

Master's Degree Studies in
International and Comparative Education, No. 58

Problematizing the Peace Discourse in *World's Largest
Lesson*

A critical exploration of knowledge production through discussions of
violence

Maggie O'Neill

June 2019



Institute of International Education
Department of Education

Contents	
List of abbreviations	i
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Chapter 1.....	2
1. Introduction	2
1.1. Background.....	3
1.2. Tensions in peace education	5
1.2.1. Feminist perspectives on peace education and transnational feminism.....	6
1.3. Brief summary	8
1.4. Aim and research questions.....	9
1.5 Significance to international and comparative education.....	9
1.6. Organization of the thesis	10
Chapter 2.....	11
2. Review of the literature	11
2.1. Critical peace education.....	11
2.2. Earlier research challenging discourses of peace in peace education	12
2.3. Feminism and peace education.....	14
2.4. Discussions of violence in critical peace education literature.....	15
2.5. Brief summary	17
Chapter 3.....	18
3. Theoretical and conceptual framework	18
3.1. Transnational feminism	18
3.1.1. Intersectionality and transnational feminism.....	18
3.1.2. Transnational feminism and education	19
3.2. Brief summary	20
3.3. Concepts of violence	20
3.3.1. Direct, structural, and cultural	21
3.3.2. Feminist perspectives on violence	21
3.4. Brief summary	22
Chapter 4.....	23
4. Methodological considerations.....	23
4.1. Discourse analysis	23
4.2 Critical discourse analysis and feminist critical discourse analysis ...	23

4.3.	Transnational feminist critical discourse analysis.....	25
4.4.	Ontological and epistemological considerations	25
4.5.	Research process.....	27
	4.5.1. Research strategy and design.....	27
	4.5.2. Selection of materials.....	28
	4.5.3. Overview of World’s Largest Lesson	28
	4.5.4. Process of analysis	30
4.6.	Criteria for evaluation.....	30
4.7.	Ethical considerations.....	31
4.8.	Limitations and Delimitations	32
Chapter 5.....		33
5.	Findings	33
5.1.	The Power of Peace	33
	5.1.1. General format of The Power of Peace.....	34
	5.1.2. Peace can be defined in different ways.....	34
	5.1.3. Peaceful activists have worked in different ways around the world	35
	5.1.4. We can take action to work towards a more peaceful world	37
5.2.	Understanding Community Violence	37
	5.2.1. General format of Understanding Community Violence	38
	5.2.2. Violence exists in different forms for different reasons	38
	5.2.3. Violence affects people around the world	39
	5.2.4. There are different actions to take to develop solutions to prevent violence.....	40
Chapter 6.....		42
6.	Discussion.....	42
6.1.	The Power of Peace	42
	6.1.1. How do different definitions of peace recognize or ignore different forms of violence?	42
	6.1.2. How do the examples of peaceful activists recognize or ignore different forms of violence?	43
	6.1.3. How do actions towards a more peaceful world recognize or ignore different forms of violence?	45
6.2.	Understanding Community Violence	46

6.2.1.	How do different discussions of violence recognize or ignore the different forms of violence?	46
6.2.2.	How do the examples of violence from around the world recognize or ignore different forms of violence?	47
6.2.3.	How do actions towards developing solutions to prevent violence recognize or ignore different forms of violence?	48
6.3.	Brief summary	50
Chapter 7	52
7.	Analysis	52
7.1.	A decontextualized, dehistoricized and depoliticized peace	52
7.2.	An individual peace	54
7.3.	A status quo peace	55
Chapter 8	58
8.	Pedagogical implications	58
8.1.	Peace as tourist model	58
8.2.	Peace as solidarity model	59
Chapter 9	61
9.	Conclusion	61
Chapter 10	63
10.	Future research	63
Chapter 11	64
11.	References	64

List of abbreviations

Abbreviation	Full
CDA	Critical Discourse Analysis
DA	Discourse Analysis
FCDA	Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
UN	United Nations
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
UNICEF	United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund

Abstract

There is no one clear concept of peace in peace education. A large part of peace education recognizes and discusses different forms of violence and how they affect peace. Peace education is a broad field and finds connections to critical peace education, feminism, sustainability, the United Nations, and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Using transnational feminist theory and a transnational feminist critical discourse analysis, this thesis problematizes the peace discourse that is created in peace educational material from World's Largest Lesson. In order to problematize the overall peace discourse, this thesis critically explores the knowledge that is produced through discussions of different forms of violence. The peace education materials were selected based on their relevance to peace education occurring in relation to education for the Sustainable Development Goals. The materials were also selected based on their aim to produce knowledge specifically related to concepts of peace and violence. The thesis finds that overall, the knowledge produced in the materials deemphasizes the interconnectedness of different forms of violence and, therefore, creates a peace discourse that is decontextualized, dehistoricized, depoliticized, privileges individuals, and maintains the status quo. The thesis also discusses pedagogical implications in relation to Mohanty's (2003) discussion of different pedagogical strategies. It is argued that the peace discourse in World's Largest Lesson contributes to a peace as tourist pedagogical model. The thesis also offers insights into a peace as solidarity pedagogical model before calling for change.

Key words: peace education, critical peace education, transnational feminism, cultural violence, structural violence, feminist critical discourse analysis

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank many people for their support throughout the program and during the writing of this thesis. I would first like to thank all the professors in the program who introduced me to the world of international and comparative education. Thank you for the opportunities you have given me throughout our time together. I would also especially like to thank my supervisor, Susanne, for your support throughout the thesis. Additionally, I would like to thank my other group members, Zarina and Rebeka, your words of encouragement helped me through the completion of this thesis. I would also like to thank my other classmates, who challenged me to think deeper and encouraged me to relax when needed. Of course, I would like to thank my family, especially my mom, dad, Lawrence and Luke. Your love and support fuels me and gives me the courage to explore new horizons. You are all with me in everything I do. Finally, I would like to thank Morgan, for everything.

Chapter 1

1. Introduction

Prior to this thesis, I became interested in peace education. Particularly, I became interested in the diversity and complexity of the field. Upon more in-depth consideration of peace education, I realized the ways different peace educators were describing peace had different implications about what peace was. I discovered that educating for peace did not mean the same thing to everyone. Therefore, I became interested in different peace discourses in peace education. I became especially interested in Monisha Bajaj and Maria Hantzopoulos, and their work advocating and contributing to critical peace education. At the same time, I was reading works by Chandra Mohanty, Angela Davis, Kimberlé Crenshaw, Audre Lorde, Patricia Hill Collins and more, that were discussing how transnational feminism and/ or intersectionality has manifested in the past and how it is needed in this current moment in time. I also realized that critical peace educators and transnational feminists had a lot of the same concerns, although they were not talking about them in exactly the same way. These concerns were particularly similar surrounding discussions of different types of violence. This thesis came into being by combining what I was reading about critical peace education and what I was reading in relation to transnational feminism.

I also became interested in the conversations taking place in educational spaces regarding education for sustainable development, particularly in relation to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Because SDG 16 is Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions, I made another connection; this time between peace education and education for the Sustainable Development Goals. This motivated my interests in exploring peace discourses present in peace education material that was developed in relation to the establishment of the Sustainable Development Goals. Through this, I became aware of World's Largest Lesson.

Additionally, this thesis has been motivated by the transformative goals of feminism and desire to contribute to feminist knowledge production. Following Angela Davis (2018), this thesis challenges the framework that organizes our analyses. In doing so, this thesis makes connections between international and comparative education, peace education, and transnational feminism in a way that was not prevalent in the literature. Troubling the framework allows us to “imagine something totally different” (Davis, 2018, p. 47). I also take inspiration from Sara Ahmed (as cited in Carty & Mohanty, 2018, p. 2):

Feminism is at stake in how we generate knowledge; in how we write, who we cite. I think of feminism as a building project: if our texts are worlds, they need to be made out of feminist materials. Feminist theory is world-making. This is why we need to resist positioning feminist theory as simply or only a tool, in the sense of something that can be used in theory, only to then be put down or put away.

All this combined, provided the motivation for this thesis which seeks to problematize the peace discourse that is created in *World's Largest Lesson*. Specifically, this thesis critically explores the knowledge that is produced through discussions of different forms of violence, from a transnational feminist perspective.

1.1. Background

Forms of peace education have been taking place throughout human history, but it did not formally gain global recognition as a field of scholarship and practice until the post - World War II era (Bajaj and Hantzopoulos, 2016a). There are varying and sometimes inconsistent ways to study peace (Reardon, 1999) and there is not one strict definition of what constitutes as peace education. Reardon (1999) suggests that the lack of definition of peace education could be a result of peace education independently taking place all over the world and across subject areas. Peace education can also be described as a “field of scholarship and practice that utilizes teaching and learning not only to dismantle all forms of violence but also to create structures that build and sustain a just and equitable peace and world” (Bajaj and Hantzopoulos, 2016a, p.1). The field of peace education includes “a diverse array of scholarly perspectives, programmatic considerations, and underlying values” (Bajaj, 2008b, p. 135).

Peace education “aims to build and create new forms and structures of education through curricula, pedagogy, participatory learning, dialogue-based encounters, and multiple perspectives on historical narratives (Bajaj, 2014; Bekerman and Zembylas, 2012; Brantmeier, 2011; Hantzopoulos, 2010, 2011; Reardon, 2000)” (as cited in Bajaj & Hantzopoulos, 2016a, p. 3). It centers around the belief that education can give students the skills needed in order to work towards peace and social justice, locally, nationally, and internationally (Bajaj, 2008a). The idea that students can “develop a sense of possibility that enables them to become agents of social change” (Bajaj, 2008a, p. 3) is foundational to peace education. While these concepts are generally agreed upon, there are varying political, theoretical, and methodological stances of peace scholars and practitioners worldwide (Bajaj, 2008a). Peace educators are optimistic that peace education can “lead to positive social change (Bajaj, 2008a, p. 3).

Within peace education, Reardon suggests there are different approaches; education *for* peace and education *about* peace (Reardon, 1999). International education, multicultural education and environmental education can all be considered as parts of education *for* peace (Reardon, 1999). Education *about* peace includes conflict resolution training, human rights education and peace studies (Reardon, 1999). Harris (2008) notes other manifestations of peace education through religious teachings, community-based peace education, and formal-school based programs.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, peace education takes place in many different contexts. There are many different ways to approach peace programs because of the “wide variety of conflicts that plague human existence” (Harris, 2008, p. 19). Comprehensive peace education includes the distinctions made between positive and negative peace, which is generally attributed to Johan Galtung (1969). Negative peace can be described as the absence of forms of direct and physical violence manifested through war, torture, militarism, rape, or other conflicts (Bajaj & Hantzopoulos, 2016; Reardon, 1999; Galtung 1969). Positive peace can be described as the absence of structural/indirect and cultural

violence and the presence of justice, freedom, equal access to education, and just social and political structures (Bajaj & Hantzopoulos, 2016a; Reardon, 1999; Galtung 1969). Within concepts of negative and positive peace, concepts of violence arise. One definition of violence is “any avoidable insult to basic human needs, and, more generally, to sentient *life* of any kind, defined as that which is capable of suffering pain and enjoy well-being” (Galtung, 2013, p. 35). Snauwaert (2015, p. xi) regards violence as that “which dehumanizes and thereby violates human dignity, and so being, it is the core problematic of peace and justice.” Peace education seeks to “critically analyze and dismantle” (Bajaj & Hantzopoulos, 2016a, p. 3) different forms of violence. Galtung (1969) notes that “an extended concept of violence leads to an extended concept of peace” (p. 183). Different forms of violence will be developed later in the thesis.

There are several connections between peace education and education for sustainability and sustainable development. Brantmeier (2013) notes that the field of peace education has long linked peace education to social, economic, and environmental education. Continually, he says that education for sustainable peace and peaceful sustainability “holds promise given that if we understand the root causes and conditions of violence, finding alternative strategies and approaches open possibilities for more promising futures that embrace a long view of sustainability” (Brantmeier, 2013, p. 243). He suggests that because peace education explores structural and cultural violence, it can have a “pivotal role in the development of attitudes, values, and behaviors that cultivate the causes and conditions necessary for planetary sustainability” (Brantmeier, 2013, p. 243).

Continually, peace education has an established history with the United Nations (UN). The UN was founded with the mission to maintain and promote international peace (Page, 2008). According to the UN Charter, the UN was created, in part, to promote peace, security, justice, freedom, and human rights (United Nations, 1945). In working towards these goals, there is a natural link between the UN and peace education. There are several areas where peace education finds connections to the mission and work of the UN. Peace education is central to the constitutional mandate of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). The 1945 Preamble stated that “since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses for peace must be constructed” (UNESCO, 1945). The language has since been changed to also include women. UNESCO was formed not only to promote peace, rather it was created to specifically advance peace “through the educational and scientific and cultural relations of the peoples of the world” (UNESCO, 1945). Throughout the years, UNESCO has contributed to peace education programming globally (Page, 2008).

Peace education also has a substantial presence in literature from the United Nations International Children’s Emergency Fund (UNICEF) (Page, 2008). Most of the peace education in UNICEF concerns post-conflict situations and in 1996, UNICEF adopted peace education as part of its anti-war agenda (Page, 2008). More recently, peace education also finds relevance in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development that was adopted in 2015. The agenda is an action plan for “people, planet and prosperity” and seeks to “strengthen universal peace in larger freedom” (United Nations General Assembly (UNGA), 2015). Peace is explicitly mentioned as an area of critical importance for humanity and the planet, and the Preamble states, “we are determined to foster peaceful, just and inclusive societies which are free from fear and violence. There can be no sustainable development without peace and no peace without sustainable development” (UNGA, 2015). In accordance with this agenda, 17 SDGs were identified

along with 169 targets. Peace education finds relevance in every SDG, but perhaps most overtly in relation to SDG 16: Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions. Educating for the SDGs includes educating for peace. Peace education's connection to the 2030 Agenda and SDGs signifies peace education's continued relationship with the UN. Page (2008) notes that when considering the connections between the UN and peace education, it is important to be aware of their potential strengths and weaknesses.

Both UNESCO and UNICEF have contributed to educational programming for the SDGs and peace education. One example is their collaboration with the World's Largest Lesson. World's Largest Lesson is an organization that was created to advance the SDGs. According to its website, it has been used in over 130 countries and has reached millions of students all over the world since its launch in 2015 (World's Largest Lesson, n.d.). It produces "free and creative resources for educators to teach lessons, run projects and stimulate action in support of the Goals" (World's Largest Lesson, n.d.). The materials include digital content in the form of films, posters, and lesson plans that are meant to be used across different sectors. Ministries of Education, education organizations, for and non- profits, are all encouraged to use the materials provided by World's Largest Lesson in order to promote action for working towards the Global Goals. The website has numerous resources regarding the Global Goals, ranging from classroom decorations, print outs of certificates of participation, to educator training courses. There is also a resource library, information about teaching the goals and information about different ways students can take action for the goals. Lastly, information about partnerships with World's Largest Lesson and how to use social media to promote World's Largest Lesson and the Global Goals is mentioned. The target audience is aimed towards educators in some capacity. These educators could be teachers in a school, but could also be educators in other groups that meet outside of a normal school day or school setting. Regardless of who the educators are, and where they are educating, these materials are designed to be used by them to promote the SDGs.

1.2. Tensions in peace education

While varying manifestations of peace education have already been briefly discussed, there is another distinction made in peace in education that goes beyond the different forms and locations of peace education. This is the distinction made between peace education and critical peace education. Bajaj (2008b) notes the turn towards a critical peace education beginning in the 1970s, under the influence of the Frankfurt School of Social Research. Bajaj (2008b) argues that in an ever more globalized world, "renewed attention to larger structural realities" and "engaged and systematic research" would be "beneficial in understanding the possibilities and limitations of peace education" (p.138). She advocates for peace educators to critically engage with human rights education and promote student agency (Bajaj, 2008b). She also recognizes the transformative potential of critical peace education. She says transformative peace education should encourage students to act towards greater equity and social justice and suggests that its potential should be "galvanized through consideration of the larger social and political realities which structure, limit, and enable research and practice in the field" (Bajaj, 2008b, p. 142).

There are examples from the literature that discuss different kinds of critical peace education. Snauwaert (2011), Chubbuck and Zembylas (2011), Bajaj (2015), and Brantmeier (2013) all discuss some of the theoretical considerations in critical peace education. Different concepts of peace, justice, violence, and pedagogy are identified and discussed in relation to critical peace education. Snauwaert (2011) suggests that education is not neutral and questions how peace should be defined. He recognizes that how peace is “conceived determines the legitimacy, theory, and practice of peace education (Snauwaert, 2011, p. 316). Chubbuck and Zembylas (2011), Baja (2015) and Brantmeier (2013), all recognize the importance of critical pedagogy and/or pedagogies of resistance in critical peace education. They consider how power relations in the classroom between teachers and students, and their connection to larger society must be considered. Similarly, Bermeo (2016, p. 160) believes that education is a relational encounter and that the “roles of schools in interrupting violence and exclusion is therefore also determined by social and cultural elements of teaching.” Christopher and Taylor (2011), Kwon and Kristjánsson (2018), Hantzopoulos (2011), and Cann (2012) also recognize that critical peace education extends beyond the content of curricula and also manifests in school and classroom structure and management. Brantmeier (2013) suggests that peace theories still lack critical engagement with power and that considering power relations must be a crucial part of critical peace education. All these examples recognize political, structural, cultural, social realities and power relations as aspects of critical peace education.

Additionally, peace scholar Brock-Utne (1989) suggests that peace is a controversial concept. Peace is a contested topic that is used both for analytical and political purposes (Brock-Utne, 1989). She describes that while peace usually has a positive connotation and people tend to want peace, what people actually mean when they say *peace* varies greatly (Brock-Utne, 1989). Definitions of peace have certain political implications and what should be included and excluded is an essential part of peace research (Brock-Utne, 1989). Continually, peace education is a contested concept (Brock-Utne, 1989). Brock-Utne recognizes that peace education is open to many different political interpretations and that definitions of peace education are intentionally “made to be open to various interpretations and accommodate various viewpoints” (1989, p. 74).

1.2.1. Feminist perspectives on peace education and transnational feminism

Critical peace educators have made connections between peace education and feminism. Brantmeier (2013) notes that feminist discussions of power can be helpful for peace researchers and educators. He says, “there is much to be learned by peace researchers and educators from feminist theories and critiques of patriarchy” (p. 245). Bajaj (2015) also notes that critical peace educators and peace education should always be in conversation with other fields like postcolonial theory, critical race theory, human rights and others. A feminist education can be described as an education that “challenges core social and cultural values that look at patriarchal violence both locally and globally and how patriarchy is connected to systemic violence; aims to promote norms of empathy and nonviolence (Brock-Utne, 1985; Harris & Morrison, 2003; Reardon, 2000)” (as cited in Bajaj, 2008c, p. 165). Therefore, a feminist education can also be seen as a form of peace education.

Brock-Utne(1989) describes how a transformational approach to peace education is in alignment with a feminist approach to peace education. This transformational approach seeks the goal of rejecting all forms of violence (Brock-Utne, 1989). Reardon (1988a, as cited in Brock-Utne 1989) believes feminism is “the most fully human current perspective on peace and peace education” (p. 82). Reardon (2015c) questions whether transformation is possible without “recognizing, dismantling and forswearing various institutions and habits of patriarchy that we perceive as integral to the present global culture of violence” (p. 89). Therefore, it can be argued that in order to work for and towards an education for peace, a feminist perspective needs to be present.

Additionally, Reardon (2015c) notes that feminist scholars and peace researchers have influenced international civil society and the policies of the UN system. Reardon (2015e) discusses how gender and peace advocates insisted that “gender and peace concerns be more fully integrated into the post 2015 sustainable development goals” (p. 146). Sandler notes that the “UN with all its imperfections, must continue to be an important site for transnational feminist activism” (Baksh & Harcourt, 2015, p. 38). Feminist perspectives in peace education related to the post-2015 agenda offer a unique opportunity for analysis. The global focus on the SDGs creates an environment where critical analysis is necessary. The global discourse and knowledge production surrounding educating for the SDGs provides a background that warrants analysis that challenges the gender-neutral education and research that Reardon (2015c), Brock-Utne (1989), and so many other feminists have opposed.

Brock-Utne (1989) suggests that analyzing from feminist perspectives can be done either empirically or theoretically. An empirical approach could consider peace education programs from around the world and could study how the programs are carried out and “documents would be compared and analyzed” (p. 74). A theoretical approach discusses justifications for using definitions of peace and “discussions of the peace concept as well as of the education concept are necessary” (Brock-Utne, 1989, p. 74). Brock-Utne (1989) also describes that making an analysis built on existing sources can be done in two ways: by doing a reanalysis of primary data (secondary analysis) or by using existing texts as primary data.

However, there is no one definition of what a feminist perspective is. According to Snauwaert, Reardon recognizes that a “monolithic concept of feminism does not exist” (Snauwaert, 2015, p. xvi). Similarly, Brock-Utne (1989) recognizes six different feminist perspectives: the conservative perspective, the liberal perspective, the traditional Marxist perspective, the socialist perspective, the radical perspective, and the women of color perspective (p. 16). She also notes how there can be a perspective that is a combination of these different perspectives (Brock-Utne, 1989). Brock-Utne (1989) describes: the conservative perspective considers women’s oppression as biologically determined (and she notes that many would not consider this feminism). Liberalism considers women’s oppression as unfair discrimination. Traditional Marxism is when women’s oppression is seen as a result of the class system, which is similar to socialist feminism, which sees an inseparability between gender and class oppression. Radical feminism considers women’s oppression as the most fundamental oppression. Women of color feminism is when the inseparability of gender, and race oppression is stressed (pp.16-17). The feminism this thesis is rooted in is most similar to what Brock-Utne (1989) describes as women of color feminism, though I refer to it as transnational feminism. Transnational feminism considers a variety of oppressions and their interconnections in its analysis. Transnational feminism “encourages an examination of how categories of race, sexuality,

culture, nation, and gender not only intersect, but are mutually constituted, formed, and transformed within transnational power laden processes such as European imperialism and colonialism, neoliberal globalization and so on” (Patil, 2013, p. 847).

Additionally, transnational feminism recognizes the need to challenge certain types of knowledge production (Fultner, 2017). A feminist approach to knowledge recognizes that knowledge is powerful and serves a purpose (Brisolara & Seigart, 2014). Hawkeswork (2014) also recognizes feminist research interests in knowledge production. Davis (2008) recommends the use of feminist methodologies to explore connections that are not always obvious. Davis (2008) also suggests that feminism is concerned in making connections, and is therefore not only about women and gender. Feminism is a “broader methodology that can enable us to better conceptualize and fight for progressive change” (Davis, 2008, p. 25). Mohanty (2003) notes that feminist practice occurs at multiple levels, some being at the level of “theory, pedagogy, and textual creativity in the scholarly and writing practices of feminists engaged in the production of knowledge” (p. 5). Therefore, transnational feminism not only seeks to challenge certain knowledge productions, but it also seeks to contribute to feminist knowledge production. Davis (2008) also notes feminist scholars and activists have always been in the forefront peace movements, therefore I suggest the connection between peace education and transnational feminism is worthy of consideration.

1.3. Brief summary

Peace education is a broad field that takes many forms and draws inspiration from different disciplines. It has a history with the goals of UNESCO and UNICEF and one way their relationship currently manifests is in the peace education occurring in relation to educating for SDG 16. Specifically, it manifests in peace education occurring in World’s Largest Lesson. Many different topics find relevance in peace education, one being the discussion of different forms of violence. There are also different tensions in the field of peace education, with critical peace educators expressing the need for peace education to consider power dynamics, recognize social and political realities, and acknowledge different concepts of peace. Additionally, feminist perspectives on peace education have been noted, and I specifically position my research in relation to transnational feminism. Transnational feminism not only is concerned with different types of violence, and their connections, but it is also interested in challenging knowledge and discourse. Davis (2008) calls us to “always be critical of the vocabulary we use for change” (p. 24). She gives the examples of being critical with the words like diversity and democracy. I apply this same reasoning to problematize the discourse of peace in peace education via World’s Largest Lesson. This research is rooted in recognizing that there are different forms of violence and how they are discussed produces knowledge that contributes to a certain peace discourse. Williams (2016) notes connections between postcolonial theory and critical peace education and combines insights from both to inform his research framework. Similarly, moving forward, this thesis finds influences from critical peace education, feminist peace education and transnational feminism.

1.4. Aim and research questions

The aim of this thesis is to problematize the peace discourse that is created in peace education material from World's Largest Lesson. Specifically, this thesis critically explores the knowledge that is produced through discussions of different forms of violence. I am guided by the general research questions: From a transnational feminist perspective. . .

1. To what extent does the depiction of peace in World's Largest Lesson produce knowledge that deemphasizes the interconnectedness of different forms of violence?
2. To what extent does the depiction of violence in World's Largest Lesson produce knowledge that deemphasizes the interconnectedness of different forms of violence?
3. What kind of peace discourse is created if/or when the produced knowledge deemphasises the interconnectedness of different forms of violence?
4. What pedagogical implications arise from this analysis?

1.5 Significance to international and comparative education

This thesis seeks to contribute to the field of international and comparative education by critically exploring and problematizing peace education curricula from World's Largest Lesson. International understanding, cooperation, human rights, peace, and environmental education are all important aspects of the field of international and comparative education (Burns, 2008). Halls (1990, as cited in Marshall, 2014) also recognizes peace education as being a part of international and comparative education. Therefore, this thesis seeks to contribute to the field of research where peace education and international and comparative education meet.

Additionally, education for the SDGs has international attention, as can be seen through UNESCO and UNICEF initiatives, international conferences, new university programs and centers, organizations and more, all working towards educating for the goals. World's Largest Lesson is of particular interest to international and comparative education, because its materials have been used in over 130 countries (World's Largest Lesson, n.d.). The knowledge that is produced in the World's Largest Lesson extends beyond one country, therefore the comparisons and implications in the lessons have global reach. This thesis seeks to contribute to research in international and comparative education that aims to improve educational institutions; their content, processes and methods; to understand the relationship between education and society, and to promote international understanding (Marshall, 2014, p. 17).

Lastly, this thesis seeks to contribute to feminist knowledge production in the field of international and comparative education and peace education. Feminist knowledge production raises challenges to established disciplines across research fields (Hawkeswork, 2014). Through exploring the peace discourse that is created in peace education material, this thesis seeks to contribute to feminist knowledge production that

“problematizes the given and denaturalizes the taken-for-granted” (Hawkeswork, 2014, p. 113). By questioning the peace discourse through a transnational feminist perspective, this thesis seeks to contribute to research that highlights the social, political, and economic aspects of life that often “go undetected in mainstream discourses” (Hawkeswork, 2014, p. 113). Prior research shows a lack of feminist (specifically, transnational feminist) and critical analysis regarding concepts of violence in peace education. See Section 2.4.) Therefore, this thesis aims to contribute to the underdeveloped field of research that connects international and comparative education, peace education, and transnational feminism.

1.6. Organization of the thesis

Thus far, Chapter 1 has provided the motivation, background and introduction of this thesis. It has discussed the aim, research questions, and has positioned the thesis in relation to the field of international and comparative education. Chapter 2 discusses relevant literature in the field to further focus the thesis. Chapter 3 provides the theoretical and conceptual framework, which provide the foundation of the overall analysis in the thesis. Chapter 4 discusses all the methodological considerations of the thesis and the selection of World’s Largest Lesson is discussed. Chapter 5, Chapter 6, and Chapter 7 work through the materials from World’s Largest Lesson in accordance with the aim and research questions of this thesis. Chapter 8 and Chapter 9 raise implications and conclusions and call for change. Chapter 10 discusses the potential of future research.

Chapter 2

2. Review of the literature

The review of the literature further grounds this research as I make connections between critical peace education, feminism and peace education, discourses of peace in peace education, and gaps in research in order to motivate my study. Concepts identified in the literature later inform the discussion and analysis.

2.1. Critical peace education

Critical peace education challenges status quo productions of peace and aims to empower learners to “critically analyze power dynamics and intersectionalities among race, class, gender, ability/disability, sexual orientation, language, religion, geography and other forms of stratification” (Brantmeier and Bajaj, 2013, p. 145). Critical peace education can draw on conceptual insights from fields like critical pedagogy, human rights education, critical race theory and post-colonial theory (Bajaj & Hantzopoulos, 2016a). Critical peace education distinguishes itself from regular peace education (Bajaj, 2014 cited in Bajaj & Hantzopoulos, 2016a & b, p.4 and p. 109): while all peace educators draw from analyses of violence, critical peace educators pay attention to how unequal social relations and issues of power must inform both peace education and corresponding social action, and it encourages critical thinking and analysis, empathy and solidarity, and individual and collective agency, among others. Additionally, critical peace education “seeks to uncover subjugated knowledge, challenge normalized truths, and illuminate wisdom from individuals and groups historically silenced” (Bajaj & Hantzopoulos, 2016a, p. 7). Bajaj’s call for a critical peace education that is not “an attempt to splinter the field, but rather a recommendation for scholars and practitioners considering peace education research” (2008b, p. 143). She suggests that considering peace education critically, “can only further enhance the legitimacy and validity of the knowledge generated in the field” (Bajaj, 2008b, p. 143).

Bajaj and Chiu (2009) note that there are different ways to educate for peace, but that all peace education is trying to transform “students into agents of change for greater equity and social justice” (p. 443). This view of peace education has allowed peace education to evolve in multidisciplinary ways (Bajaj & Chiu, 2009). The speed of global change, environmental destruction and increasing inequity between the rich and the poor, has resulted in peace education “to be seen as an interdisciplinary effort rather than being isolated to one approach or disciplinary school of thought” (Bajaj & Chiu, 2009, p. 443).

Additionally, Bajaj and Chiu (2009) also suggest that a holistic peace education needs to include teaching students about social responsibility and the effects of the absence of negative peace and positive peace, such as the realities of social and economic structural inequalities. They suggest that peace education should focus on developing the values and critical thinking skills “to empower children to understand how the global issues of peace, development, and environmental sustainability interact and are relevant to their everyday surroundings” (Bajaj & Chiu, 2009, p. 449).

2.2. Earlier research challenging discourses of peace in peace education

Earlier research in critical peace education has challenged discourses of peace in peace education. Bajaj (2008b) challenges traditional peace education and notes that peace education must transform “educational content, structure, and pedagogy to address direct and structural forms of violence at all levels” (p. 135). She notes an approach to peace education should introduce students to “asymmetrical power relations [and] structural violence” (p. 139). She recognizes the need for local and historical references in peace education and she challenges status quo reproductions of peace (Bajaj, 2008b). She notes “approaches that fail to question the status quo and examine structural causes of social conflict usually accommodate the economically and politically privileged” (p. 142). She suggests the “conceptual foundations of peace education must be reexamined in order to tease out issues of power, domination, and symbolic violence” (p. 142).

Horner (2016) also challenges discourses of peace in peace education. She critiques elevating individual rights because it can “extol a culture of individualism and consequently suppress notions of collective rights” (p. 126). She does not say that considering individual rights as no value, but that “applying them blindly without critical engagement and sufficient nuances and complexities inherent to them can cause unintended problems” (p. 126). She challenges the discourse of what she calls liberal peace, which is presented as neutral and depoliticized (Horner, 2016). This discourse of peace makes Western political and economic violence invisible (Horner, 2016, p. 126). Within this discourse of peace, less attention is given to the “complexities and interactions between the less visible forms of cultural and structural, which may underpin direct violence” (p. 126). She also challenges the language in the peace discourse that seems to “hide the role economics can play in violence, [. . .] for example through economic inequality, increased competitiveness, and individualism (in neo-liberal economics)” (p. 127).

Williams (2016) challenges discourses of peace through exploring discourses about school violence in Trinidad and Tobago. His research shows that predominating discourse about what constitutes “school violence itself, its drivers/causes, takes on a limiting and individualizing nature” (p. 142). This results in interventions for school violence that are “correspondingly narrow and therefore fail to recognize the structural violence in which youth violence in schools takes place” (p. 142). His study shows that most participants (p.146):

reduced school violence to youth violence, and most conceptualizations (about 97 percent) centered on direct/material violence.” As for the response about the causes of violence most were “more of an individualist nature than structural; i.e. most (including students) made attributions to students’ homes, parents, and communities rather than made attributions to school, societal, or more macro-structural factors.

He suggests an analysis of school violence must not only consider intra- and interpersonal relationships but that it must also include larger “institutional practices and the particular political economy; omitting considerations of macro inequalities and structural violence narrows the interventions and reinforces the status quo (Henry, 2009)” (as cited in Williams, 2016, p. 154). If structural violence is left unquestioned, it becomes

a “major blockade to the implementation of comprehensive critical peace education interventions” (Williams, 2016, p. 154).

Bermeo (2016) discusses a critical approach to unpacking urban violence in schools in Ecuador. She discusses how urban violence manifests in schools both through educators and students. Her research is based on a critical approach to urban violence, which she says, “must include careful attention to the cultural, political, and material forces –often rooted in colonial relations- that engender it in specific places and times with specific groups of people” (p. 159). Her research assumes two things (p. 160):

urban violence is a phenomenon tied to deeper structural inequalities that propagate the exclusion and undermining of the life chances of particular groups in society, and second, that education carries the potential to further reinforce those inequalities or to play a part in interrupting and transforming these cycles of violence.

Therefore, she suggests that a critical peace education analysis connects the intersection of urban violence and education “to better understand mechanisms of exclusion and possibilities for transformation, and to shape proposals for praxis that aim to build comprehensive peace with communities hindered by these combined oppressions” (Bermeo, 2016, p. 160). Similarly, Bajaj (2016) suggests that a peace education that is inspired by equity and social justice must offer learners the opportunity to “cultivate an understanding of social dynamics and resist pressures –be they post/colonial or the outcome of class conflict- to assimilate into dominant economic and cultural structures that often do not serve the needs of students and their communities” (p. 109).

Brantmeier (2013) suggests that considerations to power are missing in peace education and he challenges the field to include “a critical eye on power dynamics and place-based violence” (p. 244). He also notes how “deconstructing cultural violence” (p. 247) could be beneficial to peace education because it pays attention “to how dominant groups maintain power over others” (p. 247). His work in multicultural peace education has challenged “dominant narratives of predominately white, pre-service teachers in the USA by exposing them to the alternative counter-narratives of people of color” (p. 247). He suggests that critical peace education is needed to help “actualize a vibrant, sustainable peace” (p. 255) and suggests that understanding forms of violence and power allow for “intentional change on individual, institutional, societal and global levels” (p. 255). Lastly, he also suggests that a critique of power should be applied to humans as well as the earth and environment (p. 247).

After considering a wide range of literature within peace education, Bajaj and Hantzopoulos (2016b) state that peace education must continually “re-evaluate its goals to open up possibilities for engagement in new ways” (p. 236). Additionally, it must “continually take into account [the] intricate negotiation between participants’ experiences and the larger structural realities that frame them” (p. 236). They suggest that we must illuminate the discussions of the larger structures realities that “transcend demarcated international, national, regional, and local levels of violence, to more fully understand the complex interplay among them and their subsequent bearing on peace education programming, research, and scholarship” (p. 236). They suggest that “complex analyses of violence must undergird peace education” (p. 233).

2.3. Feminism and peace education

The connection between peace education and feminism has been discussed, notably by Betty Reardon and Birgit Brock-Utne. Reardon is described as a pioneer for a gendered perspective for peace research and peace education (Snauwaert, 2015). Her work argues that “feminist, holistic, and gendered perspective can serve as the conceptual core of a transformation of our present global system of patriarchy, and its culture of violence and war” (Snauwaert, 2015, p. ix). For Reardon, a just society is realized “through achieving a transformational, fundamental shift in worldview towards a paradigm of peace informed by a gender perspective” (Snauwaert, 2015, p. ix). Reardon argues (2015a) that in order to create a more peaceful world, we must change from a hierarchal view of humanity to an equal view of humanity and the social system must transform into a system that does not allow the use of violence to maintain order or “achieve ends” (p. 12). She suggests that if we conceive a peace system “as one where there is a minimal amount of violence and a maximal amount of justice, then we project a future with a totally different form of politics” (p. 12). The field of gender and peace has evolved throughout time, but it has always been concerned with “the problematic of patriarchy, a social and cultural construct that has not only privileged men over women, but can be seen as a paradigm for other forms of authoritarianism, hierarchy and inequality” (Reardon, 2015c, p. 90). The patriarchal system is not only a source of gender violence that affects women, rather it is a system that results in human rights violations and oppression for both men and women (Reardon, 2015c, p. 106). Reardon argues the patriarchal system is the most “fundamental impediment to peace at all levels of the social order” and that the failure to name it as such and the failure “to fully analyze it as a primary obstacle to the kind of just global order that most would agree to be peace, is what keeps us caught in the war system and mired in the global culture of violence which it nurtures and by which it is nurtured” (Reardon, 2015c, p. 106).

For Reardon, gender is a critical perspective that is needed for peace education. She suggests that peace education is concerned with teaching students to look beyond the curricula that considers controversial issues that “usually teach students to consider little more than the two major opposing positions involved in the public discourse on the issues in question” (Reardon, 2015c, p. 91). A gender perspective to peace education allows for more complex questions and analysis. For example, she notes that in school we learn about the transition of political thought that challenged divine right “as the source and monarchy as the main form of governance, and postulated “the rights of man” (Reardon, 2015d, p.115). However, she suggests we never learned that the steps towards a representative government did not change the fundamental “patriarchal power paradigm” (Reardon, 2008, as cited in Reardon 2015d, p. 116). Through this patriarchal thinking, hierarchal societal structures are maintained through:

race, class and gender, buttressed by inequitable access to the benefits of production based on what has become global, corporate, free market capitalism, psychologically reinforced by the fear of others engendered by fundamentalist religious precepts and ultranationalist xenophobia, patriarchy as the basic paradigm of human institutions continues to prevail (p. 116).

Therefore, peace education with a gender perspective is not only an education that retells history through the perspectives of women, rather it is an education that fundamentally challenges societal structures. Peace education with a gender perspective is an education that seeks ways to peace through a “global inquiry into possible alternatives to the patriarchal paradigm” (Reardon, 2015c, p. 108). Reardon notes that feminism is important for peace because feminism is “profoundly transformational, for it calls for fundamental changes in personal values and human relationships as well as in structures and systems” (Reardon, 2015b, p. 23).

Birgit Brock-Utne (1989) also discusses feminist perspectives on peace and peace education. Brock-Utne (1989) states that applying a feminist perspective means that in order to write about social inequalities, we must consider how inequality in education, health, income, and wealth affect women differently than men. This means looking at peace education through “an analysis from the viewpoint that women matter” (Brock-Utne, 1989, p. 7). She continues, that women as a group are oppressed by the patriarchy in macro, meso and micro- levels and that this has “great consequences for peace and peace education” (p. 7). She discusses how knowledge is shaped by information, whether given or not. Her research shows how attitudes and values are taught through history and science curriculum. In the history curriculum, violence is often celebrated and women are left invisible. In the science curriculum, she notes racism and discrimination against women. She suggests that non-violent acts need to be included in history books and that actions led by women need to be highlighted. Brock-Utne notes that when “history is taught as a series of wars, and science is taught without taking ecological and human consequences into account, this teaching naturally influences the attitudes and norms that are being transmitted” (Brock-Utne, 1989, p. 169). Her research shows the need for feminist perspectives in education, and peace education.

She suggests that peace and peace education can be analyzed through feminist perspectives in order to question “the values the current patriarchies are built on” (1989, p. 38). Research analyzing peace education from feminist perspectives seeks to disrupt the gender neutrality that has been assumed in peace research (Reardon, 2015b and Brock-Utne, 1989). Reardon notes that in the past peace research has been “caught in the intellectual trap of patriarchy” and has assumed its research to “be gender neutral” (Reardon, 2015b, p. 43). A feminist perspective includes an analysis of power and envisions a world free from “sexism and racism, class oppression, and oppression on the grounds of caste, color, or creed” (Brock-Utne, 1989, p. 38). Including gender in the “peace knowledge field” creates an “overarching conceptual framework that interprets the global system and culture of violence within the framework of a global patriarchal order” (Snauwaert, 2015, p. xix).

Continually, feminist perspectives are not meant to just be theoretical constructs “that can be used to analyze research data, but can be perspective transforming, spreading new light on the field of peace research itself” (Brock-Utne, 1989, p. 68).

2.4. Discussions of violence in critical peace education literature

Prior to this thesis, I conducted a literature review exploring concepts of violence in critical peace education (O’Neill, 2019). In the critical peace education literature numerous forms of violence were mentioned (O’Neill, 2019): structural violence,

cultural, direct/indirect violence, school violence, social violence, societal violence, oppressive violence, symbolic violence, economic violence, environmental violence, ecological violence, physical violence, relational violence, mental and psychological violence, everyday violence, patriarchal violence, gender-based violence, sexual violence, repressive violence, alienating violence, and non-violence. Different forms of structural and cultural violence are recognized in a lot of critical peace education research (O'Neill, 2019). Brantmeier (2013) discusses how environmental violence leads to environmental racism. Cann (2012) notes how students make sense of how racism, sexism and classism intersect with violence in their own lives. Kwon, Walker, and Kristjánsson (2018) credit colonization and capitalism as contributing factors to the indirect violence that takes place in South Korean schools. Other studies discuss how nationalism and colonialism can be reinforced or challenged in education (Willis, 2017; Darweish & Mohammed, 2018; McCorkle, 2017). Continually, Call-Cummings and Hook (2015) recognize the colonial history and post-colonial realities that take in peace education organizations in Jamaica and Peru. Mizzi (2010), Taber (2015), and Ragland (2015) all recognize racism, sexism, and patriarchy as problems for peace.

While much of the literature mentions different types of violence, the literature largely did not discuss these concepts of violence past recognition. The research seems to focus on how peace education has the opportunity to raise awareness about different kinds of violence or how peace education can even be the site of violence. Different kinds of violence are framed as something that exists in the world, without much consideration to the knowledge or discourse that is created when talking about violence in certain ways in educational spaces. That is to say, the literature generally does not analyze how different types of violence are discussed in relation to peace education. The research recognizes different forms of violence as problems for peace, but does not consider how speaking about violence in a certain way creates a certain knowledge and discourse surrounding peace. I suggest there is a difference between research analyzing how violence is present in student/teacher relationships and research analyzing how certain discussions surrounding violence in a classroom produce knowledge that create a certain peace discourse.

Based on this, perhaps it is unsurprising that the literature review revealed a lack of critical discourse analysis (CDA). In the literature search, only two articles used a critical discourse analysis, one of them being a feminist critical discourse analysis (FCDA). Darweish and Mohammed (2018) conduct a CDA of values of peace and violence represented in history education in Iraqi Kurdistan. They state that a CDA allows them to interrogate how “with what effects knowledge is controlled, silenced, or ignored” (p. 55). Their research explores “how curriculum contents challenge, resist, or entrench the power relations of dominant groups” (Darweish & Mohammed, 2018, p. 55). Their analysis shows that the history education encourages violence, glorifies war, and fosters divisions. They find examples of symbolic violence in depictions of historical events that present “many discriminatory and archaic concepts that were prevalent in the Islamic era and in Kurdish history” (Darweish & Mohammed, 2018, p. 62). Their analysis shows that “the dominant group promulgates their own knowledge and regulates a null curriculum in order to legitimize its continued dominance” (Darweish & Mohammed, 2018, p. 67). Conducting a critical discourse analysis of concepts of peace and violence allows Darweish and Mohammed (2018) to challenge the knowledge and discourse that is being produced in this history education.

Taber (2015) conducts a FCDA of books that are awarded the Jane Addam's Children's Book Award based on the presence of social justice (among other criteria). Her research analysis takes a feminist anti-militarist approach to analyze discourses of peace, equality and gender (Taber, 2015, p. 3). Feminist antimilitarism explores the ways which "societal discourses of militarism are connected to patriarchy (Enloe, 2000, 2007; Feinman, 2000)" (as cited in Taber, 2015, p. 3). This perspective forms her FCDA as it seeks to challenge assumptions, see things from different perspectives, and view the world in new ways (Taber, 2015, p. 4). Her analysis shows that the books have an overall focus on racism and past injustices, and lacks connecting racism and other problems to today (Taber, 2015). She also notes that there is a general lack of white-privilege, colonialism, imperialism, militarism considered in the books, while heteronormativity and binary categories of male/female are largely present (Taber, 2015, p. 11). Despite this, she suggests that if the books are used by a critical educator, they could be used to problematize the representations of gender, race and class and could also be used to "explore how the content can inform contemporary understandings of intersecting oppressions" (Taber, 2015, p. 11). Her use of FCDA on concepts of peace, equality and gender allows her to challenge the knowledge and the discourse that is produced in the books, but it also allows her to imagine futures for alternative knowledge productions.

2.5. Brief summary

Bryman notes that it is unlikely that an exhaustive literature review is able to be conducted at the master's level and notes the importance of reading key texts by main figures in the field (Bryman, 2016, p. 6). The literature review has discussed some of the main contributors to critical peace education and to feminist perspectives on peace education. The literature describes the need for critical explorations and feminist perspectives in peace education. While some discourses of peace have been challenged in critical peace education, the review reveals a lack of literature critically exploring concepts of violence in relation to knowledge production. Despite connections being made between feminism and peace education, the review reveals a lack of current research using feminist analysis to explore how discussions of different concepts of violence in peace education create a specific discourse surrounding peace. The use of CDA, FCDA, research analyzing curriculum, and research analyzing materials related to peace education and the SDGs, is also lacking.

Chapter 3

3. Theoretical and conceptual framework

3.1. Transnational feminism

Transnational feminism has been briefly described in the introduction and this section serves to further expand the ideas and aims of transnational feminism.

3.1.1. *Intersectionality and transnational feminism*

Transnational feminist theory draws on recognizing the intersections of oppressions, which be described as the term intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991). Intersectionality, as a term, was first articulated by Kimberlé Crenshaw's discussion about racism and sexism. She argued that "the intersection of racism and sexism factors into Black women's lives in ways that cannot be captured wholly by looking at the race or gender dimensions of those experiences separately" (Crenshaw, 1991, p. 1244)." Simply put, intersectionality forces feminism to recognize the intersection of multiple identities and oppressions. People use the term intersectionality in many different ways and there is no one set consensus on how people understand and use the term, but generally, it can be said that intersectionality serves "as a way of analysing the complexity in the world, in people, and in human experiences" (Hill Collins & Bilge, 2016, p. 12). Intersectionality takes the position that "that when it comes to social inequality, people's lives and the organization of power in a given society are better understood as being shaped not by a single axis of social division, [. . .] but by many axes that work together and influence each other" (Hill Collins & Bilge, 2016, p. 12). This is also seen in transnational feminism.

Transnational feminism "encourages an examination of how categories of race, sexuality, culture, nation, and gender not only intersect, but are mutually constituted, formed, and transformed within transnational power laden processes such as European imperialism and colonialism, neoliberal globalization and so on" (Patil, 2013, p. 847). Transnational feminism is critical of the "neoliberal appropriation of feminism that uses feminism as a theory of gender minus a feminist critique of power relations" (Mohanty, 2013, p. 972). While transnational feminism does promote solidarity across borders, it does so by recognizing differences in women's experiences based on the intersections of race, class, and more. Feminism without borders is not the same as "border-less feminism" and it "acknowledges that there is no one sense of a border, that the lines between and through nations, races, classes, sexualities, religions, and disabilities are real- and that a feminism without borders must envision change and social justice work across these lines of demarcation and division" (Mohanty, 2003, p. 2). Mohanty (2003, p. 6.) has been critical of the predominantly class based gap between a vital women's movement and feminist theorizing, and the "neoliberal, consumerist (procapitalist) feminism concerned with "women's advancement" up the corporate and nation state

ladder” which encourages competition and individualism. Davis (2008) also discusses a feminism that does not “capitulate to possessive individualism” (p. 21).

Continually, transnational feminism is “political in nature” and has the “commitment to challenge injustice or oppression” (Parekh and Wilcox, 2018, n.p.). It recognizes that in order to understand different systems of oppression, gender, race, class, and sexuality cannot be ignored (Cagan, 2008). Alcoff (2017) also notes that “nationality, religion, geographic region, disability, and political status (citizenship)” (p. 23) also need to be considered. Transnational feminism suggests that while there are differences in women’s issues across the world, “women’s plights in one place are often deeply connected to women’s situations everywhere” (Fultner, 2017, p. 205). Fultner (2017) suggests that this is this is “perhaps *the* defining feature of transnational feminist theory” (p. 205). Continually, Fultner (2017) says transnational feminism recognizes that the historical, economic, political, social and cultural contexts need to be considered in order to understand a given issue. Transnational feminism shows that (Fultner, 2017, p. 219):

in a globalized world, the problems people face in one country are connected in complex, intersecting ways to what is happening elsewhere and what has happened in the past. This means we can understand neither cultural difference nor economic or political interests in a vacuum but only as interconnected in particular sociohistorical contexts.

Transnational feminism is concerned with how racism, sexism, misogyny, Islamophobia, xenophobia, nationalism, capitalism, transphobia, ableism, homophobia, militarism, religious fundamentalism, heteropatriarchy, and white supremacy manifest across the world and it actively questions, challenges and resists these oppressions (Carty & Mohanty, 2018; Davis, 2018; Bannerji, 2018; Hernández- Castillo, 2018; Eisenstein, 2018; Bruce Pratt, 2018; Okazawa-Rey, 2018). I suggest that a transnational feminist perspective is also needed when considering peace.

3.1.2. *Transnational feminism and education*

Mohanty (2003) notes that radical educators have long argue that the academy and classroom are “not mere sites of instruction,” rather, “they are also political and cultural sites that represent accommodations and contestations over knowledge by differently empowered social constituencies” (p. 195). As a result, teachers and students “produce, reinforce, recreate, resist and transform ideas about race, gender and difference in the classroom” (Mohanty, 2003, p. 195). Education itself is a place where power and politics are contested. Education, from a transnational feminist perspective, needs to develop “critical knowledges, (what women’s, black, and ethnic studies attempt) and, simultaneously, to critique knowledge itself” (Mohanty, 2003, p. 195).

Additionally, Mohanty (2003) discusses different pedagogical strategies that can be used when “internationalizing the women’s studies curriculum” (p. 238). While she focuses on women’s studies curricula, she suggests that her arguments hold for any education that seeks to globalize or internationalize its curriculum (Mohanty, 2003). She recognizes that the way “we construct curricula and the pedagogies we use to put such curricula into practice tell a story- or tell many stories” (p. 238). She identifies three different pedagogical strategies: the feminist as tourist model, the feminist as explorer model, and the comparative feminist studies/ feminist solidarity model (Mohanty, 2003).

She recommends a feminist comparative studies/ feminist solidarity model. This model is “based on the premise that the local and the global are not defined in terms of physical geography or territory but exist simultaneously and constitute each other” (Mohanty, 2003, p. 242). In this model, the connections between the local and global are “foregrounded and these links are conceptual, material, temporal, contextual and so on” (p. 242). It considers the “interconnectedness of the histories, experiences, and struggles of U.S. women of color, white women, and women from the Third World/South” (Mohanty, 2003, p. 242). This model focuses “on mutuality and common interests” (Mohanty, 2003, p. 243). It pays attention to power and historical experiences. It simultaneously highlights “individual and collective experiences of oppression and exploitation and of struggle and resistance” (p. 242). This pedagogy allows students to “see the complexities, singularities, and interconnections between communities of women such that power, privilege, agency, and dissent can be made visible and engaged with” (Mohanty, 2003, p. 243). These complexities are considered in relation to each other, rather than separately (Mohanty, 2003, p. 244). She states that the way we discuss “experience, culture, and subjectivity in relation to histories, institutional practice, and collective struggles determines the kind of stories we tell in the classroom” (p. 244).

Mohanty (2003) acknowledges that education is a contested space and she offers an example of a feminist solidarity pedagogy as a way to educate for a more just world. I suggest that because peace education, especially in relation to educating for the SDGs, aims to make global connections, that her arguments also apply to the peace education material in *World’s Largest Lesson*. I return to this idea in Chapter 8.

3.2. Brief summary

The discussion regarding transnational feminism is limited and by no means has covered the extensive voices that contribute to the field. I use transnational feminism with its specific attention given to, gender, race, class, sexuality, nationality, religion, geographic region, disability and political status (citizenship), racism, sexism, and more, as way to critically explore knowledge production and problematize the peace discourse. A transnational feminist perspective not only challenges knowledge production, but it also challenges its implications. It requires different systems of oppression, like capitalism, colonialism, racism, patriarchy, heterosexism, and nationalism be considered. Transnational feminism recognizes the connections between different systems of oppressions and recognizes that they have global connections and implications. Therefore, in relation to problematizing the peace discourse in *World’s Largest Lesson*, a transnational feminist analysis considers how all these things manifest through the knowledge that is produced via the discussions of different forms of violence.

3.3. Concepts of violence

The field of peace education evolved, most directly, out of the call for “peace research, peace action, and peace education by seminal peace studies scholars who saw education

as an integral component of the dismantling of structures of violence and the promotion of peace (Galtung 1973: 317)” (as cited in Bajaj, 2016, p. 108). Though the field originally focused on the elimination of direct violence, another core concern is addressing cultural and structural violence, “which are rooted in social inequalities that limit access to resources and opportunities for individuals and groups, and may be embedded in long-standing cultural practices, attitudes or patterns” (Galtung, 2009, as cited in Bajaj, 2016, p. 108). Reardon (2015f, p. 152) identifies violence as “the central problematic for peace education” and suggests that:

the substance of the field should comprise an inquiry into violence as a phenomenon and a system, its multiple and pervasive forms, the interrelationships among the various forms, its sources and purposes, how it functions and potential alternatives for achieving the legally sanctioned, socially accepted, or politically tolerated purposes commonly pursued through violence.

3.3.1. *Direct, structural, and cultural*

Direct, structural, and cultural violence are some of the ways different forms of violence are conceptualized. Galtung (1969) describes direct violence as violence that is committed against a person via direct action, like killing, maiming, or detention. Direct violence can be “exemplified by torture, war, militarism, rape and other forms of aggression” (Bajaj & Hantzopoulos, 2016a, p. 3) Structural violence, can be described as when a structure “has exploitation as a centre piece, meaning that some get much more out of the system than others” (Galtung, 2013, p. 37). It can be described as a “state of social inequality in which privileged groups exploit or oppress others; created by deprivation of basic human needs, such as civil rights, health, and education (Galtung, 1969; Harris & Morrison, 2003)” (as cited in Bajaj, 2008, p. 166). Structural violence is when there are systematic inequalities because “violence is built into the structure and shows up as unequal power and consequently as unequal life chances” (Galtung, 1969, p. 171). Structural violence can be manifested through oppression, discrimination, exploitation, and marginalization (Galtung, 1969). Cann (2012) identifies both racism and classism as structural violence.

Cultural violence is when aspects of culture, via “religion and ideology, language and art, empirical science and formal science” are used to “justify, legitimize direct or structural violence” (Galtung, 2013, p. 38). Cultural violence “makes direct and structural violence look and feel right, or at least not wrong” (Galtung, 2013, p. 39). Brantmeier (2013) describes cultural violence is when cultural beliefs are used to “legitimate any form of violence, either direct or indirect” (p. 246). Both structural and cultural violence can also be referred to as indirect violence and include “systems of racism, sexism, colonialism, [and] culturally- condoned exclusion- that privilege some to the denigration of others” (Bajaj & Hantzopoulos, 2016a, p. 3). Reardon positions patriarchy as both a form of structural and cultural violence (Snauwaert, 2015).

3.3.2. *Feminist perspectives on violence*

Transnational feminism is concerned with the complexities of and between different forms of violence. Davis (2008) notes that if we want to end violence against women, our work must extend beyond addressing individual acts of violence because violence is not

only “individualized and domestic” (p.25). She recognizes how different forms of violence such as prisons, state violence, capital punishment and torture are all connected (Davis, 2008, p. 25). Davis’ approach to violence recognizes a “spectrum of violence” and she suggests that “while we cannot simultaneously eliminate the entire spectrum of violence, we can always insist on an awareness of these connections” (2008, p. 25). Davis notes the need to make connections between different kinds of violence.

A transnational feminist approach to violence rejects conceptualizing violence without considering its political context (Chew, 2008). Chew (2008) is critical of “antiviolence” activities that do not challenge sexism more broadly (p. 85). Chew (2008) gives the example of educating males who are abusive to their partners through an anti-violence paradigm rather than an anti-sexist one. She discusses that this approach encourages behavioral changes, not structural ones. Chew says that focusing on “how *individual* males perform violent masculinity in limited circumstances, misses the overwhelming structural inequalities that remain in place to prop up abuse” (2008, p. 86). She suggests that we should question how economics, politics, social support, or citizenship status “allow some people to prey on others in interpersonal relationships” (Chew, 2008, p. 86). A feminist approach to violence challenges the “larger societal structures fueling violence- rather than simply accommodating its existence” (Chew, 2008, p. 86). Chew argues for the political and structural conceptualizations of violence.

A transnational feminist approach to violence is concerned about war and its use of violence to “control populations, to impose whole structures of control and domination (Cagan, 2008, p. 252). Cagan (2008) positions war as being opposite to feminism. She says “war is violence. . . [and] at its core, anti-life”(p. 252). She not only critiques the physical violence used in war, but also critiques how military structures are top down and hierarchal and “leave no room for collective processes or the input of individuals” (Cagan, 2008, p. 252). Cagan states that war reinforces the “traditional power that men have had over women” (p.252) and the military “remains a bastion of male power and privilege” (p.252). Cagan considers how power is present in different forms of violence.

3.4. Brief summary

There are many different forms of violence that can be named in peace education literature like, school violence, economic violence, gender violence, ecological violence, oppressive violence and more (O’Neill, 2019). This conceptual framework suggests that all types of violence fall into one or more of the categories. Additionally, while transnational feminism does not use the same terms as peace educators to describe forms of violence, I suggest that its concerns with, for example, sexism, patriarchy, and misogyny make it concerned with different forms of violence because sexism, patriarchy, and misogyny are forms of structural and cultural violence themselves. Moving forward, the thesis explores how discussions of different types of violence create knowledge surrounding peace and violence. Continually, the thesis explores how this knowledge creates the peace discourse in World’s Largest Lesson.

Chapter 4

4. Methodological considerations

4.1. Discourse analysis

Discourse is not only language as words, rather it is also social practice (Mullet, 2018). Weiss and Wodak (2003) describe discourse, via speech and writing, as a social practice and note that discourse “implies a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event and the situation(s), institution(s) and social structure(s) which frame it: the discursive event is shaped by them, but it also shapes them” (p. 13). Discourse analysis (DA) is a broad term with “many different meanings and types” (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2018, p. 686). Bryman (2016) describes DA as an approach to language that can be applied to forms of communication that extends beyond spoken language. It can analyse language in written texts, conversations or narratives, to name a few (Cohen et al., 2018). DA finds inspiration from Michel Foucault, for whom discourse was a term that “denoted the way in which a particular set of linguistic categories relating to an object and the ways of depicting it frame the way we comprehend that object” (Bryman, 2016, p. 531). In other words, the way something is discussed creates a certain version and understanding of it. It creates a certain *knowledge* of it. Here, language forms versions of our social reality and creates particular world views. In other words, discourse does not just provide an account of what goes on in society; it is also a process whereby meaning is created” (Bryman, 2016, p. 539). DA recognizes that our language is filled with bias and agendas, therefore we are not neutral when we speak and write. DA also looks “beyond linguistic features to the links between language and society, language and the social context in which they are set” (Cohen et al., 2018, p. 687). This is similar to critical discourse analysis (CDA).

4.2 Critical discourse analysis and feminist critical discourse analysis

CDA emphasizes “the role of language as a power resource” (Bryman, 2016, p. 540). Wodak (2001) describes CDA as “fundamentally concerned with analyzing opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language” (p. 2). CDA “reveals how power operates and is constituted, shaped, legitimated, maintained, regulated and challenged in and through language and discourses (e.g. Fairclough, 1992, 1995; Fraser, 2004)” (as cited in Cohen et al., 2018, p. 687). Continually, CDA “aims to investigate critically social inequality as it is expressed, signaled, constituted, legitimized and so on by language use (or in discourse)” (Wodak, 2001, p. 2). An interest in power structures and power dynamics is

at the core of CDA. In CDA, the analysis not only considers what is included in the text, covertly or overtly, but also what is excluded, covertly or overtly, to investigate power dynamics. CDA claims that language and social power cannot be separated because “language indexes power, expresses power, is involved in where there is contention over and a challenge to power” (Wodak, 2001, p. 11). CDA considers not only how language creates social realities and world views, but it also considers who maintains power in the process.

Additionally, CDA is not only interested in the analysis of physical text, but must also consider the social processes and structures that lead to the production of the text (Wodak, 2001). Unlike some DA, CDA has a favorable view of “orienting the analysis of discourse to its context” (Bryman, 2016, p. 541). Phillips and Hardy (2002) suggest “if we are to understand discourses and their effects, we must also understand the context in which they arise” (p. 4). Perhaps most importantly, CDA has roots in critical theory and has “an explicit agenda of critiquing inequalities, discrimination and ideological domination; it seeks to transform and emancipate society and its members, and redress illegitimate imbalances of power and influence within relationships” (Cohen et al., 2018, p. 688). It also “interrogates ideological, political, social and economic power and how this is created, achieved, perpetuated and reproduced through discourses” (Cohen et al., 2018, p. 688).

Similar to CDA, a feminist critical discourse analysis (FCDA) is “motivated by goals of social emancipation and transformation, [and critiques] grossly unequal social orders” (Lazar, 2007, p. 141). Lazar (2007) says the aim of a feminist CDA is to highlight the “complex, subtle, and sometimes not so subtle, ways in which frequently taken-for-granted gendered assumptions and hegemonic power relations are discursively produced, sustained, negotiated, and challenged in different contexts and communities” (p. 142). Feminist researchers are aware that “language is a constitutive force that creates reality” (Brisolara & Seigart, 2014, p. 15). Lazar (2007) states the central concern of FCDA is to critique “discourses which sustain a patriarchal social order” (p. 145) Lazar suggests that the combination of feminism and CDA “can produce a rich and powerful political critique for action” because “unlike feminist approaches that apply descriptive discourse analytic methods, FCDA has the advantage of operating, at the outset, within politically invested, explanatory program of discourse analysis” (Lazar, 2007, p. 142). With its clear intentions, a FCDA is able to “examine how power and dominance are discursively produced and/or (counter-)resisted in a variety of ways through textual representations of gendered social practices, and through interactional strategies of talk” (Lazar, 2007, p. 149).

FCDA can draw from different disciplines in its analysis and can be thought about in three ways: first, in terms of the kinds of social and political questions it addresses, and the theoretical and empirical insights it engages with; second, in terms of methodology, which can include a close textual analysis of written discourse with an aim to interpret and explain societal structures; and third, in terms of building collaborative feminist research projects and opportunities for interdisciplinary publications (Lazar, 2007, p. 151). FCDA “entails mobilizing theory in order to create critical awareness and develop feminist strategies for resistance and change” (Lazar, 2007, p. 145).

4.3. Transnational feminist critical discourse analysis

I suggest a transnational feminist critical discourse analysis extends even beyond a FCDA, because it is an analysis that examines a discourse for even “broader patterns and structures of domination and exploitation” (Mohanty, 2013, p. 967). Transnational feminism extends beyond traditional liberal feminisms, radical feminism, and Marxist feminism, which either don’t allow for historical considerations, singularize gender, or ignore race and gender (Mohanty, 2003, p. 243). A transnational feminist analysis “refuses to choose among economic, cultural, and political concerns” (Kaplan & Grewal, 1999, p. 358). Therefore, transnational feminist critical discourse analysis not only considers how language can influence a discourse at the expense of women, but it also considers how language creates discourses that are at the expense of other marginalized groups. Beverly Bain says that feminism helps “makes visible how the discourses of race, nationalism, citizenship, colonialism, queerness, economics, culture, are invested in whiteness, masculinity, class privilege, and homonormativity” (Carty & Mohanty, 2015, p.99). Therefore, a transnational feminist critical discourse analysis is not only concerned with critiquing discourses that maintain patriarchal structures, but also in critiquing discourses that maintain racist, colonial, capitalist, nationalist, and more, structures.

Drawing from CDA and FCDA, a transnational feminist critical discourse analysis is the appropriate method to guide the analysis of critically exploring concepts of violence in World’s Largest Lesson because it explicitly considers how discussions of different concepts of violence create certain knowledge about peace and violence. Specifically, it considers the extent to which depictions of peace and violence deemphasize the interconnectedness of violence, therefore it is able to problematize the peace discourse that is consequently produced.

4.4. Ontological and epistemological considerations

Before further discussion of the methodology, ontological and epistemological assumptions are discussed. Ontological assumptions are concerned with the question of whether social entities can and should be considered objectively, independent of social actors, or whether they must be considered as social constructions that “are built up from the perceptions and actions of social actors” (Bryman, 2016, p. 28). These principles are referred to as objectivism and constructionism. Objectivism assumes that “social phenomena confront us as external facts that are beyond our reach or influence” (Bryman, 2016, p. 29). Constructionism assumes “social phenomena and their meanings are continually being accomplished by social actors” (Bryman, 2016, p. 29). This thesis draws on a constructionist ontological position, which asserts that the categories, systems, groups, language, etc. that humans use to organize the world are social constructions in and of themselves. Meaning, categories “do not have built-in essences; instead, their meaning is constructed in and through interaction” (Bryman, 2016, p. 30). This type of ontological position is often concerned with how language is used to present categories in certain ways (Bryman, 2016). Constructionism is often used in discourse analysis and

“frequently results in an interest in the representation of social phenomena (Bryman, 2016, p. 30). The thesis specifically seeks to critically explore how the social phenomena of peace is constructed through discussions of violence. This thesis explores how different concepts of violence create knowledge about peace and violence, via language. I seek to problematize how the language in peace education lesson plans creates a certain peace discourse.

Epistemological assumptions are concerned with questioning “what is (or should be) regarded as acceptable knowledge” (Bryman, 2016, p. 24). A main concern in social science research is whether or not research should or can be conducted in the same way as the natural sciences (Bryman, 2016). Positivism is the epistemological position that “advocates the application of the methods of the natural sciences to the study of social reality and beyond” (Bryman, 2016, p. 24). Positivism strives for objectivity, measurability, controllability, and predictability (Cohen et al., 2018, p. 51). Alternatively, interpretivism assumes that people and the social sciences are different than the natural sciences and that studying the social world “requires a different logic of research procedure, one that reflects the distinctiveness of humans as against the natural order” (Bryman, 2016, p. 26). Interpretivism embraces the subjectivity that is required in the interpretation of human action (Bryman, 2016). It strives to “understand the world in terms of its actors” (Cohen et al., 2018, p. 51). This thesis seeks to interpret how human action, as expressed through language, creates the discourse of peace and how this creates our understanding of peace and our knowledge of peace. Therefore, it is more in alignment with interpretivism than positivism.

However, because this research is both critical and feminist, it operates under the paradigm of critical educational research. This is somewhat different to a purely interpretivist paradigm in that critical educational research does not seek “merely to understand situations and phenomena, but to change them” (Cohen et al., 2018, p. 51). A critical approach to educational research regards both a purely positivist and interpretivist view of social behavior as incomplete because they do not account for the “political and ideological contexts of educational research” (Cohen et al., 2018, p. 51). Additionally, critical education research goes beyond purely seeking to understand a situation (as could be the case in positivist and interpretive paradigms), as it actively seeks to question and transform the situation (Cohen et al., 2018). Critical educational research seeks to be transformative and asks questions about how knowledge is created, who decides what is worthwhile knowledge, how is power produced and maintained, among other questions (Cohen et al., 2018). Therefore, researchers “have an obligation to promote certain political views and to achieve certain political goals” (Cohen et al., 2018, p. 52).

This is similar to feminist research. Feminist research follows many of the same principles found in critical educational research (Cohen et al., 2018). Feminist research “recognizes the necessity for foregrounding issues of power, silencing and voicing, ideology critique and a questioning of the legitimacy of research that does not emancipate hitherto disempowered groups” (Cohen et al., 2018, p. 59). Fonow and Cook (2005) note that there has never been “one correct feminist epistemology generating one correct feminist methodology” (p. 2213). Therefore, this thesis is able to draw on constructive, interpretive, and critical paradigms. These ontological and epistemological assumptions are supported by the research questions, research methods, and analysis of conducting a transnational feminist critical discourse analysis.

4.5. Research process

4.5.1. *Research strategy and design*

In accordance with the epistemological and ontological assumptions, the research strategy is qualitative. Qualitative research usually emphasizes words and is also concerned with description and emphasis on context (Bryman, 2016, p. 394). It is likely to include a lot of descriptive detail in order to “emphasize the importance of the contextual understanding of social behavior” (Bryman, 2016). A qualitative research strategy aligns with the aim, research questions, theory and chosen method of a transnational feminist critical discourse analysis, as I explore how language creates a certain peace discourse.

A research design “provides a framework for the collection and analysis of data” (Bryman, 2016, p. 40). This thesis has aspects from a case study design and a comparative design. A case study includes the extensive analysis of a single case. (Bryman, 2016). Case studies can be applied to a single organization, in this case, World’s Largest Lesson. This thesis seeks to problematize the overall discourse of peace that is created in the single case. However, in order to answer all research questions, discussions of violence in two different lesson plans are considered. Elements of a comparative research design surface when discussions of concepts of violence in each lesson are compared. A comparative research design “entails studying two contrasting cases using more or less identical methods” (Bryman, 2016, p. 364).

Within the field of international and comparative education, it is common to refer to the Bray and Thomas Cube (1995) to define areas of comparison (as cited in Bray, Adamson, and Mason, 2014). Often the comparisons of nations, schools, populations, etc. are offered as examples of fruitful points of comparison. However, because this research seeks to critically explore knowledge production and problematize the peace discourse from a transnational feminist perspective, I suggest it warrants different comparison guidelines. The selection of material is guided by the aim, research questions, theory, and methodology. The aim is not to compare the material in a way that considers the material in a this *versus* that way. Rather, I aim to compare in a way that creates a larger discussion of how different peace education material work *together* to create a discourse of peace. Therefore, I look to two different curricula to compare concepts of violence.

Adamson and Morris (2007) note there are different ways to compare curricula. One perspective for curricula comparison is through a critical perspective (Adamson & Morris, 2007). Comparing curricula from a critical perspective from seeks to explore what is or is not in the curricula, by design or by accident (Adamson & Morris, 2007). Curricula comparison asks the questions what is being said? What is not? Who decides? What does this mean? In order to engage in effective curricula comparison, a “specified element of comparison is needed (Adamson & Morris, 2007, p. 273). I consider discussions of concepts of violence as the comparison element. One way to compare curricula is to compare the planned and intended aspects of the curricula (Adamson & Morris, 2007). In other words, curricula comparison can include looking at texts of curricula to compare in order to speak to their intended use. Different manifestations of this type of curricula include policy documents, syllabuses, and lesson plans, to name a few (Adamson & Morris, 2007, p. 274).

4.5.2. *Selection of material*

In combining aspects of peace education and transnational feminism, I specifically looked for peace education material related to the SDGs, specifically Goal 16: Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions. The selection was then guided not by questions of location or type of education, rather I searched for peace education materials specifically created in relation to SDG 16, as a response to the UN post- 2015 agenda. Additionally, the search was limited to material written in English and accessible from the internet. Through this search, I located World's Largest Lesson. They have education material for all the SDGs, but I only considered SDG 16, as it specifically relates to peace education. Therefore, education materials for the other 16 goals were not considered as they do not specifically seek to contribute to peace education. The resources include information for teachers, lesson plans and posters. In accordance with my research questions, I considered all the educational material offered. After reading through the material, I narrowed it down to two lessons. These lessons were selected because they are explicitly identified as lesson plans created specifically for SDG 16 and because they were the only lessons that focused specifically on discussions of violence and peace. The lessons are rooted in the idea that knowledge will be created during the lessons and that knowledge is intended to inform students understanding of peace and violence. This is in alignment with the aim of critically exploring knowledge production in peace education. Therefore, other lessons focused on migration and human rights are not considered in this thesis. I first discuss the materials separately for purposes of cohesion, but they should not be thought about as separate. Rather, they work together to create the peace discourse that is present in peace education materials offered by World's Largest Lesson.¹ The first lesson is called The Power of Peace.² The second lesson is called Understanding Community Violence.³

4.5.3. *Overview of World's Largest Lesson*

Some of World's Largest Lesson has been briefly described (see Section 1.1.). However, to get a better idea of the of the lessons and their roles in creating a peace discourse, it is necessary to consider World's Largest Lesson and the selected lessons further. World's Largest Lesson is produced by Project Everyone and is “delivered in partnership with UNICEF, NGOs, private sector organizations, and foundations” (World's Largest Lesson, n.d.). Both lessons list a series of organizations that contributed to the production and distribution of the materials. UNICEF is highlighted as the founding partnership, but other organizations are mentioned in the “Founding Team”: *Aviva, Getty Images, Person, Standard Chartered, and Unilever*. The lesson is “Powered By” *t'es*, “Distributed By” *UNESCO*, and “Translated By” Berlitz and ELS Educational Services. In addition, 30 other organizations/businesses are listed as receiving a “special thanks to those who have worked with [World's Largest Lesson] from across the world.” Lastly, it is mentioned

¹ <http://worldslargestlesson.globalgoals.org/global-goals/peace-and-justice/>

² <http://cdn.worldslargestlesson.globalgoals.org/2016/06/8 The Power of Peace.pdf>

³ <http://cdn.worldslargestlesson.globalgoals.org/2016/06/Understanding-Community-Violence-LP-PDF.pdf>

that the lesson plans are created in collaboration with Think Global. Both lessons note that World's Largest Lesson is:

A collaborative education project to support the announcement of the United Nations Global Goals for Sustainable Development. The project is living proof of the importance of Global Goal 17 "Partnerships for the Goals" and would not have been possible without the help of all our partners working with us and with each other" (The Power of Peace & Understanding Community Violence, n.d., p. 1).

While I do not analyze each of these organizations/ businesses in this thesis, their presence must still be noted in relation to how it creates a certain discourse of peace in peace education. Before the lesson even begins, large education businesses are highlighted. This already implies a certain dynamic for the production of knowledge in this peace education material; one being highlighting capitalism's role in education and educational materials.

Both *The Power of Peace* and *Understanding Community Violence* follow the same general format. The lessons' cover page includes a photo of a celebrity UNICEF Goodwill Ambassador. The *Power of Peace* Goodwill Ambassador is singer Nancy Ajram, while *Understanding Community Violence* Goodwill Ambassador is professional tennis player Serena Williams. There is a quote included from Serena where she expresses her desire for all kids to grow up free from violence. There is not a quote from Nancy. Both cover pages also include the UNICEF and World's Largest Lesson logos. Additionally, they include the icon for the SDGs that have been identified as being related to these lessons, which are SDG 16: Peace, Justice and SDG 11: Sustainable Cities and Communities. Interestingly, the SDG 16 icon presented in these lessons does not include the "Strong Institutions" part of SDG 16. The cover page is made up of several different components: school subject, learning outcome, preparation, teacher note, total time and age range. The lessons are made up of a series of Learning Activities or different stages in the lesson that range from 5 to 25 minutes long. Continually, Differentiation and Alternatives activities are noted throughout *The Power of Peace* as suggestions for younger, "less or more able students," or if tasks are too complicated. Following the lessons are the appendices, where the actual information about the lessons is found.

It is also worth noting that both lessons have been translated into several languages. Both lessons have been translated into Spanish, French, Arabic, and Portuguese. The *Power of Peace* has also been translated into Bengali, Hindi, and Bahasa Indonesian. The only other lesson plan that has been translated is the lesson created with Amnesty International regarding human rights, which is also translated into Spanish and French. These translations are worth noting for a couple of reasons. Although I only consider the lessons in English and my analysis will be done in English, English is not the only language in which these lessons exist. This is both a limit and a strength for my analysis. While my analysis cannot fully speak to the other translations, it perhaps still can offer some insight into the knowledge production that is taking place within these lessons. Additionally, it is interesting to note that many other lesson plans offered in English (those about human rights, migration, multiculturalism, and refugees) have not been translated. It could be due to a number of reasons, one being that these lessons are produced slightly differently than *The Power of Peace* and *Understanding Community Violence* (for example, UNICEF is not listed as a main sponsor on the cover page). But

it could also possibly be because those other lessons could be seen as too political or sensitive in certain contexts. The idea that peace and violence can be seen as both political and depolitical will resurface in the analysis (See Chapters 6 and 7). The fact that some lessons are translated and others are not, contributes to the knowledge production taking place within the peace education material in World's Largest Lesson, and therefore contributes to the overall peace discourse of World's Largest Lesson.

4.5.4. *Process of analysis*

I follow Mullet's (2018) general CDA framework for education research in the analysis. The framework includes seven stages: select the discourse, locate and prepare data sources, explore the background of each text, code text and identify overarching themes, analyze the external relations in the text (interdiscursivity), analyze the internal relations of the text, and interpret the data. Mullet notes that this framework is broad and allows the researcher to decide what methods best fit the "scope and goals of the research problem" and leaves the "choice of products open to the researcher" (p. 123). Although the framework is presented in stages, the order is seen as an "ideal type: in practice, a study may not follow the framework in a linear way; the researcher may move backwards and forwards between the levels a number of times before finding it appropriate to move on" (Jørgsen & Phillips, 2002, p. 77). Following this, the analysis does not consider these stages in a strict concrete order, rather the analysis considers the stages as overlapping and contributing to one another.

Mullet (2018) states that coding texts can be done a couple different ways: through thematic analysis, open or inductive coding, or axial or deductive coding. The analysis is done by both deductive and inductive coding. It is deductive in the sense that I am specifically analyzing lessons and comparing concepts of violence in the lessons in order to critically explore knowledge production and the peace discourse. It is inductive in the sense that general themes are created through the lessons inductively. I go through the text several times in order to create general themes. In order to analyze the external and internal relations of the text and in order to interpret the data, I create a more specific set of questions to guide my analysis through a transnational feminist perspective. These questions are informed by the general themes (inductive), but are they are also informed by the theory, conceptual framework, methodology, and aim to critically explore knowledge and problematize the peace discourse (deductive).

4.6. Criteria for evaluation

There different ways to evaluate the quality of research according to different research traditions. Since this thesis draws from both feminist and critical theories, both are considered in the quality criteria. Brisolara and Seigart (2014) note the need for a feminist evaluation in research because traditional research evaluation, "research methods, institutions, and practices are all social constructs that have been strongly influenced by a dominant male and patriarchal society" (Brisolara & Seigart, 2014, p. 11). They also suggest that a feminist evaluation is needed because gender discrimination is systematic

and structural, and evaluation of research is political (Brisolara & Seigart, 2014). Hawkeswork (2014) states that feminist research does not aim to claim universal validity, rather it seeks to “illuminate existing social relations, demonstrate the deficiencies of alternative interpretations, and debunk opposing views” (p. 114). The discussion, analysis, pedagogical implications and conclusion (See Chapters 6, 7, and 8) all consider how social, cultural, political, and economic aspects form knowledge and a specific peace discourse. Consequently, this thesis challenges the deficiencies that are presented in the discourse. In doing so, the thesis “debunks” the peace discourse present in World’s Largest Lesson.

Cohen et al. (2018) and Mullet (2018) both mention catalytic validity as ways to evaluate authenticity in CDA and research within the realm of critical educational research. Catalytic validity “strives to ensure that research leads to action” and “is intended to act as a spur to social change and transformation” (Cohen et al., 2018, p. 259). This research seeks to problematize the peace discourse within World’s Largest Lesson. In doing so, it raises implications and calls for change.

Additionally, Mullet (2018) references Wodak and Meyer (2009), stating theoretical triangulation is also a way to evaluate quality in CDA. This means that the analysis includes all levels of context in the analysis: “immediate language, interdiscursive relations, immediate social context, and broader social context” (as cited in Mullet, 2018, p. 121). Accordingly, this thesis considers the immediate language of the two lessons, relates the texts to their position in World’s Largest Lesson, positions the texts in relation to the overall field of peace education and education for the SDGs, and connects the texts to the broader social contexts through the discussion and analysis inspired by critical peace education and transnational feminism.

4.7. Ethical considerations

The study uses text that is accessible to the public, so there is no need for consent or any privacy concerns (Swedish Research Council, 2017; Codex, 2018). Ethics regarding secrecy, anonymity, and confidentiality (Swedish Research Council, 2017), do not apply to this thesis. Continually, because the texts are freely available on the internet, there was no need to store, achieve or delete any data (Swedish Research Council, 2017). While there is no potential to cause harm to human participants, it is also important to be clear about the nature of this research. Bryman (2016) states that “deception in research occurs when researchers represent their work as something other than what it is” (p. 133). I am upfront about the political nature of my research and do not present it to be neutral. I am clear that my intention is to conduct a transnational feminist critical discourse analysis with transformative goals. Lastly, in accordance with research ethics established by Swedish Research Council (2017) and Codex (2018), I do not steal other people’s data, manipulate or falsify data, or plagiarize.

4.8. Limitations and Delimitations

One limitation to this thesis is the fact that it only considers documents that are in English. This gives the analysis a limited view into the knowledge produced in the peace discourse in the World's Largest Lesson. However, the two lessons that are analyzed are the most widely translated lessons within the lesson related to SDG 16, so despite the analysis only being in English, it still has possible implications for the non-English lessons. Another limit to only considering documents in English is that it contributes to the privileging of some knowledge, and therefore the thesis contributes to research that is "solely engaged in English-dominant research spaces" (Falcon, 2016, p. 189). However, as English is the only language in which I have extensive knowledge, this cannot be avoided. Recognizing this thesis contributes to research that is produced by the overrepresented white scholars from the north/west in academia (Lazar, 2007), I engage in feminist self-reflexivity (Lazar, 2007). Lazar (2007) stresses the importance of using feminist self-reflexivity to critique one's own research practices. I acknowledge my position as a white, cisgender, able-bodied, neurotypical, traditionally "educated", woman from the USA. I acknowledge that my analysis is affected by my social, cultural and political history.

However, Lazar (2007) notes that feminist self-reflexivity must extend beyond just this, and she emphasizes the need to "internationalize the scope of research" (p. 155). The thesis considers peace educational material that has been created for a global audience, makes international connections and raises international implications. Additionally, Lazar (2007) notes it is important to include international feminist scholarship from research articles, handbooks, readers, and more. Accordingly, this thesis includes literature from a wide variety of sources that is informed by scholars that vary in country of origin, languages spoken, race, and sexuality. In order not to "mark" these varying voices as "other" (Lazar, 2007, p. 155), they are not separated from the rest of the literature in the thesis. I recognize the importance of including the voices of feminist scholars from a wide background without othering these voices (Lazar, 2007). Most notably, the thesis is guided by transnational feminism, which is rooted in making global connections.

The other main limitation of this thesis is that it is only a textual analysis. The thesis' analysis is limited to the knowledge and discourse that is produced solely based on the text. Therefore, the thesis cannot speak to how the texts are used in actual classrooms or the like. Taber (2015) notes the potential of material, even if problematic, if it is used by a critical educator. As this thesis only seeks to explore how the peace discourse is created through the texts, this is not considered. Despite this, this research is still worthy of consideration because researchers engaged in CDA and FCDA recognize that discourses produced in text not only describe and give insights to what is going on in society, but discourses themselves also create certain realities (Bryman, 2016; Lazar, 2007; Wodak, 2001; Jäger, 2001). The discourse produced in the texts is worthy of consideration because language expresses, indexes, and challenges power (Wodak, 2001). (See sections 4.1, 4.2. and 4.3).

Chapter 5

5. Findings

Mullet (2018) states that coding texts can be done a couple different ways: through thematic analysis, open or inductive coding, or axial or deductive coding. The first part of the analysis is conducted through inductive coding, as I find general themes in the material. Hesse-Biber and Leavy (2006) suggest that when thinking about deductive and inductive coding procedures, it is important to realize “that this is not an either/or decision because deductive and inductive approaches exist on a long continuum” (as cited in Leavy, 2007, p. 243). I went through the material several times and noted the different ways peace and violence are explicitly referenced. This process included working through the physical text several times, marking with highlighters and writing notes to mark text segments which are relevant to the research questions (Mullet, 2018). As Mullet (2018) suggests, this stage involved “identifying overarching themes in the texts and contexts surrounding the discourse” (p. 127). I wrote general notes each time I read through the lessons and identified general themes that were related to knowledge production of the concepts of peace and violence. They were used to motivate further questions to analyze the texts. These questions were produced deductively, as I combined the general themes with the theory, conceptual framework, methodology, and research questions to analyze the internal and external relations in the text. The internal relations of the texts can be described as words, patterns, or linguistic devices that demonstrate power relations, social contexts, or speakers’ positionalities (Mullet, 2018). The analysis of these questions, allows for the analysis of the external relations in the text (interdiscursivity) to arise. Interdiscursivity is concerned with how different discourses interact within a text and questions how the texts affect social practice and conversely, how social practice informs the arguments made in the text (Mullet, 2018). The following 2 chapters consider the two lessons separately in relation to research question 1 and 2, followed by a joint analysis relating to research question 3. This chapter gives a descriptive account of the lessons.

5.1. The Power of Peace

The analysis is informed by the text that is present on the Cover Page, throughout the Learning Activities, and the Appendices. That said, I do not consider the additional links offered in the lesson. Additionally, some of the information regarding the Cover Page has been discussed in Section 4.5.3. As mentioned, the analysis began by reading through the text several times to identify key words, phrases and general themes that emerged during explicit references to peace. The themes were chosen as they relate to the knowledge production occurring in the lesson. The lesson is explicit in its Learning Outcomes that specific knowledge about peace will be created in the lesson. Therefore, the themes are understandably closely related to the outcomes. The themes are:

1. Peace can be defined in different ways.
2. Peaceful activists have worked for peace in different ways around the world.
3. We can take action to work towards a more peaceful world.

These themes inform this chapter and Chapter 6. Before considering them, I first discuss the general format of *The Power of Peace*.

5.1.1. *General format of The Power of Peace*

The *Power of Peace* lesson identifies social studies, citizenship, and personal, social, health and economic (PSHE) education as subjects that are good fits for the lesson. The total time listed for the lesson is 60 minutes and the age range 8-11 years old is noted. However, this age range is not absolute, as it mentions the potential of using the lesson for older students later in the lesson. The three Learning Outcomes of the lesson are:

1. To explore some definitions of peace.
2. To investigate and recognize characteristics, actions and symbols of peaceful activists.
3. To begin to determine ways to incorporate peace into the classroom environment and the world around them.

Prior to the lesson, teachers are told to read through Appendix 1, which describes how the lesson addresses sensitive topics and that the lesson needs to be “handled sensitively and with consideration given to students’ backgrounds and experiences” (*The Power of Peace*, n.d., p. 6). Appendix 1 also lists websites where teachers can find additional support for teaching sensitive topics. Appendix 2 offers supplemental definitions of peace and critical thinking questions. Additionally, teachers are meant to find “photographs of peaceful and non-peaceful situations that [their] students would recognize” (p. 1). Additionally, they are supposed to “ensure students have access to books or websites to support their research about peaceful activists, or print off information the information in appendix 3 and 4” (p. 1). The information in Appendix 3 and 4 tells the stories of five different activists who have been identified as peaceful activists.

The lesson is comprised of six Learning Activities. Throughout the Learning Activities, students are prompted to discuss photos that demonstrate peaceful and non-peaceful situations, talk about different definitions of peace, research different peaceful activists, present what they have learned, write their own definitions of peace and discuss what they learned and how to make changes in the world. The lesson also provides ideas for Extension Activities which includes “Create a Class Peace Contract,” where both the teacher and students are encouraged to “establish methods to keep the classroom peaceful” (p. 15). It also mentions “The Great Kindness Challenge,” which encourages schools to participate in “The Great Kindness Challenge Week” by downloading the “Acts of Kindness Checklist and Toolkit” (p. 15).

5.1.2. *Peace can be defined in different ways*

The material begins to create a concept of peace starting with the title of the lesson. Definitions of peace are described as something to *explore*, peaceful activists are described as having characteristics that can be *investigated*, and *recognized*, and students are encouraged “to *begin* [emphasis added] to determine ways to incorporate peace into the classroom and the world around them” (p. 1). The whole idea of the lesson is to develop and strengthen knowledge surrounding concepts of peace in order for students to make changes in the world.

In order to get the students thinking about definitions of peace, the teachers are instructed to show the students images of peaceful and non-peaceful situations. The students are asked to respond to teacher selected photographs portraying peaceful and non-peace situations. They are promoted to describe their feelings towards the images and their responses are meant to be discussed in a way that highlights the differences between words used to describe peaceful and non-peaceful situations. Additionally, they are asked “Why do you think the non-peaceful situations or situations involving conflict happened?” (p. 2). The lesson lists a couple examples of potential images for teachers to use to portray peaceful and non-peaceful situations: prayer, friends, people shouting or being aggressive, a large peaceful rally, tanks, and a protest with police (p. 2).

Students are also asked to choose a definition of peace that they think is “most accurate” (p. 2) or that they “most identify with” (p. 2) among the choices “peace is freedom from trouble or worry, a feeling of mental or emotional calm, or a time when there is no war or a war has ended” (p. 2). Following this, students are asked how they would describe peace and are teachers are suggested to help students develop their ideas by asking them to think about the questions:

- Can peace mean different things for different people? Why might this be?
- How do we deal with conflict? What are some peaceful ways to deal with conflict?
- Do we feel peace inside of us or outside? Maybe both? (p. 2).

As a supplement to further this discussion, teachers are also encouraged to read an article about defining peace, and more information is given to them in Appendix 2. It notes again that there are different ways to describe peace, but says “from a global perspective peace is when conflict is able to be resolved without violence and improves the quality of life” (p. 7). It goes on to make statements describing that “peace is when. . .” These include access to equal protection before the law, healthcare, food, clean water, education, the right to participate in shaping political discussions, and right to equal opportunity “to work and make a living, regardless of gender, ethnicity, or any other aspect of identity” (p. 7).

Following these examples of peace, students are asked critical thinking questions: Why is peace important to us? Without peace, what would the world look like? Would it look the same or different? What does peace mean to you? What is similar about the ideas included in this definition of peace and any human rights that you have heard of? (p. 7).

5.1.3. *Peaceful activists have worked in different ways around the world*

The largest amount of time in the lesson is given for students to research different people who have been identified as peaceful activists. The stories of five peaceful activists are provided. Students are asked to research the activists, create a poster with important information about their activists, and give a short presentation about what they have learned. They are specifically directed to think about where activists come from, what is/was their goal, how did they achieve or attempt to achieve their goal, why are/were their methods peaceful, and what characteristics do/did they have (p. 3).

The stories of the five peaceful activists portray different examples of peaceful activists from around the world. Their stories refer to bombings, civil war, child soldiers, racial prejudice, discriminatory legislation, shootings, and unequal access to institutions

like government and education as examples of non-peaceful situations. What makes these activists examples of peace, is their response to these non-peaceful situations. Karim Wasfi's story describes acting defiantly by playing music at bomb sites in Iraq. Leymah Gbowee's story describes organizing for peace via public protests, in order to work towards peace during the Second Liberian Civil War. Mahatma Gandhi's story describes working towards independence, reducing the number of poor people, ending the caste system, and making women equal with men through "organized civil disobedience acts" (p. 10) and non-violence. Malala Yousafzai's story discusses working towards girls' rights to education, by standing up to the Taliban and advocating for girls' rights. Nelson Mandela's story highlights working to end apartheid, by speaking out against the South African government. Here, all their stories are examples of peace because they fought against non-peaceful situations through peaceful means.

The story about Gandhi highlights that he "organized civil disobedience acts. . . [and] if they were all done at once, they had the power to shut down the country" (p. 10). It describes Gandhi was imprisoned for organizing these protests (which were illegal) and describes that he would fast while in prison. Gandhi's Salt March, as response to Britain's tax on salt, is highlighted as one of his "most famous and successful protests" (p. 10). It describes how Gandhi and thousands of Indians marched to the sea (241 miles away) to make their own salt.

The story discussing Nelson Mandela mentions Gandhi's peaceful protests in India, as a source of inspiration for Mandela. The text states that in "1815, [South Africa] *became part of the British Empire* [emphasis added] and the *government was all white* [emphasis added]" (The Power of Peace, n.d., p. 12). It also says that in 1948 "new laws were made by the government to keep *white people and black people apart* [emphasis added]. . . these new *laws* [emphasis added] were call 'apartheid'" (p. 12). Continually, it states that Mandela wanted to "get rid of apartheid without having to fight" (p. 12). The story says the reason Mandela was released prison and apartheid ended because "the government began to change and the world wanted Nelson Mandela to be free" (p. 12). It mentions that when Mandela was released by the new president, "both men agreed to stop fighting" (p. 12).

Malala Yousafzai's story describes how she was shot by the Taliban because she defied them and demanded that girls be allowed to go to school. The story notes that Malala was shot because she was speaking out "about her right, and the right of all women, to an education" (p. 11). Karim Wasfi's story describes his resistance to bombings in Baghdad through music. His act of playing music at sites of bombings is described as an "act of defiance and appeal to the humanity of both terrorists and civilians" (p. 8). He appears at sites of explosions across Baghdad and plays his cello. For him, "this combination of music and place has become a form of resistance" (p. 8).

Lastly, Leymah Gbowee's story discusses her work as a leader who worked for peace during the Second Liberian Civil War. She organized Christian and Muslim women to take action for peace and led women in "weeks-long public protests that grew to include thousands of people" (p. 9). The text says Leymah Gbowee led the women in "public protests that forced Liberia's President Charles Taylor to meet with them and agree to take part in formal peace talks in Ghana" (p. 9).

5.1.4. *We can take action to work towards a more peaceful world*

The lesson presents different actions to take to work towards a more peaceful world. These actions can be found in the stories about the activists and can be found the final Class Discussion and Extension Activities. The students research the peaceful activists to inform their ideas about how to take action towards a more peaceful world. Each story has a “Who is [Name of activist]” section and a “What did [Name of activist] do? Continually, the lesson directs students to look for specific things when researching the activists: “Who is your peaceful activist? What is their name? Where do they come from? What is/was their goal? How did they achieve or attempt to achieve their goal? Why are/were their methods peaceful? What characteristics do/did they have?” (p. 3). After students give their presentations about the activists they researched, they are prompted to discuss what the different presentations had in common, with attention given to the questions: What character traits and qualities did each activist possess? Would you like to have some of these same character traits? If yes, which ones and why?” (p. 4). The stories highlight Mandela’s “cleverness”, “hard work and dedication” (p. 12) and Gandhi’s commitment to “living simply” (p. 10). Malala is described as a “brave and gentle advocate of peace” (p. 11). Wasfi is described as defiant and says he can’t just “surrender to the impending doom of uncertainty by not functioning” and says everyone can “make a choice [to] choose how they want to live, not how they want to die” (p. 8).

The students and the teacher are encouraged to discuss what they have learned. They are asked: What have we learnt today that can change the way we behave in our classroom and with our friends? How can we contribute to making the world a more peaceful place?” (p. 5). The teacher is prompted to “emphasize how students can make a difference in helping to make the world a more peaceful place even by the smallest of actions” (p. 5). The lesson also recommends two Extension Activities as a way for students to take action for peace. One is creating a class “Peace Contract” where the students and teacher work together “to establish methods to keep the classroom peaceful” (p. 15). The other activity is participating in “The Great Kindness Challenge Week at school by downloading the Acts of Kindness Checklist and Toolkit” (p. 15).

5.2. Understanding Community Violence

The analysis is informed by the text that is present on the Cover Page, throughout the lesson, and the Appendices. That said, I do not consider any additional links offered in the lesson. As mentioned, my analysis began by reading through the text several times to identify key words, phrases and general themes that emerged during explicit references to violence. The themes were eventually chosen as they relate to the knowledge production occurring in the lesson. The lesson is explicit in its Learning Outcomes that specific knowledge about violence will be created in this lesson. Therefore, the themes are understandably closely related to the outcomes. The themes are:

1. Violence exists in different forms for different reasons.
2. Violence affects people around the world.

3. There are different actions to take to develop solutions to prevent violence.

These themes inform this chapter and Chapter 6. Before considering them, I first discuss the general format of Understanding Community Violence.

5.2.1. *General format of Understanding Community Violence*

The Understanding Community Violence lesson identifies citizenship as a subject that is a good fit for the lesson. A total time for the lesson is 60 minutes and the suggested age range is 11-14 years old. The four Learning Outcomes of the lesson are (Understanding Community Violence, n.d., p.1):

1. To understand what violence is and how it can exist in different forms.
2. To explore the different reasons for violence around the world.
3. To make connections between local experience of violence and global violence
4. To develop solutions for preventing violence.

Prior to the lesson, teachers are told to read about violence against children in Appendix 1. Appendix 1 describes background information about violence against children and notes the sensitivity of the topic, just as The Power of Peace lesson. Appendix 1 also gives websites where teachers can find extra support for teaching sensitive topics. Additionally, UNICEF notes a “Where We’ve Seen Success” section and describes four different strategies they say have led to violence prevention. The teachers are also directed to prepare a board on which to write students’ suggestions and print/make available the children’s stories that are included in Appendix 2. Six different children’s stories from around the world are included in the lesson.

The lesson is divided into four parts: Introduction, Exploring Violence Around the World, What Can be done?, and Take Action on Community Violence. The Introduction begins with a student discussion about violence. The students are prompted to think about words they associate with violence. They are also asked to think about violence in their own communities and violence in the news. In the Exploring Violence Around the World section, students are instructed to read six different stories about children experiencing violence from several different countries. Students are asked to answer a few different questions related to the violence committed in the stories. The What Can Be Done? section asks the students to divide into pairs and discuss ways they could prevent violence in their communities, schools, and on a global scale. This turns into the Take Action on Community Violence section, which encourages the students to make a display of the action items they came up with to prevent violence.

5.2.2. *Violence exists in different forms for different reasons*

A quote from Serena Williams introduces the lesson. It reads:

I believe all children deserve a chance to succeed in life, wherever they live. I’m proud to champion this important lesson and help share the message that all children have the right to live free from fear of violence and be able to pursue their dreams (p.1).

This quote and the title of the lesson both recognize there are different types of violence. The Learning Outcomes, describe violence as something that can be *understood* and *explored*, as something that *exists* in different forms for different reasons across the world, as something that has both local and global *connections*, and as something that can be *prevented* through *developing* solutions (p. 1). The lesson is rooted in the idea that discussing and exploring different forms of violence from around the world can lead to action to prevent violence.

Before the lesson, teachers are instructed to read the notes about violence against children that are provided in Appendix 1. The information provided in Appendix 1 describes violence in several different ways. It notes that children experience extreme violence, exploitation, and abuse in “everyday life, everywhere” (p. 4). A definition of violence against children, as defined by Article 19 of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, is provided. It states violence against children is “all forms of physical or mental violence, injury and abuse, neglect or negligent treatment, maltreatment or exploitation, including sexual abuse” (p.4). The text goes on to say that there are many different types of violence, including physical, psychological, and sexual violence” (p. 4). The text notes that violence “can be direct or indirect” (p. 4). It says violence can be “directly life-altering or life-ending through physical harm” (p. 4) and it can also be indirect like “witnessing violence at home or the effects of war on countries and communities” (p. 4). It also recognizes that violence can occur “behind closed doors,” (p. 4) can “worsen existing development problems” (p. 4) and can have “lasting impacts on the development of a child’s brain, which can mean they are unable to reach their full potential” (p. 4).

The lesson begins with a discussion about violence. The students are asked what words they associate with violence and are prompted to think “broadly about different forms of violence, including those that might happen in their own communities and those they are aware of from domestic or international news” (p. 2). The students are supposed to write these words on pieces of paper and are then supposed to share their thoughts with the class. Following this, students are asked: “are types of violence that are mentioned more than once (e.g. physical or emotional violence, conflict, or gang violence)? Where do these types of violence happen? Or do most of the words reflect emotions related to the experience of violence?” (p. 2).

5.2.3. *Violence affects people around the world*

The majority of time in the lesson is spent on students reading stories about children experiencing violence around the world. The students are specifically asked to discuss the following questions relating to the stories: Who were the victims of violence and who were the perpetrators of the stories? What types of violence have you learnt about? Are these different from the types of violence noted at the start of the lesson?” (p. 2). After discussing the stories in groups, the class as a whole is supposed to discuss “What were some of the factors that led to the violence occurring in the first place?” (p. 2). Additionally, students are encouraged to “think about wider issues like poverty and unemployment, as well as local factors such as people’s attitudes to violence and the stresses of being a young person” (p. 2). The teacher is instructed to “highlight any similarities between each of the stories and the students’ own experiences or previous knowledge” (p. 2).

There are six different stories that discuss violence experienced by children around the world. The stories are cases from El Salvador (2 stories), Guatemala, Nigeria, Niger, and the USA. The first story is a story about 11-year-old Martin, who is from an “inner city community” (p. 6) in El Salvador. It describes how Martin’s older brother started hanging out with a group of friends that were in a gang. This resulted in him smoking, taking drugs, and eventually acting violently. It discusses how one day Martin woke up to his brother “kicking him repeatedly for no reason” (p. 6) and discusses how Martin’s brother died from a drug overdose. The second story is a story about 10-year-old Denis from Guatemala. The story describes how his sister was kidnapped when she was just two months old. It also notes that Guatemala is one of the most dangerous places in the world for children and says that “every day, 40 children lose their parents to violence and 22 new cases of sexual violence against a child are reported every day (at least one every two hours), yet few cases ever get to court” (p. 7). The third story tells the story of 10-year-old Alia from Nigeria. It describes her village and family being attacked by the Boko Haram. Her father was killed and her family was forced to flee to another town and then neighbouring country Cameroon, before making their way back to a camp “for people displaced by the violence” (p. 8) in Nigeria.

The fourth story is a story about 13-year-old Susana from El Salvador. The text discusses how many children in El Salvador are “pushed into powerful crime gangs” (p. 9) and how Susana has known “kids who were good students, but because their parents had problems, they left school, turned to drugs and some even died” (p. 9). It also mentions that Susana’s cousin had to move away after refusing to join a gang, because he was worried for his life. The fifth story tells the story of 16-year-old Farida from Niger. It describes that she was abused by her step-mother so she ran away from home. She “fell into the hands of violent gangs in Zinder, Niger” (p. 10). These gangs get children to “commit robbery and assaults” (p. 10) and “girls are especially vulnerable and are often victims of abuse” (p. 10). The sixth story tells the story of 16-year-old Hanh from the USA. It describes how he and his sister were born in Vietnam and were illegally kidnapped and illegally adopted by a woman in Missouri, USA. The woman who illegally adopted them “forced them to work and earn money for her . . . [and] if they did not give the woman all the money they made, she would beat them” (p. 11).

5.2.4. *There are different actions to take to develop solutions to prevent violence*

The lesson presents different actions to take towards developing solutions to prevent violence. These actions can be found the second part of Appendix 1, the stories about the children who experience violence, in the classroom discussion and action plan. The second part of appendix 1 is called “Where We’ve Seen Success” and discusses different strategies and successes to prevent violence around the world. The four strategies include: supporting parents, caregivers and families, helping children manage the risks they face, promoting and providing support for children, and implementing laws and policies that protect children (p. 5). The first example, from Turkey, discusses that “creating a positive family environment for underprivileged mothers and their children resulted in a 79 percent decrease in physical disciplining” (p. 5). The second example, from Brazil, discusses “helping children living in the slum to overcome the emotional scars they’ve endured as a result of violence” (p. 5). The third example, from Sudan, discusses how introducing family and child protection units in police stations have led to “increased

access to police services for victims of violence and for children who are in trouble with the law” (p. 5). The fourth example, from Sweden, discusses how making any form of corporal punishment illegal in 1979 has “resulted in an 80 percent decrease in the use of corporal punishment over a 35-year period” (p. 5).

The stories of the examples of violence against children list ways different groups are taking action to prevent violence. Four of the six stories give examples (Martin, Denis, Alia, and Farida) that mention UNICEF founded or supported programmes, foundations, schools, or shelters. The other two examples mention the National Human Trafficking Resource Center (Hanh’s story) and participation in the school prevention of violence committee (Susana’s story). The UNICEF and National Human Trafficking Resource examples, mention the organizations themselves have tried to prevent further violence. Denis’ story mentions that the UNICEF funded Fundacion Sobrevivientes (Survivors Foundation) is helping his family find his sister (p. 7). Alia’s story mentions that she now attends a UNICEF supported school in a camp that is for people “displaced by [the] violence” (p. 8). Farida’s story says that she is back to school “thanks to a UNICEF supported shelter for girls” (p. 10). Hanh’s story states that National Human Trafficking Resource Center helped “him and his sister escape their situation and receive medical care, counselling and also found them a safe place to live” (Understanding Community Violence, n.d., p. 11).

Martin’s story discusses the UNICEF programme called No te digna (“Rise Above it”) which “teaches children how to resolve arguments without violence, that violence is wrong and that they don’t have to suffer in silence” (p. 6). Susana’s story discusses her participation in the violence prevention group at her school, which teaches “children how to be good parents in the future” (p. 9).

The lesson ends with students getting in pairs to discuss and agree on “three actions that could prevent any form of violence that they have seen or heard about in their own communities/school” (p. 2). The students are supposed to be reminded that violence can take many forms. Eventually, the whole class is supposed to come together and vote on the five top actions to “produce a manifesto for change in their community” and “students may also want to think about actions to prevent violence on a global scale” (p. 2). This list is encouraged to be made into an action plan or class display and the class is meant to discuss how they “could spread the message about their actions more widely through their school or community” (p. 2).

Chapter 6

6. Discussion

In order to further answer my first two research questions: (1) To what extent do depictions of peace produce knowledge that deemphasizes the interconnectedness of different forms of violence? and (2) To what extent do depictions of violence produce knowledge that deemphasizes the interconnectedness of different forms of violence?, I consider how different forms of violence are discussed in the two lessons in relation literature from critical peace education and in relation to the concepts of violence that were described in the conceptual framework(direct, structural, cultural). It is not enough to analyze these themes as I have just presented them, rather an analysis that is based in transnational feminist critical discourse analysis requires the analysis to go further to question and critique the material. Lazar (2007) says a FCDA must consider both what is in a text and what is not in a text, therefore my analysis will highlight things that are missing from the text. The analysis specifically pays attention to the words that are used to describe different forms of violence. That said, I do not speculate all the things that could have been said in the text that were not. Instead, I use specific examples from each story that present a situation in a certain way to critically explore the knowledge that is created. Because my analysis is rooted in transnational feminism, I specifically am interested in if connections are made between different forms of violence like racism, sexism, classism, nationalism, and more. In order to answer my first two research questions, I came up with a set of sub questions to further my analysis through the documents. The sub questions are created in relation to the themes that have been identified. These sub questions help me to better answer my overall research questions.

The following questions further guide my analysis:

1. How do different depictions of peace recognize or ignore different forms of violence?
2. How do the examples of peaceful activists recognize or ignore different forms of violence?
3. How do actions, as described in the lesson, towards a more peaceful world, recognize or ignore different forms of violence?

6.1. The Power of Peace

6.1.1. *How do different definitions of peace recognize or ignore different forms of violence?*

Based on the language in the title and learning outcomes, peace is immediately positioned as something which has various meanings and as something that is powerful. In the discussions about photos of peaceful and non-peaceful situations, peace is positioned as something that is connected to non-peace and conflict. The examples of peaceful and non-peaceful situations create a clear binary between what can be seen as

peaceful and non-peaceful. This leads to an oversimplification of peace that does not account for different forms of violence (structural, cultural) or their connections.

The different definitions of peace that students are prompted to select, based on the one they most identify with, also offer insights into concepts of peace. “Freedom from trouble or worry, “a time when there is no war or a war has ended” and “a feeling of mental or emotional calm” (p. 2) recognize different concepts of violence are present in different concepts of peace. A time when there is no war, recognizes the absence of direct violence, while freedom from trouble and a feeling of calm both have the potential to recognize the absence of direct, structural, and cultural violence. The lesson notes there are different ways to describe peace, but suggests peace can be described as “when conflict is able to be resolved without violence and improves the quality of life” (p. 7).

The examples given to describe “peace is when” (p. 7) highlight people’s possibility *to* live without direct and structural violence. However, the examples do not suggest that peace is when people have the possibility to live free *from* unjust systems themselves. Continually, the examples generally do not account for cultural forms of violence that create the foundation of these direct and structural forms of violence. For example, the lesson mentions that peace is when “everyone is equal before the law” (p. 7), but it does not mention why some people are treated differently under the law or mention the potential of certain laws to be forms of violence themselves. That said, one definition does mention people’s right to work regardless of their “gender, ethnicity or any other aspect of identity” (p. 7) but there is no mention of racism, sexism, homophobia, and more. Additionally, this is only mentioned in relation to the opportunity to work. For example, it does not mention everyone should have “fair and equal access to the basic needs for their wellbeing,” (p. 7) or everyone should be “able to participate in shaping political decisions” (p. 7) regardless of gender, ethnicity or any other aspects of identity. Framing peace in a binary way, without connecting it to other cultural and structural forms of violence, contributes to the kind of peace education that Bajaj and Hantzopoulos (2016b) question. This kind of peace education omits cultural, political and economic forces from peace education programs (Bajaj & Hantzopoulos, 2016b, p. 236). Additionally, this framing of peace does not allow the structures that potentially have “exploitation at a center piece, meaning that some get much more out of the system than others” (Galtung, 2013, p. 37) to be questioned.

6.1.2. How do the examples of peaceful activists recognize or ignore different forms of violence?

The lesson tells teachers to “be aware that some activists may be considered political in a particular national or local context and should be chosen with care” (The Power of Peace, n.d., p. 3). The activists’ stories do mention some forms of structural and cultural violence, like racial prejudice, discrimination, denied access to education, and imprisonment. However, despite mentioning some examples, there is still an overall lack of consideration for structural and cultural violence. For example, despite the story of Mahatma Gandhi mentioning racial prejudice against Indians, discrimination, the fight for independence, the fight for ending the caste system, protests against taxes, and the desire to make “women equal with men” (p. 10), there is no mention of colonialism, racism, religious discrimination, classism, or sexism. The story does not give any indication about why certain people are poor and are protesting about taxes, or why people should fight for women to be equal to men. The story highlights that Gandhi

organized civil disobedience acts, but it fails to discuss the context in which these acts were taking place. Similarly, it describes Gandhi was imprisoned for organizing these protests (which were illegal) and describes that he would fast while in prison, but it gives no connection to the direct violence he inflicted on himself (via not eating) as a way to fight against the structural violence of the British government. The story describes Gandhi's Salt March as a response to Britain's tax on salt, but there is no reference to the structural and cultural violence that framed this march (imperialism, colonialism, capitalism, to name some). Without recognizing this, it is hard to see how this story would teach students about the "hidden consequences of social and economic structural inequalities" (Bajaj & Chiu, 2009, p. 246).

The story discussing Nelson Mandela mentions Gandhi's peaceful protests in India as a source of inspiration for Mandela. However, similar to the text about Gandhi, there is no mention of racism or colonialism in the Mandela text. Stating that South Africa "*became* [emphasis added] part of the *British Empire* [emphasis added]" (The Power of Peace, n.d., p. 12) ignores the direct, structural and cultural violence that occurred at the hands of the British Empire. Simply noting that the "*government was all white* [emphasis added]" (p. 12) and that apartheid laws were made to "*keep white and black people apart* [emphasis added]" (p. 12) ignores the role of white supremacy as a form of cultural violence that justifies structural violence. Describing the background of Mandela's story in this way ignores the structural and cultural violence of colonialism, racism, and white supremacy, that formed the basis of what Mandela was fighting against. Additionally, it deemphasizes the fact because colonialism and racism were so imbedded in South African government and way of life, laws were able to be passed that made apartheid and his imprisonment legal. The story credits Mandela's release from prison and ending of apartheid to the fact that the government was changing and the fact that the world wanted Mandela to be free. It also mentions that Mandela and the president agreed to stop fighting. This presents the idea that Mandela's *fight* to end the system of apartheid is somehow on the same level as the South African government's *fight* to uphold the system of apartheid. This assumes a both sides were equally wrong and both sides agree to move forward idea, which completely erases the structural and cultural forms of violence (colonialism and racism) that were/are imbedded in South Africa's founding and were at the foundation of apartheid. Williams (2016) notes that if structural violence is left unquestioned, it becomes a "major blockade to the implementation of comprehensive critical peace education interventions" (p. 154).

The story of Malala Yousafzai describes how she was shot by the Taliban because she defied them and demanded that girls be allowed to go to school. The story connects the direct violence Malala received to the fact she demanded girls be granted access to education, but not does mention the structural/cultural forms of violence of sexism and patriarchy. By ignoring sexism and patriarchy as forms of violence, it deemphasizes the fact that Malala was shot (direct violence) because of the structural and cultural forms of violence that allowed and continue to allow her rights to be devalued. Her fight for girls' access to education is presented as something that is not connected to sexism and patriarchy, therefore the direct violence she received is presented as something that is disconnected from other forms of violence. Therefore, the violence she experienced is disconnected from what Snauwaert calls "our present global system of patriarchy, and its culture of violence and war" (2015, p. ix).

Karim Wasfi's story describes his resistance to bombings in Baghdad through music. He plays music at sites of direct violence across Baghdad. The story presents Karim's

response to acts of direct violence without any mention of the structural or cultural forms of violence that form the background of the bombings (imperialism, colonialism, militarism, religious fundamentalism). Lastly, Leymah Gbowee's story discusses her work as a leader who worked for peace during the Second Liberian Civil War. The lesson describes her response to the direct violence of the war and describes how she brought Muslim women and Christian together for the first time to work towards peace (p. 9). However, it makes no mention of any structural or cultural forms of violence.

Here, all their stories are examples of peace because they fought against non-peaceful situations through peaceful means. Here, *peace* is described in its response to non-peaceful situations, by acting non-violently. Specifically, non-violent or peaceful appears to be equated with acting without causing physical harm. However, because the stories fail to mention many forms of cultural and structural violence, the depictions do not allow for connections to be made between the activists' peaceful responses and the structures that had them living in a "state of social inequality in which privileged groups exploit or oppress others; created by deprivation of basic human needs, such as civil rights, health, and education (Galtung, 1969; Harris & Morrison, 2003)" (as cited in Bajaj, 2008b, p. 171).

6.1.3. *How do actions towards a more peaceful world recognize or ignore different forms of violence?*

While the stories of Mandela, Gbowee, and Gandhi do mention group involvement in peaceful protests, the overall focus of the peaceful activists' stories highlight the actions of the individual. This is first seen in the structure of the lesson. From the beginning, the students are instructed to research peaceful *activists*, instead of peaceful *movements*. This reduces peace movements to individuals and it focuses on the violence experienced by individuals, rather than the violence that is experienced by larger numbers of people. Therefore, the actions to fight against violence become the actions of individuals with little to no connection to different forms of violence. Each story has a "Who is [Name of activist]" section and a "What did [Name of activist] do? This framing deemphasizes the potential of large numbers of people experiencing different forms of violence simultaneously can have for collective movements of action.

Continually, the lesson directs students to look for specific things when researching the activists, which continue to further emphasize the role of the individual. Focusing on individuals' goals, characteristics and even names, once again highlights the actions of individuals. It frames their actions as being centered around their individual goal, rather than their actions being centered around the collective core of the peace movements. Students are meant to identify the individuals' characteristics as a way to inform their own action for peace. Here, peace activism becomes something that is driven and sustained by personality traits rather than collective struggle against multiple forms of violence. For example, the stories highlight Mandela's "hard work and dedication" (The Power of Peace, n.d., p. 12) and Gandhi's commitment to "living simply" (p. 10). The only two women presented in the stories, Malala and Gbowee, have both won Noble Peace Prizes, and Malala is described as a "brave and gentle advocate of peace" (p. 11). Wasfi is described as committing an "act of defiance" (p. 8), as someone who does not "surrender to the impending doom of uncertainty by not functioning" (p. 8) and as someone who "[makes] a choice [to] choose how they want to live, not how they want to die" (p. 8). All these examples describe the activists as having characteristics and having

made choices that have made them and/or rewarded them for being in a position to advocate for peace. Focusing on these characteristics deemphasizes the role different forms of violence have in shaping peace movements.

Students are encouraged to discuss what they have learned in the lesson and are prompted to take action in their classroom, towards their friends, and in the world. Here, student action is connected to their classroom, friends, and world. However, due to the emphasis placed on students to identify with certain characteristics of peaceful activists, it is unclear how much students will connect different forms of violence when considering their actions. The lesson also recommends two Extension Activities as a way for students to take action for peace. One is creating a class “Peace Contract”. The contract is meant to be written and signed by the class. This activity has the potential to recognize different forms of violence. However, there is a risk that teachers and/or students could contribute to structural or cultural violence when creating this contract if the teacher or the students are not aware of how their actions have the potential to contribute to different forms of violence. The other activity is participating in “The Great Kindness Challenge Week at school by downloading the Acts of Kindness Checklist and Toolkit” (p. 15). If the definition of peace is equated with kindness, there is a possibility that teachers or other students could inappropriately sanction certain behavior because they deem it *unkind*. Peace equated with kindness could easily be used as a way to quiet demands against structural or cultural violence because the demands don’t seem or sound *kind* enough. Discussing action for peace by focusing on individuals and kindness contributes to a discourse of peace that does not account for the “complexities and interactions between the less visible forms of cultural and structural, which may underpin direct violence” (Horner, 2016, p. 126).

6.2. Understanding Community Violence

This section follows the same reasoning as the previous section. The following questions further guide my analysis:

1. How do different discussions of violence recognize or ignore different forms of violence?
2. How do the examples of violence from around the world recognize or ignore different forms of violence?
3. How do actions, as described in the lesson, towards developing solutions to prevent violence recognize or ignore different forms of violence?

6.2.1. *How do different discussions of violence recognize or ignore the different forms of violence?*

The quote from Serena Williams at the beginning of the lesson connects violence to children in a couple different ways. Noting that all children deserve a chance to succeed in life, no matter where they live, positions violence as a worldwide problem that can affect children’s chances of succeeding. Saying children have to right to live *free from fear of violence* says more than just saying that children have to the right to live *free from violence*. This positions violence as both something that a child can experience but also

something that a child can fear to the point that it affects their ability to pursue their dreams. This can be seen as an example of recognizing the interconnectedness of different forms of violence, because it creates the idea that violence can affect children's lives in multiple ways. The title of the lesson, *Understanding Community Violence*, also recognizes that violence is more complex than something that only affects individuals (however, this point will be challenged later. See Section 7.2.). Additionally, local experiences of violence are meant to be connected to global violence. The lesson is rooted in the idea that discussing and exploring different forms of violence from around the world can lead to action to prevent violence. All these examples present violence as something that is complex and as something that has different forms.

The lesson provides teachers with a background about violence against children that recognizes many different types of violence. It notes that children experience direct violence via things like physical harm, neglect, maltreatment, and sexual abuse. It also notes that violence can be direct or indirect. Direct violence is described as something that can be life-altering or life-ending through physical harm. Indirect violence is described as something like "witnessing violence at the home or the effects of war on countries and communities" (*Understanding Community Violence*, n.d., p. 4). The discussion of violence also recognizes that violence can occur in private, worsen existing problems, and can have lasting impacts on children's brains. These examples recognize multiple forms of violence and recognize that certain forms of violence can influence and affect other forms of violence. For example, it gives an example of how war can prevent a child from getting an education if the school is used "as a military base" (p. 4). The direct violence is the war, but the structural violence is the systematic prevention of children receiving an education. Similarly, noting that violence can alter a child's brain also connects direct and structural forms of violence. However, despite making these connections, the depictions neglect making other connections. For example, it describes direct violence as something that can be directly life-altering or life-ending through physical harm, but it does not consider how cultural and structural violence can, and do, contribute to life threatening violence. Galtung (1969; 2013) and Brantmeire (2013) both recognize structural violence leads to unequal power and unequal life chances and that cultural violence is used to legitimate direct violence. The way direct violence is presented fails to recognize this.

6.2.2. *How do the examples of violence from around the world recognize or ignore different forms of violence?*

The majority of time in the lesson is spent on students reading stories about children experiencing violence around the world. The students are specifically asked to discuss questions that recognize that different factors contribute to different forms of violence. For example, they are asked to consider how poverty and unemployment can be factors that contribute to violence. This is an example of how structural violence can lead to direct violence. They are also asked to consider how people's attitudes towards violence can lead to violence. This is an example of how cultural violence can lead to direct violence. Continually, the teacher is supposed to make connections between the stories and the students' own experiences or previous knowledge. This encourages students to recognize different forms of violence.

The stories recognize different forms of violence: gang and drug related violence, kicking, abuse, robbery, assault, killings, conflict, war, beatings, exploitation, sexual

violence, violence in the home, emotional violence in the forms of sadness, depression, and worry, and violence as it contributes to deteriorating health via high blood pressure and diabetes. However, other forms of violence are largely unconsidered. The direct violence committed by the gangs is not discussed in relation to other forms of violence (like colonialism, classism or imperialism). This is the case for the stories about Martin, Denis, Susana, and Farida. Similarly, portraying the violence by the Boko Haram expressed in Alia's story without making any connection to other forms of violence (like religious fundamentalism), creates a picture of the violence committed by the Boko Haram that is disconnected from other forms of violence. Additionally, Farida's story mentions that girls are especially vulnerable and are often victims of abuse, but does not mention sexism or patriarchy. This does little to inform why the girls experience the violence they do. Similarly, in Susana's story, she expresses that she thinks gang violence happens in part because gang members are depressed and lack family support and father figures. However, there is no mention how masculinity and cultural ideas about father figures via patriarchy can contribute to different forms of violence.

Continually, Denis's story notes that children experience high numbers of sexual violence, but that few cases ever go to court. Without noting other larger forms of structural and cultural violence (potentially, sexism, classism, homophobia, racism) the sexual violence that children experience is framed as an experience that happens independent from other forms of violence. Lastly, Hanh's story mentions that he was illegally adopted from Vietnam and was forced to work and earn money, but does not mention that other forms of violence (like racism or capitalism), can lead to the exploitation of children. Different forms of violence are largely not connected. Therefore, attention largely is not given to "the cultural, political, and material forces –often rooted in colonial relations- that engender [violence] in specific places and times with specific groups of people" (Bermeo, 2016, p. 159).

6.2.3. *How do actions towards developing solutions to prevent violence recognize or ignore different forms of violence?*

The lesson presents different actions to take towards developing solutions to prevent violence. Appendix 1 lists different strategies that recognize different forms of violence can be prevented in different ways. However, the examples of the implementations of the strategies largely do not recognize the structural and cultural forms of violence that are present. When discussing physically disciplining children in Turkey, it mentions "underprivileged mothers" (Understanding Community Violence, n.d., p.5), but does not give any indication what it means to be underprivileged under certain structures of violence (via racism, sexism, classism, and more) or what this means in relation to forms of cultural violence (cultural ideas that allow for the physical disciplining of children). The example from Brazil discusses helping children living in slums, but does not mention the how structural and cultural violence (like classism or racism) relate to certain children living in slums. The example from Sudan discusses child protection units at police stations, but gives no indication to how certain structural and cultural forms of violence allow for the devaluing of children in the eyes of the law in the first place. The example from Sweden discusses the illegality of corporal punishment, but does not mention how cultural violence relates to ideas about inflicting physical harm as punishment. Without mentioning these other aspects or forms of violence, solutions to preventing violence are limited.

The stories of the examples of violence against children list ways different groups are attempting to prevent violence. Four of the six stories give examples (Martin, Denis, Alia, and Farida) of UNICEF founded or supported programmes, foundations, schools, or shelters. The other two examples mention the National Human Trafficking Resource Center (Hanh's story) and participation in the school prevention of violence committee (Susana's story). Giving these examples of ways to prevent violence does a couple different things. First, the UNICEF and National Human Trafficking Resource examples mention that the organizations themselves have tried to prevent further violence. They mention that their programs have helped individuals get out violent situations and have helped individuals because they have been victims of violent situations. The stories offer examples of action from UNICEF and the National Human Trafficking Resource Center, but do not discuss how the programs, shelter, etc. are working to prevent future violence. Additionally, they do not discuss how they are helping children work to prevent violence (with the exception of Martin's and Susana's stories). This creates an idea of action for violence prevention that is largely done through the actions of large organizations, with little attention given to the role the children in the stories (or the students doing to the lesson), or members of the community have in preventing future violence. For example, Hanh's story discusses how the National Human Trafficking Resource Center helped him and his sister escape, and receive medical and counselling, but it does not discuss how the center is working to prevent future violence. Highlighting the names of organizations as examples of action for preventing violence without considering the actual work they are doing to prevent violence, creates an idea of violence prevention that lacks connecting the violence experienced by the children to the solutions of how to prevent violence.

That said, the examples of action from Martin and Susana's stories do discuss the children's role in violence prevention. Martin's story discusses the UNICEF programme called *No te digna* ("Rise Above it") which "teaches children how to resolve arguments without violence, that violence is wrong and that they don't have to suffer in silence" (Understanding Community Violence, n.d., p. 6). It also mentions that Martin knows that joining a gang "wouldn't get him anywhere at all, and that he would end up like his brother. . . [so] instead he focuses on maths as he aspires to be a doctor or accountant, to make something better of his life" (p.6). These examples show an element of choice that is highlighted in preventing violence. This is also seen in Susana's story that discusses her participation in the violence prevention group at her school, which teaches "children how to be good parents in the future" (p. 9). Her story also notes that Susana has several friends that have gang member boyfriends and that she has "tried to support one of her friends by telling her 'she could choose not to have a gang member boyfriend'" (p. 9). Not only is an element of choice implied in these examples, but an element of "who is worthy enough to live without violence" is also present. There is a sense that those who choose to and those that are good enough, don't have to continue to live in violence. This presents an idea of violence prevention that ignores how different forms of violence limit people's choices and simultaneously punishes them or rewards them for the choices they do or do not make. It presents action towards violence prevention in a way that ignores the complexity of violence.

The lesson ends with students getting in pairs to discuss and agree on actions that could prevent violence in their schools or communities. The students are supposed to be reminded that violence can take many forms. This encourages students to recognize different forms of violence. The students are asked to make a manifesto about how to prevent violence and are also instructed to think about making global connections. This

list is supposed to be made into an action plan and is to be displayed for people to see. These calls for action have the potential to highlight different forms of violence as the students think of ways to prevent violence in their communities and the world. Noting that violence takes many forms and encouraging students to make connections between their communities and the world at this point in the lesson has the potential for students to take action to prevent violence in its many forms. The lesson wants students to make connections between different forms of violence when making their action plan but, overall, the lesson does not make connections between direct, structural and cultural forms of violence. Discussing actions for violence prevention in these ways does not offer students the opportunity to “cultivate an understanding of social dynamics and resist pressures –be they post/colonial or the outcome of class conflict- to assimilate into dominant economic and cultural structures that often do not serve the needs of students and their communities” (Bajaj, 2016, p. 109).

6.3. Brief summary

The Power of Peace lesson largely reduces concepts of peace to a binary of peaceful and non- peaceful, which limits the extent other forms of violence are recognized. It recognizes people’s right to live free from structural violence, but it does not challenge the structure itself. The few examples of structural violence that are mentioned are discussed without reference to racism, classism, colonialism, religious discrimination, or sexism. Therefore, the types of violence that are described in the stories are disconnected from each other and do not account for cultural violence. The violence is largely discussed without context, which also limits connections to be made. Continually, despite mentioning some group involvement in peaceful protests, the overall focus of action for peace is shown as action by individuals fighting against either direct violence or unnamed or decontextualized structural violence. Overall, the lesson produces knowledge that understates the interconnectedness of different forms of violence.

Understand Community Violence creates an idea of violence that acknowledges its complexity and attempts to make connections between local and global experiences of violence. It recognizes different forms of direct and structural violence, but the discussion of cultural violence is largely missing. The stories do not provide much context, so the different forms of violence become disconnected from their foundations. The actions to take to prevent violence that are offered by the lesson lack recognition of structural or cultural violence. The actions that are discussed also create an element of choice in preventing violence in a way that lacks connecting structural and cultural violence to direct violence. The lesson attempts to have students take action and make connections between violence in their communities and the world. However, the lesson itself largely does not do this. While some connections between different forms of violence are made in the lesson, the interconnectedness of different forms of violence is largely missing.

Of the different forms of violence that were mentioned in the two lessons, racism, classism, colonialism, religious discrimination, sexism, and more, were never named. The lesson creates a concept of peace that does not name these types of structural violence. By extension, the lessons do not account for different forms of cultural violence like white supremacy, capitalism/casteism, patriarchy, misogyny, homophobia, anti-blackness and more. Continually, not only are these types of violence not **named**, they are not connected

to one another. Considering all this, the next chapter will discuss how knowledge that deemphasizes the interconnectedness and complexities of violence creates a peace discourse that is decontextualized, dehistoricized, and depoliticized, privileges individuals, and maintains the status quo.

Chapter 7

7. Analysis

The discussion considered how different forms of violence produce certain knowledge around peace and violence that overall deemphasizes the interconnectedness between different forms of violence. Moving forward, the analysis considers how the knowledge produced in these two lessons work together to create the overall peace discourse. In this chapter, I discuss both lessons together to see how they create an overall discourse of peace within World's Largest Lesson. The analysis draws on transnational feminism, concepts from the conceptual framework, and literature from feminist perspectives on peace education and critical peace education. The discussion points in this chapter have been mentioned in the previous chapter. This chapter digs deeper into each in order to answer the third research question.

7.1. A decontextualized, dehistoricized and depoliticized peace

Both lessons create knowledge about peace and violence that lack recognizing the interconnectedness of different forms of violence which results in a peace discourse that is decontextualized, dehistoricized, and depoliticized. The Power of Peace lesson notes that some peaceful activists could be viewed as political and warns the teachers to choose with care, but the stories of the peaceful activists are themselves depoliticized. All the stories create a concept of peace that does not acknowledge or connect many forms of structural and cultural violence. For example, Gandhi's story about his fight for independence against the British Empire is told without acknowledging structural and cultural forms of violence like colonialism, racism, religious discrimination, classism, or sexism. Similarly, in the story of Nelson Mandela, there is no mention of racism, white supremacy, or colonialism. Malala's story does not make any connection between the direct violence she experienced and sexism/patriarchy. Therefore, it promotes the type of thinking that does not connect the idea that, as Fultner (2017) notes, the struggles of women in one place are often connected to the struggles of women in other places. Because these examples do not make connections between these different forms of violence, their peaceful activism is based in a story with no contextual, historical or political foundation. It creates a discourse of peace that does not consider the "complex relational understanding of experience, location and history" (Mohanty, 2003, p. 238). Continually, Davis (2018) expresses the importance of current generations learning from past generations, but the peace discourse that is created limits this because the history, politics, and context are missing.

Karim's story describes his response to acts of direct violence without any mention of the structural or cultural forms of violence that form the background of the bombings in Baghdad (imperialism, colonialism, militarism, religious fundamentalism). Leymah Gbowee's story highlights her ability to get Muslim and Christian women to work together for the first time, but it does not give any indication to why this was so out of the ordinary, and therefore deemphasizes the significance of overcoming potential structural

and cultural violence to work together for peace. It also does not mention sexism or patriarchy, so it neglects discussing that the group of women demanded peace because they were seeing and experiencing horrible forms of violence that were unique to them as women. The story describes Gbowee's activism without acknowledging how women experienced different forms of violence, but it also doesn't acknowledge how the women in particular were able to fight for peace in ways that were informed by the violence they faced. This neglects to make the connection to how women, as Brock-Utne (1989) suggests, are "as a group are oppressed by the patriarchy on a macro level, and experience male dominance at the meso-and micro levels" (Brock-Utne, 1989, p. 7). Discussing the stories of these peaceful activists without making connections to different forms of cultural and structural violence creates a version of peace that is decontextualized, dehistoricized, and depoliticized because it separates the work of the activist from the context, history and politics that their work was/is rooted in. Additionally, because it does not mention things like white-supremacy or misogyny, it limits the historical, contextual, and political connections that, Mohanty (2003) and Alcoff (2017), suggest can be made between groups throughout the world.

Similarly, the stories and actions to prevent violence in *Understanding Community Violence* also create a decontextualized, dehistoricized, and depoliticized version of peace. Gang violence in the stories about Martin, Denis, Susana, and Farida is not connected to other forms of violence like colonialism, imperialism, classism, etc. Alia's increased risk of being a victim of violence because she is a girl is not connected to sexism or patriarchy. Susana's story does not connect ideas of masculinity and patriarchy to gang violence. Denis' story does not connect children's experiences of sexual violence to other forms of violence like classism, sexism, homophobia, or racism. Hanh's story does not connect child labor exploitation to capitalism or racism. This contributes to a peace discourse that is neutral and depoliticized (Horner, 2016). The violence they experience is presented as something that is separate from time and space. This discourse of peace does not focus on "institutional or historical domination" (Mohanty, 2003, p. 209).

The actions to prevent violence continue to create a discourse of peace that ignores forms of violence and their interconnectedness. The examples do not offer solutions to violence that acknowledge different forms of structural and cultural violence like racism, sexism, classism, or cultural ideas about physical punishment, or their connections. Galtung (2008) expresses the importance for peace education to make connections to historical mobilizations against structural violence, but the strategies for violence prevention lack contextual, historical or political relevance. I suggest a transnational feminist perspective of peace is a peace that recognizes that different forms of violence are connected and refuses to separate them from either context, history, or politics because a transnational feminist perspective knows that these things cannot be disconnected (Mohanty, 2003). I suggest a decontextualized, dehistoricized, depoliticized concept of peace is one that cannot work towards transformative feminist peace because it does not call for "fundamental changes in personal values, human relationships as well as in structures and systems" (Reardon, 2015b p. 23).

7.2. An individual peace

Both lessons produce knowledge about peace and violence that lack recognizing the interconnectedness of different forms of violence, which results in a peace discourse that places the emphasis on individuals, instead of structural or cultural aspects when creating the peace discourse. Different definitions of peace in *The Power of Peace* highlight individuals' possibilities to live a certain way without different forms of violence. However, the lesson does not mention individuals' possibilities to challenge unjust systems. Therefore, the burden of peace is placed on individuals having the opportunity *to* have something in a system because they are an individual human, rather than a more collective one where everyone has the opportunity to live with the freedom *from* an unjust system. For example, instead of framing peace as "when everyone has fair and equal access to water", I suggest a transnational feminist framing of peace would challenge the structural and cultural violence that allows some people to go without access to water, and instead might say "peace is when everyone is able to live free *from* an unjust system that prioritizes access to water for some people, while neglecting or even blocking the access of others (often women, people living in poverty, transgender people, immigrants, prisoners, non-citizens, or other marginalized groups). A transnational feminist perspective would challenge the injustice or oppression in the system, not just accept the system as is (Mohanty, 2003). Additionally, framing peace as something that individual humans can access also limits peace for other things on the Earth, like peace for animals and the environment. I suggest an individual peace is a peace that does not recognize the interconnections of different forms of violence, therefore it is also a peace that does not see the need for the structural and cultural change that would benefit humans, animals, and the environment, as Brantmeier (2013) suggests.

Individuals are also highlighted in other places in the lesson. The entire structure of the lesson focuses on peaceful *activists* instead of peaceful *movements*. This deemphasizes the roles of organizers, many of whom have been women, "and the agency of the participants in movements for change" (Davis, 2018, p. 48). The stories are also formatted in a way that furthers the idea of individual action. Not only does this deemphasize the collective struggle for peace, but it also continues the idea that peace is something that belongs to individuals. It creates a discourse of peace that contributes to "possessive individualism" (Davis, 2008, p. 21). The lesson highlights different characteristics of the peaceful advocates in a way that promotes individual choice for peace and rewards people for acting for peace. This concept of peace focuses on individual change rather than challenging structural and cultural violence, and deemphasizes the need for structural change for peace. It creates a discourse of peace that is part of the "masculinist leadership paradigms anchored in charismatic individualism" (Davis, 2018, p. 48). This is also seen in *Understanding Community Violence*.

The lesson describes direct violence as something that is directly life-threatening through physical harm without considering how other types of violence can be life-threatening themselves. This frames direct violence as a physical act against an individual, not as a structure itself. This peace discourse contributes to what Mohanty (2003) describes as when "complex structural experiences of domination and resistance [are] ideologically reformulated as individual behaviors and attitudes" (p. 209). Framing violence through individuals limit how we conceptualize violence. For example, if direct

violence is when someone commits physical harm, then what kind of violence is it when certain people are denied access to medical care do to their race, gender, or class? Is it not direct, structural and cultural violence? When direct violence is framed in this individual way, it limits the need for structural change because it does not see direct violence as also being structural or cultural violence. It limits the complexity and interconnectedness between these forms of violence. It creates a discourse of peace that is unable to critically account for how, for example, police violence, sexual violence, or state violence are all simultaneously forms of direct, structural, and cultural violence.

Additionally, the lesson highlights how organizations have helped the individual children in the stories, but it does not mention what they are continuing to do to work towards violence prevention. This emphasizes how an individual organization has helped individual children, but it does not say how the organizations are continuing to work with the children and the community towards violence prevention. Focusing on the organizations' violence prevention without actually discussing what they are doing to prevent violence in communities ignores how different forms of violence are connected. This deemphasizes the structural and cultural change that is needed to prevent violence against children, which also leads to ignoring the structural and cultural change that is needed to work towards peace. This discourse of peace simply tries to eliminate violence within in a system, rather than challenge "the larger societal structures fueling violence" (Chew, 2008, p. 86).

7.3. A status quo peace

Both lessons produce knowledge about peace and violence that lack recognizing the interconnectedness of different forms of violence, which results in a peace discourse that does not challenge power or structures, and therefore maintains the status quo. Despite recognizing the potential power of peace, as see in the title of the lesson, *The Power of Peace* does not challenge the status quo. This is seen in *The Power of Peace* lesson when it describes pictures of peaceful and non-peaceful protests. If images (displaying actions) are clearly meant to be either peaceful or non-peaceful, it has the potential to create a meaning of peace that ignores structural or cultural violence in favor of something simply *appearing* peaceful. For example, if a teacher shows a picture of people "shouting or being aggressive" (*The Power of Peace*, n.d., p. 2) what kind of concept of peace does this create? If shouting or being aggressive are seen as non-peaceful situations, what does this mean for images of activists *yelling* in protest of police shootings of unarmed Black people, or images of women *being aggressive* towards elected officials in demanding sexual assault to be taken seriously?

Alternatively, what does this mean for images of "a large peaceful rally" (p. 2) if the rally is a rally for white nationalism or rallies for certain political figures? Does peaceful mean a large group of people gathered together without physical harm being done (direct violence)? Is this really peaceful? This is not to say that no images can be used to display something peaceful and non-peaceful situations, rather it is just to question how portraying something as non-peaceful could be at the expense of people who are fighting against structural and/or cultural violence. Continually, the idea of something as peaceful and non-peaceful creates a binary that has the potential to keep those in power already in power because they are the ones who get to decide what is seen as peaceful and non-

peaceful and therefore can promote and dismiss certain concepts of peace (which can turn into another form of violence). This is also seen when the lesson encourages schools to participate in the Great Kindness Challenge Week. Equating peace with kindness has the potential to maintain the status quo because it can allow those in power to dismiss demands of people fighting against structural or culture violence because it does not sound *kind* enough. This discourse of peace potentially allows those already in power to maintain a “monopoly of violence” (Bannerji, 2018, p. 56) because they get to decide what peace is and what it is not.

Similarly, the lack of interconnectedness of different forms of violence promotes a status quo peace in the stories about the peaceful activists. I have already discussed how the stories are decontextualized, dehistoricized, and depoliticized, and focus on individuals. These all contribute to maintaining the status quo. But the stories further this in other ways as well. The stories of Gandhi and Mandela both mention that the men broke laws by protesting for freedom and they were both imprisoned. Because the lesson does not consider the different types of violence that contributed to their imprisonment, the stories frame imprisonment as an event in the men’s lives, rather than as another form of violence. It allows violence that is perpetrated by the state or governments via imprisonment, to be seen as stand-alone events committed against individuals, rather than as structural or cultural forms of violence. This allows the existence of prisons, and the laws that allowed the men to be sent there, to go unchallenged. This creates a discourse of peace that does not view these different forms of violence on a “spectrum of violence” (Davis, 2008, p. 25). It does not acknowledge how prisons and state violence are connected (Davis, 2008). This also seen when the text discusses Mandela being released from prison. It says that both men agreed to stop fighting as if they were coming to the discussion with the same amount of power. It positions both of them as agreeing to stop fighting in way that assumes they are in the same position, as if they were both equally wrong or right. This reproduces a status quo peace discourse because it ignores how power dynamics and hierarchies, as Brantmeier (2013) suggests, lead to the domination of some humans over others.

A status quo discourse of peace is also seen in Leymah Gbowee’s story. The text says Leymah Gbowee led women in public protests that forced Liberia’s President Charles Taylor to meet with them and agree to take part in formal peace talks in Ghana. However, it doesn’t mention that over 200 women, dressed in all white, went to the negotiations and forced the peace discussions to continue by preventing the negotiators to leave. If the men attempted to leave, the women threatened to take off their clothes (seeing a married or elderly woman take off her clothes was believed to cause a curse) (Gbowee, 2011). Here, the women were able to use a form of cultural violence (a taboo placed on their naked body) to their advantage. Because the story does not mention this, it deemphasizes the power women had that was unique to them as women, and ignores what Okazawa-Rey calls the “capitalism, militarism, and religious fundamentalism, entwined with patriarchy and misogyny, ethnic and racial supremacy and accumulated phobias, [which] constitute the bedrock of the world order in which we exist” (2018, p. 31).

Some of the stories in *Understanding Community Violence* also contribute to a status quo concept of peace. The stories of Martin and Susana present the idea that there is an element of choice and an element of worthiness in who gets to live without violence. This creates a concept of peace that places the power to live without violence on choices and worthiness and therefore creates a concept of peace that does not challenge the current power positions of society. It presents a concept of peace where the burden of peace is

placed on the choices of individuals rather than on challenging the powerful structural and cultural aspects that create violence. This allows current power structures to retain their power because they are not positioned as something that needs to be changed. Henry (2009) suggests that without considering macro inequalities and structural violence, the status quo is reinforced (as cited in Williams, 2016). Creating a concept of peace that does not challenge power structures maintains the status quo. Therefore, it creates a discourse of peace that does not consider “how dominant groups maintain power over others” (Brantmeier, 2013, p. 247).

Chapter 8

8. Pedagogical implications

The previous 3 chapters have answered the first three research questions. This chapter discusses the final research question: What are the pedagogical implications that arise from this analysis? I now return pedagogical strategies that were mentioned in section 3.1.2. Mohanty describes three different pedagogical strategies for internationalizing gender and women's studies curricula and names them the feminist as tourist model, the feminist as explorer model, and the comparative feminist studies or feminist solidarities model (Mohanty, 2003). The feminist as tourist model "involves a pedagogical strategy in which brief forays are made into non-Euro-American cultures" (Mohanty, 2003, p. 239). She believes this model is a problem because it "leaves power relations and hierarchies untouched since ideas about center and margin are reproduced along Eurocentric lines" (Mohanty, 2003, p. 2016). Feminist as explorer model positions women as "the object and subject of knowledge and the larger intellectual project is entirely about countries other than the United States" (p. 240). She suggests this model is inadequate because it leads to "a way of not addressing internal racism, capitalist hegemony, colonialism, and heterosexualization as central to processes of global domination, exploitation, and resistance" (Mohanty, 2003, p. 240). The comparative feminist studies or feminist solidarities model considers the "interconnectedness of the histories, experiences, and struggles of U.S. women of color, white women, and women from the Third World/South" (Mohanty, 2003, p. 242).

Mohanty suggests that these arguments hold for other education programs that are seeking to globalize or internationalize their curriculum (2003). Due to peace education's global nature, specifically in the form of education curricula created in relation to the SDGs, I suggest that these arguments also hold for the lessons from World's Largest Lesson. The lessons specifically highlight stories from around the world in order to educate for SDG 16: Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions. Based on my analysis, I suggest that the curriculum presented in the lessons fall under the feminist as tourist model. With this in mind, I decide to call it the peace as tourist model. Mohanty (2003) usually describes specifically women in her discussions of the different models, but I consider all the people described in the lessons. The following section will describe how the curriculum contribute to this model.

8.1. Peace as tourist model

Mohanty (2003) describes the feminist as tourist model includes curriculum that briefly looks at non-Euro-American cultures from an otherwise Eurocentric gaze. This can be seen in the lessons from World's Largest Lesson. The lessons look into examples, from what Mohanty calls the Third World/South, without much connection to context, history, politics or power, therefore the Eurocentric gaze is maintained. The Eurocentric gaze is maintained because the examples offered portray the people from the stories either as victims or as powerful (Mohanty, 2003). This allows World's Largest Lesson,

UNICEF, and the other educational businesses mentioned in the lesson to remain at the center, while briefly considering stories from the periphery. Mohanty (2003) suggests this creates a clear sense of who is seen as the other and suggests that this “leaves power relations and hierarchies untouched since ideas about center and margin reproduced along Eurocentric lines” (p. 239).

The feminist as tourist model also highlights extremes from the Third World/South, like dowry deaths or the exploitation of women factory workers (Mohanty, 2003). This results in women just being seen in stereotypical terms rather than in their everyday lives, like Euro-American women are able to be (Mohanty, 2003). The lessons give examples of peace, non-peace, and violence that are positioned outside of Euro-America (with the exception of mentioning Sweden and Hanh’s story based in the USA, although it mentions he was adopted from Vietnam). Without connecting the stories to their historical, contextual, and political locations, the people and their experiences are stereotyped and are presented as separate from Euro-America. This also contributes to the idea Mohanty calls a “confirmed sense of the evolved U.S./Euro feminist” (2003, p. 239). The lessons highlight UNICEF programs and educational organizations, which potentially creates an idea that these organizations know best. The lessons also highlight UNICEF’s contributions to encouraging peace and preventing violence. Consequently, their work potentially becomes “a predominantly self-interested chasm” (Mohanty, p. 239).

Additionally, the feminist as tourist model creates the “Third World difference” (Mohanty, 2003, p. 240), which portrays monolithic images of Third World/South women. This image is different to that of Euro-American women, who are viewed as “vital, changing and complex” (Mohanty, 2003, p. 240). This is seen in the lessons. The people in the stories are described through their relationships with violence, largely without considering the interconnectedness of different forms of violence. Therefore, this creates an image of the Third World/South that is monolithic because it does not account for the complexities of the stories. The stories present individuals “as representatives of majority or minority groups whose experience is predetermined within an oppressor/victim paradigm” Mohanty (2003, p. 209). The overall peace discourse created in World’s Largest Lesson contributes to a peace as tourist model because the Euro-American centric gaze is maintained through the overemphasis of stories about individuals from the Third World/South without considering power relations and histories.

8.2. Peace as solidarity model

What would a peace as solidarity model, in World’s Largest Lesson, look like? This model would recognize that differences and commonalities exist “in relation and tension with each other in all contexts” (Mohanty, 2003, p. 242). Applying Mohanty’s (2003) reasoning, a peace as solidarity model would tell the stories of the peaceful activists and the stories of the children experiencing violence in a way that recognizes the interconnectedness of their histories, experiences and struggles. This type of teaching is attentive to power, therefore “each historical experience illuminates the experiences of the others” (Mohanty, 2003, p. 242). A peace as solidarity model in World’s Largest Lesson would tell the stories of the peaceful activists in a way that explicitly connects how their struggles for peace are connected through their responses to colonialism,

racism, sexism, and imperialism. Their stories of peace would then be centered around collective struggles, instead of being centered around the stories of individuals whose stories are only connected via their use of non-violent acts. In a peace as solidarity model, the stories of peace would start from a place of resistance to these larger oppressions and would only later mention the individuals, because the focus would be on how interconnecting histories have led to non-peace and how collective struggles have fought against it. In the peace as solidarity model, the lessons in *World's Largest Lesson* would be organized around "social and economic processes and histories of various communities" (Mohanty, 2003, p. 242). For example, the stories of the children's experiences from around the world would consider how the experience of violence of one child in one place can also be connected to the violence experienced by another child in another place. It would consider how the social (racism, sexism, and more) and economic history (colonialism, imperialism, capitalism) in one place leads to violence, and it would also connect it to how the social and economic history in another place leads to violence. Therefore, the stories would not be centered around individual children or individual UNICEF programs, rather they would focus on how certain economic and social processes result in violence against children. The center of a peace as solidarity model is not individuals, rather the center considers the interconnectedness of the histories, power relations, and collective struggle. I suggest a peace as solidarity model combines both the concerns of critical peace educators and the concerns of transnational feminism. Therefore, I suggest it is the model that is needed in order to work towards transformative peace and a more just world.

Chapter 9

9. Conclusion

In the conclusion of this thesis, I return to the overall idea that peace is a contested concept, therefore the knowledge and discourse surrounding peace are also contested. I have argued that the knowledge produced in the lessons from World's Largest Lesson deemphasizes the interconnectedness of different forms of violence and therefore creates a peace discourse that is decontextualized, dehistoricized, depoliticized, privileges individuals, and maintains the status quo. Additionally, I have suggested that the peace discourse created in World's Largest Lesson contributes to a peace as tourist model and I have discussed a peace as solidarity model as an alternative that is in alignment with the concerns of critical peace educators and transnational feminism.

Additionally, I would also like to consider how the peace discourse in World's Largest Lesson also results in the erasure of groups of people from the peace discourse entirely. According to the arguments I have made thus far, where do gay people, trans people, non-binary people, people with disabilities, Indigenous people, refugees, migrants, prisoners and more, fit in the peace discourse created in World's Largest Lesson? If students are taught about peace and violence in a way that my analysis has argued, how are students supposed to be able to account for and connect their peace knowledge to other marginalized groups? People in these marginalized groups are in their classrooms, are in the world, or might even be themselves; yet, these marginalized groups are erased from the peace discourse because the peace discourse that has been created does not allow other connections (historical, social, cultural, political, economic) to be made. Continually, the peace discourse that is produced is also a discourse that erases animals and the environment from concepts of peace and violence.

Overall, I have attempted to problematize the peace discourse in World's Largest Lesson through critically exploring knowledge production through discussions of different forms of violence, through a transnational feminist perspective. In accordance with the goals of critical peace educators, transnational feminists, and in alignment with CDA and FCDA, I use this thesis as a call for change. I suggest that in order to have a peace discourse that seeks to end violence and create peace, the peace education lessons in World's Largest Lesson need to change. Specifically, they should move towards a peace as solidarity model. Additionally, I challenge myself, World's Largest Lesson, peace educators, international and comparative educators, educators across levels and even people who do not view themselves as educators, to become more critical with how we engage with topics like peace in education. I challenge us to further consider what kind of world we are educating for and the connections we are or are not making. While my research only considered two lessons in World's Largest Lesson, I suggest the general framework could also be applied to other educational spaces. Though limited in scope, this thesis contributes to research in international and comparative education that aims to understand the world in order to change it for the better (Arnove, 2009). It adds to research in the field of international and comparative education that contributes to "theory building, [to] more enlightened educational policy and practice, and ultimately to international understanding and peace" (Arnove, 2009, p. 114). This thesis also contributes to feminist knowledge production, as it has challenged the peace discourse

through a transnational feminist perspective, has raised implications for change, and has suggested working towards a peace as solidarity model.

Chapter 10

10. Future research

There are several ways this thesis provides a foundation for future research. As mentioned, this thesis only considered lessons in English, but future research could explore lessons that are offered in different languages. Researching if different concepts of violence create a peace discourse that is similar to the peace discourse that is created in English would provide interesting insights into the peace education that is occurring in World's Largest Lesson. Comparing how the lessons create similar or dissimilar knowledge surrounding the discourse of peace could further strengthen the conclusions in this thesis, or could provide an important counter argument.

This same reasoning that has been used in this thesis could be applied to other places in peace education, such as exploring university peace programs, peace centers, or peace classrooms. Continuing the exploration of concepts of violence in peace education would give better insights into how different sites of peace education are educating for peace, and therefore how they are or are not educating for the transformative change transnational feminism calls for. Alternatively, an exploration into concepts of violence could also be applied to educational research outside of peace education. Future research could explore how different kinds of education are acknowledging or ignoring the interconnectedness of different forms of violence in educational policies, curricula, classrooms, materials, or school policies.

Future research could also consider how critical peace educators or other critical educators are engaging with concepts of racism, sexism, nationalism, ableism, homophobia, transphobia, and more. Further research on how critical educators are engaging with these topics in their classrooms, in the literature they assign, in the stories they tell, all could raise implications for critical educators in all fields, not just peace education. Future research could continue engaging in feminist theory and practice in order to keep looking for new frameworks to challenge in order to make connections between peace education, international and comparative education, transnational feminism, and all sites of education in pursuit of creating a more just and peaceful world.

Chapter 11

11. References

- Adamson, B. & Morris, P. (2007). Comparing Curricula. In M. Bray, B. Adamson & M. Mason (Eds.), *Comparative education research: Approaches and methods* (pp. 263-282). Hong Kong: The University of Hong Kong.
- Alcoff, L. (2017). Decolonizing Feminist Philosophy. In M. McLaren (Ed.), *Decolonizing feminism: transnational feminism and globalization*. (pp. 1-18). Rowan & Littlefield International Ltd.
- Appelbaum, B. (2010). Race, Critical Race Theory and Whiteness. *International Encyclopedia of Education* (Third Edition) pp. 36-43.
- Arnove, R. F. (2009). World-Systems Analysis and Comparative Education in the Age of Globalization. In R. Cowen & A. M. Kazamias (Eds.), *International handbook of comparative education* (pp. 101-120). London: Springer
- Bajaj, M. (2008a). Introduction. In M. Bajaj (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of peace education*. (pp. 1-14). IAP
- Bajaj, M. (2008b). Critical Peace Education. In M. Bajaj (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of peace education*. (pp. 135-146). IAP
- Bajaj, M. (2008c). Glossary of Terms. In M. Bajaj (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of peace education*. (pp. 163-167). IAP
- Bajaj, M., & Chiu, B. (2009). Education for sustainable development as peace education. *Peace & Change*, 34(4), 441-455.
- Bajaj, M. (2015). 'Pedagogies of resistance and critical peace education praxis. *Journal of Peace Education*, 12(2), 154-166.
- Bajaj, M (2016). In the Gaze of Gandhi: Peace Education in Contemporary India. In M. Bajaj & M. Hantzopoulos. (Eds.), *Peace education: International perspectives* (pp. 107-122). Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Bajaj, M. & Hantzopoulos, M. (2016a). Introduction. In M. Bajaj, & M. Hantzopoulos (Eds.), *Peace education: International perspectives* (pp. 1-16). Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Bajaj, M. & Hantzopoulos, M. (2016b). Conclusion: Critical Directions for Peace Education. In M. Bajaj & M. Hantzopoulos. (Eds.), *Peace education: International perspectives* (pp. 232-238). Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Baksh- Soodeen, R. & Harcourt, W. (2015). Introduction; Rethinking Knowledge, Power, and Social Change. In R. Baksh-Soodeen & W. Harcourt, (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of transnational feminist movements*. (pp. 82-115). Oxford Handbooks.
- Bannerji, H. (2018). Materializing Class, Historicizing Culture. In L. Carty & C. Mohanty (Eds.), *Feminist Freedom Warriors*. (pp.51-70). Haymarket Books.

- Bermeo, M. (2016). Teaching for Peace In Settings Affected by Urban Violence: Reflections from Guayaquil, Ecuador. In M. Bajaj & M. Hantzopoulos. (Eds.), *Peace education: International perspectives* (pp. 157-173). Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Brantmeier, E. J. (2013). Toward a critical peace education for sustainability. *Journal of peace education, 10*(3), 242-258.
- Brantmeier, E. J., & Bajaj, M. (2013). Peace education praxis: Select resources for educators and researchers. *Educating about social issues in the 20th and 21st centuries: A critical annotated bibliography, 2*, 139-159.
- Bray, M., Adamson, B., & Mason, M. (2014). Introduction. In M. Bray, B. Adamson, and M. Mason (Eds.), *Comparative education research: Approaches and methods*. (pp.1-18). (Vol. 19). Springer.
- Brisolara, S., & Seigart, D. (2014). Feminist Evaluation Research. In S.N. Hesse-Biber, (Ed.), *Handbook of feminist research: Theory and praxis*. (pp. 1-32). SAGE publications.
- Brock-Utne, B. (1989). *Feminist perspectives on peace and peace education*. Pergamon.
- Bruce Pratt, M. (2018). Being in Motion. In L. Carty & C. Mohanty (Eds.), *Feminist Freedom Warriors*. (pp.71-84). Haymarket Books.
- Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods* (Fifth Edition). Oxford University Press.
- Burns, R. (2008). Comparative and International Education and Peace Education. In M. Bajaj (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of peace education*. (pp. 117-126). IAP
- Cagan, L. (2008). Reflections on Feminism, War and the Politics of Dissent. In R. Riley, C. Mohanty & M. Pratt (Eds.), *Feminism And War: Confronting U.S. Imperialism*. (pp. 250-257). Zed Books Ltd.
- Call-Cummings, M., & Hook, M. R. (2015). Endorsing empowerment? A critical comparative study of peace education in Jamaica and Peru. *Journal of Peace Education, 12*(1), 92-108.
- Cann, C. N. (2012). Harvesting social change: A peace education program in three acts. *Journal of Peace Education, 9*(3), 211-223.
- Carty, L. & Mohanty, C. (2018). Introduction. In L. Carty & C. Mohanty (Eds.), *Feminist Freedom Warriors*. (pp. 1-14). Haymarket Books.
- Carty, L. & Mohanty, C. (2015). Mapping Transnational Feminist Engagements: Neoliberalism and the Politics of Solidarity. In R. Baksh-Soodeen & W. Harcourt, (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of transnational feminist movements*. (pp. 82-115). Oxford Handbooks.
- Chew, H. (2008). What's Left? After 'Imperial Feminist' Hijackings. In R. Riley, C. Mohanty & M. Pratt (Eds.), *Feminism And War: Confronting U.S. Imperialism*. (pp. 75-90). Zed Books Ltd.
- Christopher, D. H., & Taylor, M. J. (2011). Social justice and critical peace education: Common ideals guiding student teacher transformation. *Journal of Peace Education, 8*(3), 295-313.
- Chubbuck, S. M., & Zembylas, M. (2011). Toward a critical pedagogy for nonviolence in urban school contexts. *Journal of Peace Education, 8*(3), 259-275.

- Codex (2018). Rules and guidelines for research. Retrieved April 2, 2019 from <http://www.codex.vr.se/en/forskninghumsam.shtml>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018) *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Crenshaw, C. (1991). Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43 (6), 1241-1299.
- Dallimore, E. J. (2000). A feminist response to issues of validity in research. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 23(2), 157-181.
- Darweish, M., & Mohammed, M. A. (2018). History education in schools in Iraqi Kurdistan: representing values of peace and violence. *Journal of Peace Education*, 15(1), 48-75.
- Davis, A. (2008). A Vocabulary for Feminist Praxis: On War and Radical Critique. In R. Riley, C. Mohanty & M. Pratt (Eds.), *Feminism And War: Confronting U.S. Imperialism*. (pp. 1-26). Zed Books Ltd.
- Davis, A. (2018). Troubling Explanatory Frameworks. In L. Carty & C. Mohanty (Eds.), *Feminist Freedom Warriors*. (pp.35-49). Haymarket Books.
- Eisenstein, Z. (2018). Toward a New Feminist Politics of Possibility and Solidarity. In L. Carty & C. Mohanty (Eds.), *Feminist Freedom Warriors*. (pp.131-150). Haymarket Books.
- Falcón, S. M. (2016). Transnational feminism as a paradigm for decolonizing the practice of research: Identifying feminist principles and methodology criteria for US-based scholars. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 37(1), 174-194.
- Fonow, M., & Cook, J. A. (2005). Feminist methodology: New applications in the academy and public policy. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 30(4), 2211-2236.
- Fultner, B. (2017). The Dynamics of Transnational Feminist Dialogue. In M. McLaren (Ed.), *Decolonizing feminism: transnational feminism and globalization*. (pp. 203-230). Rowan & Littlefield International Ltd.
- Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of peace research*, 6(3), 167-191.
- Galtung, J. (2008). Form and Content of Peace Education. In Bajaj, M. (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of peace education*. (pp. 49-66). IAP
- Galtung, J. (2013). Violence: direct, structural and cultural. In J. Galtung & D. Fisher (Eds.), *Johan Galtung* (pp. 35-40). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Gbowee, L. (2011). *Mighty be our powers: How sisterhood, prayer, and sex changed a nation at war*. Beast Books.
- Gill, R. (2000). Discourse Analysis. In M.W. Bauer & G. Gaskell (Eds.), *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound*. Londong: Sage.
- Hantzopoulos, M. (2011). Institutionalizing critical peace education in public schools: A case for comprehensive implementation. *Journal of Peace Education*, 8(3), 225-242.
- Harris, I. (2008). History of Peace Education. In Bajaj, M. (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of peace education*. (pp. 15-124). IAP

- Hawkesworth, M. (2014). Truth and truths in feminist knowledge production. In Hesse-Biber, S. N. *Handbook of feminist research: Theory and praxis* (pp. 92-118). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Hernández- Castillo, A (2018). Searching for Truth in Community. In L. Carty & C. Mohanty (Eds.), *Feminist Freedom Warriors*. (pp.107-130). Haymarket Books.
- Hill Collins, P. & Bilge, S. (2016). Intersectionality. Cambridge, UK & Malden, US: Polity Press.
- Horner, L (2016). Uncertainty, Fluidity, and Occupying Spaces in- between: Peace Education Practices in Mindanao, the Philippines. In M. Bajaj & M. Hantzopoulos. (Eds.), *Peace education: International perspectives* (pp. 125-140). Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Jäger, S. (2001). Discourse and knowledge: Theoretical and methodological aspects of a critical discourse and dispositive analysis. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 32-63). Sage Publications.
- Jørgensen, M. W., & Phillips, L. J. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. Sage.
- Kaplan, C., & Grewal, I. (1999). Transnational feminist cultural studies: Beyond the Marxism/poststructuralism/feminism divides. In C. Kaplan, N. Alarón, & M. Moallem (Eds.), *Between woman and nation: Nationalisms, transnational feminisms, and the state* (pp.349-363). London: Duke University Press.
- Kwon, S., Walker, D. I., & Kristjánsson, K. (2018). Shining light into dark shadows of violence and learned helplessness: peace education in South Korean schools. *Journal of Peace Education*, 15(1), 24-47.
- Lazar, M. M. (2007). Feminist critical discourse analysis: Articulating a feminist discourse praxis. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 4(2), 141-164.
- Leavy, P. L. (2007). The feminist practice of content analysis. In S.N. Hesse-Biber & P. Leavy. (Eds.), *Feminist research practice: A primer* (pp.223-248). Sage Publications.
- Marshall, J. (2014). *Introduction to comparative and international education*. SAGE Publications Limited.
- McCorkle, W. (2017). Problematizing war: reviving the historical focus of peace education. *Journal of Peace Education*, 14(3), 261-281.
- Meyer, M. (2001). Between theory, method, and politics: positioning of the approaches to CDA. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 14-32). Sage Publications.
- Mizzi, R. (2010). Let's get this straightened out: finding a place and presence for sexual/gender identity-difference in peace education. *Journal of Peace Education*, 7(2), 139-156.
- Mohanty, C. T. (2003). *Feminism without borders*. Duke University Press.
- Mohanty, C. T. (2013). Transnational feminist crossings: On neoliberalism and radical critique. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 38(4), 967-991.
- Mullet, D. R. (2018). A general critical discourse analysis framework for educational research. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 29(2), 116-142.
- O'Neill, M. (2019). Specialized Literature of the Journal of Peace Education: Concepts of justice and violence in critical peace education.

- Okazawa-Rey, M. (2018). No Freedom Without Connection. In L. Carty & C. Mohanty (Eds.), *Feminist Freedom Warriors*. (pp.15-34). Haymarket Books.
- Page, J. (2008). The United Nations and Peace Education. In M. Bajaj (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of peace education*. (pp. 75-84). IAP
- Parekh, S. & Wilcox, S. (2018). Feminist Perspectives on Globalization. In N. Edward (Ed). *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved February 18, 2019 from <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2018/entries/feminism-globalization>.
- Patil, V. (2013). From patriarchy to intersectionality: A transnational feminist assessment of how far we've really come. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 38(4), 847-867.
- Phillips, N., & Hardy, C. (2002). *Discourse Analysis: Investigating Processes of Social Construction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Potter, J. (1997). Discourse analysis as a way of analysing naturally occurring talk. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method, and Practice*. London:Sage.
- Ragland, D. (2015). Betty Reardon's philosophy of peace education and the centrality of justice. *Journal of Peace Education*, 12(1), 37-55.
- Reardon, B. A. (1999). Peace Education: A Review and Projection. Peace Education Reports No. 17.
- Reardon, B. (2015a). Women's Movements and Human Futures. In D.T. Snauwaert & B. Reardon (Eds.), *Betty A. Reardon: Key texts in gender and peace*. (pp. 3-18). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Reardon, B. (2015b). Moving to the Future and Debating the Future. In D.T. Snauwaert & B. Reardon (Eds.), *Betty A. Reardon: Key texts in gender and peace*. (pp. 19-34). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Reardon, B. (2015c). Gender and Peace: Toward a Gender Inclusive, Holistic, Perspeticve. In D.T. Snauwaert & B. Reardon (Eds.), *Betty A. Reardon: Key texts in gender and peace*. (pp. 87-108). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Reardon, B. (2015d). Women and Human Security: A Feminist Framework and Critique of the Prevailing Patriarchal Security System. In D.T. Snauwaert & B. Reardon (Eds.), *Betty A. Reardon: Key texts in gender and peace*. (pp. 109-128). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Reardon, B. (2015e). Epilogue: Toward a Strategy for Transcending Patriarchy. In D.T. Snauwaert & B. Reardon (Eds.), *Betty A. Reardon: Key texts in gender and peace*. (pp. 141-149). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Reardon, B. (2015f). Human rights learning: Pedagogies and politics of peace. In *Betty A. Reardon: A Pioneer in Education for Peace and Human Rights* (pp. 145-164). Springer, Cham.
- Snauwaert, D. (2011). Social justice and the philosophical foundations of critical peace education: Exploring Nussbaum, Sen, and Freire. *Journal of Peace Education*, 8(3), 315-331.

- Snauwaert, D. T. (2015). Preface. In D.T. Snauwaert & B. Reardon (Eds.), *Betty A. Reardon: Key texts in gender and peace*. (pp. ix-xx). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Swedish Research Council (2017). *Good Research Practice*. Stockholm. Vetenskapsrådet.
- Taber, N. (2015). Pedagogical discourses of gender, peace, and equality: Jane Addams Children's Book Awards. *Journal of Peace Education*, 12(1), 1-14.
- The World's Largest Lesson (n.d.a) World's Largest Lesson. Retrieved March 20, 2019 from <http://worldslargestlesson.globalgoals.org/project-everyone/>.
- Understanding Community Violence (n.d.) World's Largest Lesson. Retrieved March 20, 2019 from <http://cdn.worldslargestlesson.globalgoals.org/2016/06/Understanding-Community-Violence-LP-PDF.pdf>.
- The Power of Peace (n.d.) The World's Largest Lesson. Retrieved March 20, 2019 from http://cdn.worldslargestlesson.globalgoals.org/2016/06/8_The_Power_of_Peace.pdf
- United Nations. (1945). *Charter of the United Nations and the statute of the International Court of Justice*. New York: United Nations Department of Public Information.
- UNESCO. (1945). Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. London: United Nations. (Adopted on November 16, 1945).
- United Nations General Assembly. (2015). 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Retrieved March 20, 2019 from <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/transformingourworld>
- Weiss, G., & Wodak, R. (2003). Introduction: Theory, interdisciplinarity and critical discourse analysis. In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Critical discourse analysis* (pp. 1-32). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Williams, H (2016). Lingering Colonialities as Blockades to Peace Education: School Violence in Trinidad. In M. Bajaj & M. Hantzopoulos. (Eds.), *Peace education: International perspectives* (pp. 141-156). Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Willis, A. (2017). An education for peace model that centres on belief systems: the theory behind the model. *Journal of Peace Education*, 14(3), 310-324.
- Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA is about- a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 1-14). Sage Publications.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). Critical discourse analysis: History, agenda, theory and methodology. *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, 2, 1-33.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (2007). Intersectionality, Citizenship and Contemporary Politics of Belonging. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 10 (4), 561- 574.