The first definition emphasizes a peaceful perspective in a political context in the nuances of "outer", the second definition of peace is more personal or inner sense and synonymous with peace of mind, calmness of mind and heart, serenity of spirit (inner peace), the third definition of peace "Harmony in human or personal relations" which means interpersonal or inter subjective peace ", while the last definition is related to divine or perpetual peace.

One of the pioneers and founder of peace studies and peace research was Johan Galtung, who classified peace into two types, namely positive peace and negative peace. Positive peace is a condition that is simultaneously present in community life, such as; harmony, justice and equality. The negative peace is a condition when there is no more war and a variety of conflicts between humans on a large scale. If traced, many cultural and spiritual traditions have peaceful connotations in a positive sense. For example, the concept of Eirene from Greece means harmony and justice as well as peace. In Arabic the word salaam and shalom from Hebrew not only connotes the absence of violence but also the presence of well-being, wholeness and harmony in self, community, between people and between countries. In Sanskrit, said Shanti, it does not only mean peaceful but spiritual tranquility. Ping in Chinese means harmony and respect for diversity.

Negative peace is directed towards the absence of war and other forms of violence, while positive peace is oriented to the social foundation of peace and fruit / purpose of peace (the presence of love, compassion, harmony, tolerance, mutual care, interdependence, the introduction of others' souls and feelings grateful) (Castro & Galace, 2008).

Psychologically, Webster (Webel & Galtung, 2007) viewed peace as a mental or spiritual condition characterized by freedom from disturbing or oppressive thoughts or emotions, peace of mind and heart: peace of mind, and showing harmony in humans or personal relationships: mutual harmony and pride. Peace is a state of emotional well-being and resolution of conflict without violence. Peace is a about feeling enough. In other words, if humans feel enough (such as balance and strength) they will get a sense of peace as a consequence of 'feeling enough'.

Webel & Galtung (2007) summarized definitions of peace and obtained the essence of the nature of peace as follows: (1) a condition free from conflict, namely a society that is safe and orderly by norms and laws; (2) mental and spiritual conditions that are free from anxiety and emotional disturbances (inner peace); (3) conditions that are free from chaos and violence; (4) the harmony of life between individuals, namely between individuals respecting each other and living in harmony.

Peace is a complex concept, so it means differently to different individuals and groups. Peace according to individuals is peace of mind, solitude, comfort, happiness, calmness and mind freedom of mind. Peace according to groups is togetherness, harmony and cooperation. Likewise, the peaceful concept of a nation with other nations will have their own understanding, but have the same red thread, namely living harmony (Navvaro & Castro, 2008).

In the concept of peace, a personal inner peace is the beginning of the creation of a peaceful life. A peaceful person has the characteristics of respect and dignified personal characteristics. People who have a peaceful person will face challenges in living with inner equilibrium because as difficult as anything he has confidence in the goals and intrinsic values that are in him. Therefore, it is not easy to falter from inner disharmony, challenges are faced with hope (sense of hope) and trust in one's abilities (Castro & Galace, 2008). In the view of UNESCO (2005) sources of secrecy include the private, peaceful and social peace of the universe. Personal peace is characterized by harmony with oneself, good health, avoidance of internal conflict, division, freedom, possession, spiritual calm, kindness, compassion, and appreciation for art. Social peace is characterized by harmony relations at all levels, having the ability to conflict resolution, love and friendship, togetherness, mutual understanding, acceptance and cooperation, tolerant of differences, democratic, respecting human rights and morality. Peace with the universe includes harmony with the environment and God (mother earth).

3. PEACE EDUCATION

The most significant strategy to promote a culture of peace is through peace education (Castro & Galace, 2008). Peace education is not limited to conflict and learn to resolve it peacefully. It is more effective if it is adjusted to the sociocultural context, needs and aspirations of a nation. It should be enriched by the cultural, religious and humanitarian values and other values that are relevant in the global context. It is a concept and practice that is difficult to define accurately

and comprehensively. Consequently, education in peace continues to grow so that there are many definitions of peace education up to now. There is no one definition of peace education that is truly acceptable to everyone because ultimately the choice of definition is personal preference.

Peace education in the UNICEF conception as quoted by Fountain (1999) refers to the process of advancing the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values needed to produce behavioral changes that will allow children, adolescents, and adults to prevent conflicts and violence, which are real and structured to resolve conflicts peacefully and to create conditions conducive to peace, both at the level of intrapersonal, interpersonal, inter-group, national and international levels.

Peace will be achieved when all world's citizens are aware of and understand global problems globally, have conflict resolution skills, and strive to uphold justice without violence, live by referring to human rights standards and equality, appreciate cultural diversity, respect each other. All of these can be achieved through systematic peace education (Solomon in De Rivera, 2009). Peace education is something that is holistic and multidimensional in content and process. Peace education can be likened to a tree with many branches with various themes and shapes. Castro and Galace (2008) suggested that peace education is an umbrella with a diverse context, namely: disarmament education, human rights education, global education, conflict resolution education, education for international understanding, interfaith education, development education, gender-fair / non-sexist education and environmental education. Each umbrella of peace education has a different focus, with a variety of orientation and normative skill sets.

Peace education in various countries is different in ideology, goals, accentuation, curriculum, content and practices (Baar-Tal, 2002). In Australia, for example, peace education focuses on opposition to ethnocentrism, chauvinism and violence and promotes cultural diversity, nuclear disarmament and conflict resolution. In Japan, most peace education focuses on the issue of nuclear disarmament, militarism and the attitude of responsibility for acts of violence committed in the past (Murakami, 1992). In South America, peace education focuses on structural violence, human rights, and economic inequality (Garcia, 1984). In the United States, peace education programs are related to issues of prejudice, violence and environmental issues (Harris, 1996).

The essence of peace education is the transformation of educators, and students further into society. It fosters knowledge, skills, attitudes and values to change the mindset that is able to eliminate violence or conflict. Through peace education, individuals are encouraged to be able to build awareness and understanding, develop caring and personal actions that make it possible to live peacefully, create conditions and systems without violence, based on justice, care for the environment, and other values of peace. Peace education shapes the character of children which includes dimensions of well-being, love, respect and friendship.

The peace education program in schools is basically an intervention in character development based on human, moral, legal and spiritual values that emphasize the development of students' peaceful life competencies

(UNESCO, 2005). The level of peace education programs extends from the individual, school, state level to the global level. At the individual level, to be able to live peacefully students need many skills, such as affirmation, positive thinking, empathic listening, assertive behavior, decision making and positive thinking. Peace at the school level focuses on developing a climate or a peaceful spirit through a slogan "to be caught rather than be thought" which starts from within with the spirit of appreciation, cooperation, and learning to trust each other. Relations that are built on the spirit of brotherhood and appreciation naturally will give birth to peace in schools that are supported by a value system, a norm that guides the daily behavior of students in schools (UNESCO, 2005).

3.1 The Concept of Learning Methods

Yuan (2008) argues that problem-based learning is a learning method based on constructivism and accommodates student involvement in learning and is involved in solving contextual problems. To obtain information and develop learning concepts, students learn about how to build a problem framework, examine, collect data and organize problems, compile facts, analyze data, compile arguments related to problem solving, then solve problems, either individually or in groups.

With such competencies, it is clear that education in the current era of globalization is strongly influenced by the ability of information literate human resources. Information literacy is a pillar of the progress of the world of education through improving the quality of education which will give birth to quality agent of change, because it is run using a quality education system, qualified teachers, and quality teaching resources (Nurohman, 2014).

4. PEACE EDUCATION PEDAGOGY

Education, formal and non-formal, at all levels is the main medium for building a culture of peace, and even the foundation and core component of the peace culture. The elements of peaceful education should be integrated into teaching pedagogy at all levels of education. In fact, almost all the topics in the curriculum are designed to direct students to a peaceful and happy life, but the process of learning about peace and happiness in the class has not been real (Kartadinata, Setiadi, & Ilfiandra, 2018).

A study by Kartadinata and associate (2016) show that building a safe and peaceful classroom climate has not become the vision and mission of the teachers because they put more emphasis on mastering the subject matter. Other findings show that inheritance of core values of peace between generations stagnates because it relies on oral traditions; teachers understand the importance of peaceful values in schools but have not yet realized how to intentionally and systematically develop these values; students and teachers predispose to peaceful behavior sufficiently, but are not aware of forms of behavior that are

counterproductive to the creation of peaceful classes and schools.

Schools have a strategic position as agents of the peace culture development and teachers are central figures (McLeod & Reynolds, 2010). Unlike subjects, peace education depends on the teacher's personality. Teachers who are not peaceful cannot teach peace because their behavior is contrary to what they teach (UNESCO, 2005) so that it is not excessive if the peace pedagogy is an "honorable" effort (McLeod & Reynolds, 2010). Students are the main resource in building a culture of peace and learning how to avoid violent acts in school's daily life.

Schools and all their components assume a responsibility to create a culture of peace, namely by equipping students with the attitudes, knowledge and skills needed to maintain and resolve conflicts constructively. Conflict prevention and resolution can even be taught because every child has the right to feel safe at school. What makes students feel safe is still vague in the literature. Feelings become part and attachment to others is related to security. Feelings of security are also related to the social climate, student altruistic behavior such as cooperation, helping each other can encourage their academic achievement. Having friends and feeling helped contribute to feeling safe and successful. Flaherty (2001) identifies the importance of feeling valued and valued as a key component of a safe and peaceful school. From the results of the literature review, Johnson (2010) found factors that contribute to security and peace, namely: the quality of children's relationships with caregivers, adult protection, social rules, the presence of drugs in schools, the presence of violence in homes and communities, media coverage of security in the community, violence in the media, the existence of houses of worship, mastery of techniques of being self, harmonious relations with friends, and encouragement for altruistic behavior, as well as feelings of belonging to the community.

Peace education pedagogy is a process, and not merely learning about peace and war. As a process, it requires knowledge of peace and war, also about learning to live peacefully as citizens in a democratic society. In relation to peace education pedagogical content, the content can be in the form of knowledge and skills that raise daily events that occur in the classroom that are able to deliver students to become agents of peace in their lives (McLeod & Reynolds, 2010).

In perspectives on traditional pedagogy, the majority of teaching uses the "learning about" or "learning for" approach. Learning approaches about knowledge oriented with a focus on assimilation and interpretation of facts, concepts, data, and facts. The "learning to" approach focuses on value acquisition and skills development that allows applying what has been learned. The "learning in or through" approach is the actual process of learning considered relevant as a peace education pedagogy. Peaceful life knowledge and skills need to be strengthened by reflective processes during learning, after learning and for long-term behavior (McLeod & Reynolds, 2010).

The focus of peace education pedagogy is on the mind because all wars and conflicts start from the mind. Peace

pedagogy is not only - and not limited - to conflict resolution education, but includes mindset and formation of mindsight about how differences must be resolved and opposition must be met so that it does not emerge. social noise. The learning process begins with the building of inner peace in the minds and hearts of every person who seeks the truth, knowledge and understanding of each culture and appreciation of shared values to achieve a better future. Individuals who have inner peace are characterized as having dignity and recognition as social beings (Castro & Galace, 2008).

The conceptualization of teachers as peace activists has its roots in Galtung's opinion on peacemaking, peacekeeping and peace building. Peacemaking and peacekeeping refer to conflicts, while peacebuilding is an effort to build a sustainable future in a sustainable manner. This understanding does not stop at the negative idea of peace (the absence of war) but requires positive peaceful civilization by promoting harmony between people, including respect, justice and inclusiveness (Gills & Niens, 2014). Thus, peacebuilding can be seen as a transformative process for building peace in a sustainable manner by overcoming the causes of conflict. This is a holistic process of peacebuilding involving all communities and individuals. In the transformation process, teachers are seen as peace makers who teach children how to live together in peace and overcome prejudices between individuals and society.

The implementation of peace education pedagogy requires multi-channel and multi-strategy because its true nature is holistic and collaborative. The pedagogy of peace education avoids the didactic approach that tends to conceptual acquisition. The peace pedagogy strategy is to encourage students to "" experience for themselves "the learning experience about peace in school in a variety of contexts and authentic life settings. Thus, the pedagogical approach to peace is holistic, participatory, cooperative, experiential and humanist. The implementation of the embedded pedagogy of peace education in the learning process takes precedence because it is directly related to the essence of education in schools in the form of teacher-student learning interactions in the long run. Teacher and school creativity is a key word in the implementation of the model to avoid being trapped or slipped in conventional learning patterns that promote mastery of concepts through a didactic approach (Kartadinata, Setiadi, & Ilfiandra, 2018).

The teacher has insights and skills related to anti physical and psychological violence, such as bullying, labelling, clicks between groups and isolated students. The teacher has the ability to organize emotions, develop intrapersonal skills so that they are able to do conflict resolution properly. The teacher can develop interpersonal skills so that he can empathize and respect and be responsible for the academic community at school. The methods described in the peace education for teachers stimulate the creativity of teachers and students in accepting an understanding of the importance of peace in school. Teachers can design good collaboration with students to facilitate achieving their learning goals.

The principles that guide the application of peace education pedagogy models, and the culture of peace as a

point of arrival are solidarity, responsibility, respect and democracy. Solidarity is intended for each individual in the school environment to develop a sense of trust and tolerance in their social interactions. Responsibility is the awareness of each individual to bear the risks and consequences of all their actions and willingness to maintain a safe and peaceful school environment, while respect is related to respecting the rights and obligations of individuals in carrying out their responsibilities in the school environment. Every individual in the school environment must uphold democracy and they have the same right to hear and be heard in carrying out their obligations.

At the practical level, the teacher can design a number of activities to support the creation of a peaceful school climate. Materials, media, methods prepared lead to how to stimulate students to have insights and knowledge about the importance of peace for themselves, peace with friends, peace with groups, peace in class, peace in organization and peace with the environment. Students who already feel at peace with themselves, of course the application comes out is that he will give a sense of comfort in socializing with friends and the environment. There will be no more bullying or negative utterances that will irritate his friend, because he will feel that his friend is his brother, do not hurt his heart and feelings. Finally, the prevalence of school violence will decrease.

The parameters of the successful peace education pedagogy are more tacit than explicit because the impact may not be immediately felt after learning. The main impact of the implementation of the peace education pedagogy is the transformation of the culture of peace at the individual level and the structural tendency of social disintegration towards relations built by values of solidarity and inclusiveness. This cultural transformation then becomes a social force in the world of education to build peaceable classrooms and peaceable schools. This condition is reflected in the safe and peaceful classroom atmosphere and climate so that the class becomes a zone of peace which is shown by the behavior of students and teachers to listen to each other, not isolate and be isolated, speak politely, honestly and openly and respectfully.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Peace is a complex construct so that everyone defines it according to personal preferences. The key to peace is harmony at various levels, spectrum and life context. Education is a strategic choice in building a culture of peace. Peace education is an umbrella that embodies a variety of terminology that all lead to holistic peace. Peace education is transformative because it focuses on developing systems of thought, values, attitudes and behaviors to live in harmony. In the context of education, peace is not only a goal, but must be present as a climate, as a climate that surrounds teaching-learning interactions. The teacher is a key figure in building a peaceful school that requires peace at the intrapersonal level first. Building a peaceful school is through multi channels and

multi-strategies so that a holistic and sustainable system of peace is formed.

Building peaceful schools is not solely the personal affairs of each school, but the collective efforts of educational stakeholders. Thus the development of peaceful schools requires systematic and systemic efforts in the constellation of interpersonal interactions. At the level of the image, the spirit of peace is inherent in the vision and mission of the school so that it becomes a collective awareness of all school elements framed by cultural, spiritual and religious values and in harmony with good values at the global level. In order not to appear exclusive, the development of a culture of peace does not need to be a special subject but can be integrated in all subjects so as not to add to the academic burden of students. The development of peaceful schools can also be attached to various extracurricular programs. With this variety of modes, the development of the school peace culture is carried out structurally through organizational intervention, and simultaneously with individual intervention.

6. REFERENCES

- Baar-Tal, D. (2002). *The elusive nature of peace education*. In G. Solomon, & B. Nevo (eds). *Peace Education: The concept, principles and practice in the world*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Castro, N. L. & Galace, J. N. (2008). *Peace education: A pathway to a culture of peace*. Philippines: Center for peace education, Mirriam College.
- Close, M. Shrron. (2005). Dating violence prevention in the middle school and high school youth. *Journal of child and adolescent. Psychiatrist nursing*, 18 (1).
- Delors, J. (1996). *Learning: The treasure within*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.
- De Rivera, J. (2009). *Handbook on building cultures of peace*. New York: Springer.
- Flaherty, L. (2001). *School violence: Assessment, management, prevention*. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Publishing, Inc.
- Fountain, S. (1999). *Peace education in UNICEF*. New York: Education section programme division UNICEF.
- Fusco, R. A., & Fantuzzo, J. W. (2009). Domestic violence crimes and children: A population-based investigation of direct sensory exposure and the nature of involvement. *Children and youth services review*, 31(2), 249-256.
- Garcia, C. (1984). Latin American traditions and perspectives. *International Review of Education*, 29(3), 366-360.
- Gills, S, & Niens, U. (2014). Education as humanisation: A theoretical review on the role of dialogic pedagogy in peace building education. *A journal of comparative and international education*, 44(1).

- Harris, I. M. (1990). Principles of peace pedagogy. *Peace & Change*, 15(3), 254-271.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (2010). *16 Peace education in the classroom: Creating effective peace education programs*. In G. Salomon & E. Cairns (Eds.), *Handbook of peace education*, (223–240). New York: Psychology.
- Press Johnson, D., & Johnson, R. (1995). *Teaching students to be peacemakers*. MN: Interaction Book Company.
- Kim, J., Talbot, N. L., & Cicchetti, D. (2009). Childhood abuse and current interpersonal conflict: The role of shame. *Child abuse and neglect*, 33(6), 362-371.
- Kartadinata, S., Setiadi, R. & Ilfiandra. (2016). *Pengembangan model pedagogi kedamaian untuk membangun budaya damai pada jalur pendidikan formal*. Laporan penelitian unggulan PT. Bandung: LPPM Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.
- Kartadinata, S., Setiadi, R. & Ilfiandra. (2018). *Peace education pedagogy: A reference for safe and peaceful school development*. Bandung: UPI Press.
- KPAI (2018). *Kekerasan terhadap anak tiap tahun meningkat*. Retrieved from <https://www.kpai.go.id/berita/kpai-pelaku-kekerasan-terhadap-anak-tiap-tahun-meningkat>
- Sternberg, K. J., Lamb, M. E., Guterman, E., & Abbott, C. B. (2006). Effect of early and later family violence on children's behavior problems and depression: a longitudinal, multi-informant perspective. *Child Abuse and Neglected*, 30(2).
- Bunyamin, M. (2004). Implementasi model pengajaran resolusi konflik melalui pendidikan kewarganegaraan sekolah menengah atas. (*Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia*). Retrieved from <http://repository.upi.edu>
- McLeod, J., & Reynolds, R. (2010). *Peaceful pedagogy, teaching human rights through the curriculum*. UK: Newcastle University.
- Murakami, T. (1992). *Peace education in Britain and Japan*. Kyoto: Office of Sociology of Education, Kyoto University of Education.
- Shapiro, H. S. (2010). *Educating youth for a world beyond violence: A pedagogy for peace*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- UNESCO. (2005). *Peace education: Framework for teacher education*. New Delhi: Safdarjung Enclave.
- Webel, C. & Galtung, J. (2007). *Handbook of peace and conflict studies*. London: Routledge.