CURRICULUM INQUIRY OISE UT

Peacebuilding Dialogue Pedagogies in Canadian Classrooms

KATHY BICKMORE

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

ABSTRACT

Constructively critical and inclusive dialogue about conflictual issues is one necessary ingredient of both democratic citizenship and peacebuilding learning. However, in North American classrooms populated by heterogeneous and non-affluent students, pedagogies involving discussion of conflicts are rarely fully implemented, sustained, or inclusive of all students' voices. This article reports the results of a study describing contrasting ways in which teachers actually did implement (or attempt) dialogic pedagogies on difficult issues in Canadian public school classrooms. Based on a series of observations and interviews in 11 public elementary, intermediate, and secondary classrooms (linked to three different professional development initiatives), the article examines key elements—in the content of the conflicts discussed; in the processes and task structures for classroom discussion; in the norms, skills, and relationships established; and in the school contexts—that make such dialogic classroom activities more (or less) feasible to implement and sustain, more (or less) inclusive of previously marginalized voices, and more (or less) constructive for democratic and peacebuilding education.

Paradoxically, peacebuilding and democratic education require talking about conflict. Although nobody claims that critical, conflictual dialogue would be *sufficient* to build democratic peace, it certainly is one *necessary* aspect of education for democratic peacebuilding—especially in relatively peaceful contexts, in which dominant populations have the privilege to ignore or deny such conflicts (Apple, 1979; Bekerman, 2007; Nagda & Gurin, 2007; Novelli & Lopes Cardozo, 2008). However, in North American classrooms, conflictual discussion pedagogies may be infrequent, not inclusive or not sustained (Kahne & Middaugh, 2008; Simon, 2001). Teachers frequently report feeling unprepared to lead such discussions, and yet teacher professional development rarely addresses this challenge (Bickmore, 2005a; Donnelly & Hughes, 2006; Torney-Purta, Richardson, & Barber, 2005; Yamashita, 2006). This article reports results of a study designed to inform the analysis and improvement of such practice in public school classrooms.

Curriculum Inquiry 44:4 (2014)
Published by Wiley Periodicals, Inc., 350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148, USA, and 9600 Garsington Road, Oxford OX4 2DQ, UK
doi: 10.1111/curi.12056

The Peace-Building Dialogue in Schools research project involved case studies of elementary and secondary teaching about and discussion of social and interpersonal conflicts in relation to different curriculum subject areas, in public schools with diverse populations. The research goal was to describe the elements of dialogic education about conflicts in three contrasting professional development initiatives related to peacebuilding and infused in the classroom practice of selected teachers who had participated in that professional development (the K–12 classrooms are reported upon in this article). Analyses of classroom observations examine the pedagogical principles and context factors that helped to shape these learning opportunities as potential democratic peacebuilding education, including the ways they sometimes engaged diverse and unequal-status students.

The following analytical dimensions, derived from theory and research cited below, organize the literature review and discussion of findings on opportunities to learn peacebuilding dialogue: First, a crucial element of both democracy and peacebuilding education is recognition, expression, and mutual engagement with contrasting and conflicting perspectives. This may involve infusing multiple perspectives and conflictual issues in subject matter, and/or elicitation of the contrasting perspectives of diverse students as they engage with that subject matter. Second, various pedagogical task structures—such as lecture, debate, cooperative group work, or peacemaking circle dialogue—differently shape diverse students' opportunities, and the teacher and/or peer support they receive, to actually exercise agency, voice, critical or creative thinking, and to engage with their peers' divergent perspectives. Closely related are the explicit and implicit opportunities for students to learn and practice the skills and normative climates that foster inclusive, cooperative, and peaceful communication and interaction. Last, various school community and professional context factors may help, hinder, and shape teachers' opportunities to implement and sustain curriculum engagement with conflictual subject matter, inclusive participatory pedagogical structures, and peacebuilding norms and skill-building opportunities.

CONTEXTS FOR CLASSROOM DIALOGUE

Inclusive discussion of divergent and conflicting standpoints and perspectives is an essential aspect of democratic citizenship and peacebuilding practice. Opportunities to participate and be heard in such dialogue are equally central to culturally responsive pedagogies, which can help students to connect school knowledge to their diverse life experiences and cultural knowledge (Howard, 2003; K. Morrison, Robbins, & Rose, 2008). Conversely, pedagogies that avoid juxtaposing alternate viewpoints, or critiquing the inequitable and often violent status quo, constitute neither (inclusive) democratic nor (transformative and reconciliatory) peacebuilding education (Davies, 2004; Kennelly & Llewellyn, 2011).

There is evidence that open classroom discussion of contrasting viewpoints is associated with student participants' development of capacities and inclinations for engaged and pluralist citizenship (Hahn, 2010; Hess & Avery, 2008; Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, & Schultz, 2001). However, such democratic peacebuilding citizenship learning opportunities are rare in Canadian and U.S. schools, especially in classrooms populated by heterogeneous and non-affluent students (Dull & Murrow, 2008; Kahne & Middaugh, 2008; Peck, Thompson, Chareka, Joshee, & Sears, 2010). School system context factors—such as standardized pre-specified curriculum expectations, high-stakes testing, timetables, and scant teacher development opportunities—may constrain implementation of dialogic pedagogies addressing conflict (Harber & Sakade, 2009; Peck et al., 2010). At the same time, small-scale studies demonstrate that democratic peacebuilding dialogue pedagogies clearly can be successfully implemented in various grade level and subject areas (Cook-Sather, 2006; Smith & Fairman, 2005; Stevahn, 2004; and see below). Thus contemporary mass schooling contexts can discourage (but do not prevent) implementation of dialogue-based democratic peacebuilding pedagogies. To help publicly funded education to fulfill its democratic peacebuilding mission more than it reinforces the violent and inequitable status quo (Bickmore, 2008; Davies, 2005), it will help to investigate the character of dialogic pedagogies actually implemented in such contexts.

CONFLICTUAL CONTENT

Democracy is impossible without opportunities for recognition and informed collective decision making in relation to diversity and disagreement. Contrasting and conflicting perspectives present incentives to engage and opportunities to learn, especially when encountered in reasonably cooperative, mutually respectful, open and open-minded classroom contexts (Claire & Holden, 2007; Hess & Avery, 2008; Johnson & Johnson, 2009). When young people report that they have experienced open discussion of conflicting perspectives on social and political issues in their classrooms, they often exhibit stronger citizenship understandings and stronger inclinations to engage as citizens, compared to students who do not report having experienced such citizenship learning opportunities (Claire & Holden, 2007; Hess & Avery, 2008; Johnson & Johnson, 2009; see also Kahne & Sporte, 2008; Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr, & Losito, 2010).

Similarly, peacebuilding is impossible without attention to the conflicts that otherwise impede just peace. Peacebuilding education, both inter-group and interpersonal, requires dialogue across difference for understanding and handling conflicts (Bickmore, 2011; Bush & Saltarelli, 2000; Harris, 2004; Kaufman, 2005). Regular opportunities to participate in voicing and listening to peers' perspectives about conflicts are associated

with students' development of skills, understandings, and peaceful inclinations (Burrell, Zirbel, & Allen, 2003; Garrard & Lipsey, 2007; Jones, 2004; McCluskey et al., 2008).

Inevitably, conflictual issues are embedded in inequitable power structures. One definition of "controversial" is "something in which the Establishment does not agree" (Galtung, 1985, p. 6). Critical educational theories generally assume that equity and justice questions can—must—be discussed in classrooms, yet acknowledge the perils and partialities of implementing politicized (and not indoctrinatory) classroom talk, in the context of unequal social power embedded in subject matter, among students, and between students and teachers (Kumashiro, 2000; North, 2009; Vibert & Shields, 2003).

Existing research on teachers' facilitation of conflict dialogue learning opportunities tends to describe a few exemplary teachers with extraordinary skills and commitments to effective teaching with controversial issues (e.g., Applebee, Langer, Nystrand, & Gamoran, 2004; Flynn, 2009; Hess, 2002). However, the kinds of pedagogies that students actually call "issues discussion" (on the surveys that demonstrate citizenship achievement correlates) may reflect a lower standard for classroom exchange of views—presumably more commonly implemented—rather than sustained, thoughtful, or passionate disagreement (Hess & Ganzler, 2007). Thus it is important to examine the kinds of conflicts and differences actually aired in classrooms, and the breadth of viewpoints and voices invited into these conversations, to understand the everyday possibilities for democratic peacebuilding education. Educative conflicts may include everyday differences, as well as larger "unsettled" controversies between two or more disputing sides (Hess, 2009), and complex power-imbalanced injustice challenges involving structural harm (Galtung, 1969) as well as conscious or unconscious human disagreement (Bickmore, 2005b).

PEDAGOGICAL TASK STRUCTURES

A core principle of both democracy and peacebuilding is inclusion, in particular of minority voices and unpopular viewpoints, to offset the dangers of domination and tyranny of majorities. The lowest status people in any classroom would be most at risk of being further marginalized when conflicts arise (Ellsworth, 1989; Levinson, 2003; White, 2011): what pedagogical task structures mitigate those risks and facilitate broad, equitable mutual engagement? Theories of culturally responsive pedagogy argue that eliciting and building upon diverse students' lived cultural knowledge can help to facilitate relatively equitable (democratic) learning opportunities (Ladson-Billings, 1995; K. Morrison et al., 2008; Young, 2010). Gender inequity, similarly, shapes (and is shaped by) the assertive or accommodating ways various people talk about or silence

divergent concerns (Cook, 2007; Gordon, 2006; Weikel, 1995). Thus teachers' pedagogical task structures include, affirm, or submerge particular identities, experiences, and concerns, with ramifications for building (or impeding) inclusive, democratic "peace" through classroom talk.

In loosely structured student group interaction, those who begin with confidence and peer esteem (linked to prior privilege) tend to speak and work with learning materials more, thereby gaining further confidence and competence at the expense of lower-status peers (Cohen 2004). Simply assigning students to work together in groups to produce a joint report does not guarantee true cooperation. Most often the group dynamics of an unstructured "cooperative" situation of this sort mirror the larger competitive classroom dynamic (Aronson, 2000, p. 134).

However, as Cohen's and Aronson's research demonstrates, carefully structured group work on complex tasks can help significantly to alleviate such patterns of inequality: It helps to engage students in rich, open-ended tasks that require multiple abilities, and to teach each student necessary skills (and hold them accountable) for carrying out a range of co-leadership roles. I view these kinds of solutions as applicable to the democratic equity challenges of dialogic pedagogies, in large as well as small groups. Clearly, even implicit reinforcement of social inequality or exclusion would contradict peacebuilding. Thus this research examines the ways teachers structured and supported diverse students' full participation (speaking up and being heard) in classroom talk.

SKILL-BUILDING AND NORMATIVE CLIMATE

Democratic peacebuilding dialogue about conflictual questions requires as groundwork, and builds through practice, a repertoire of skills and norms for nonviolent interpersonal communication. Dialogue preparation and processes are shaped by (and shape) participants' norms, beliefs and competence for critical and creative thinking and communication across difference.

A study of how one grade 5 language arts teacher in a middle-class community created a classroom environment supporting "authentic discussions" captures a set of procedural and normative principles consistent with the scholarship cited above on classroom discussion and democratic peacebuilding dialogue:

- a standing invitation to class members for participation
- encourage listening attentively and respectfully to the contributions of other members
- students had the right to raise issues they were interested in and to influence the direction of the classroom discussion . . .

- participants were expected to express their opinions and ideas about the issues at hand
- connections to past knowledge and experience . . . bringing out-of-school lives of class members into the classroom
- community-building gestures . . . genial treatment of co-participants
- the right to produce humorous comments that were relevant to the conversation at hand and did not violate the rights of other members (Hadjioannou, 2007, pp. 392–393).

Restorative peacebuilding education theories affirm similar norms, additionally recognizing the value of people telling their stories, welcoming emotional as well as cognitive engagement, and explicit equality among participants (B. Morrison & Vaandering, 2012; Pranis, 2005). Effective teacher facilitation of educative democratic discussion embodies values of reciprocity (privileging the Other's vantage point), humility (understanding that one's own understanding is both biased and incomplete), and caution (taking time to listen and consider the merits of opposing viewpoints before challenging) (Parker, 2010). Such pedagogies invite divergent perspectives into classroom lessons, and guide constructive engagement with those conflicts.

Classroom dialogue pedagogies have different purposes—developing understanding (interpretation) or making decisions (engagement toward action) (Parker, 2010). Unfortunately, opportunities to address any such higher-order questions may be less frequently available to working-class and racialized students, compared to their more privileged peers (Anyon, 1981; Dull & Murrow, 2008; Hemmings, 2000). Thus, it is important to examine the norms and competencies taught and practiced during classroom lessons, with particular attention to how teachers make expression divergent or conflicting viewpoints accessible to whom.

STUDY DESIGN, METHODS, AND DATA SOURCES

In response to the concerns raised in the above literature, this research examines how democratically oriented peacebuilding dialogue may be feasibly implemented in publicly funded K–12 classroom contexts. This study describes the range of conflictual and potentially conflictual subject matter brought into lessons, including everyday differences and power-imbalanced justice challenges as well as disputes or controversies—to examine what may increase the breadth of divergent perspectives that students are enabled to recognize and to raise, and what happens when they do. Equally important, the research compares how various participation formats and tasks brought diverse students' voices, identities, and viewpoints into classroom conversations. Not least, this research examines the ways teachers guided individuals and classroom communities to

develop capacities and norms for handling conflict in thoughtful, mutually respectful, inclusive and skillful ways (in the context of inherently competitive and hierarchical school contexts).

This research project was organized around case studies of primary and secondary public school teachers facilitating dialogic learning activities addressing social and interpersonal conflicts, and of three initiatives designed to help teachers develop capacity to facilitate such peacebuilding education. An observation protocol guided collection of qualitative descriptions of participants (who was included and why), context (timing, physical setup), broad types and topics of conflict dialogue (such as circle or group work), facilitator strategies (how processes were introduced, guided, concluded), content (the range of viewpoints presented or elicited from students), participation patterns (such as which participants spoke and how much, how participants appeared to listen or ignore and/or respond to peers' perspectives, including apparent indicators of status, inclusion, and exclusion), and support for skill or norm development (such as modeling, scaffolding, or feedback). Semistructured interviews invited teachers' descriptions of their own pedagogical patterns along similar lines, asked them to describe and reflect upon particular episodes in which they had facilitated dialogue about conflicts, and inquired about professional development and school-context factors that had helped or hindered their implementation of peacebuilding dialogue pedagogies.

The study involved qualitative, constructivist analysis of different ways in which dialogue on divergent perspectives and difficult issues may be implemented in public school contexts, and the observable learning opportunities in which various students engaged. Such ethnographic case study methods facilitate rich, flexible descriptions of naturally occurring activities in regular classroom settings, attentive to the experiences of diverse participants (Charmaz, 2000; Miller & Glassner, 1997). Sites in the full study include three teacher professional development initiatives (identified to facilitate recruitment of interested teachers and to sharpen the research team's awareness of key elements in facilitation of dialogic pedagogies) and eleven public school classroom teachers in one urban Canadian school district who each had participated in one of those professional development initiatives (some of these case studies are presented in Bickmore, 2013; Bickmore & Kovalchuk, 2012; Bickmore & Parker, in press 2014).

Teachers who viewed themselves as committed to peacebuilding dialogue pedagogies were selected purposively to reflect a diversity of approaches, participants, and contexts, working with students from different ethnocultural and economic backgrounds. Data collected, summarized in Table 1, include about 80 hours of classroom observations in the public school sites, documents (classroom materials) related to those lessons, and one or two semistructured 40-to-90–minute interviews with each teacher in each case study site (people's and programs' names are pseudonyms).[1] The selection of lessons to observe in each teacher's classroom depended on each

TABLE 1.
Case Study Data Summary

Professional Development Initiative	School Context	Teacher, Grade, Subject Area	Data Collected
Genocide History Citizenship (GHC)		Rachel Baker Greg Lewis	5 days (1,945 min) 2 interviews
	High School 9; inner city, diverse immigrant newcomers	Beth Samuels, grade 10 History	9 observations (495 min), 2 interviews
	High School 6; mixed middle class, majority white (68% English 1st L)	Anna Georgalis, grade 10 History	6 observations (440 min), 2 interviews
	High School 6	Pam Taylor, grade 11 English	4 observations (320 min), 2 interviews
Scripted Restorative Justice Conferencing (SRJC)		Jim Allen Henry Simon	2 days (840 min), 1 interview
	High School 8; inner city, diverse immigrant newcomers		
	High School 8	Laura Cole, grades 9 and 11 Drama	5 observations (400 min), 2 interviews
	High School 8	Karen Davis, grades 11–12 Social Science	1 observation (85 min), 1 interview
	High School 8	Mona Parisi, grades 10 and 12 Biology	6 observations (490 min), 2 interviews
Peacemaking Talking Circles (PTC)		Judith Neil Rose Jeelani	1 full and 2 half days (895 min), 2 interviews
	Elementary School 4 (grades K–4); magnet school, middle class, majority white	Nancy Holly, Kindergarten	7 observations (190 min), 2 interviews
	Elementary School 4	Carol Kelly, grades K–4 Arts	5 observations (170 min), 1 interview
	Elementary School 4	Fern Brown, grade 1	16 observations (510 min), 2 interviews
	Elementary School 2 (grades K–8); magnet school, middle class, majority white	Ellen Murphy (co-teacher Sheila Wood), grades 7–8 Social Studies/Language Arts	14 observations (450 min), 2 interviews
	Elementary School 2	Tracy Walker, grades 7–8 Social Studies/Language Arts	12 observations (900 min), 2 interviews

teacher's communication (in advance) with the research team, to focus on the lessons in which they planned to implement student-centred dialogue about conflicts. Due to uneven teacher availability and how (in)frequently they implemented such pedagogies, some case studies include many more observations than others. Thus the data summarized here illustrate the wide range of lessons that teacher participants themselves viewed as including constructive dialogue about conflicts, but do not document the frequency with which such pedagogies were implemented.

Specifically, the data analysis is based on iterative constant comparison of key elements in teachers' implemented curriculum and pedagogy for peacebuilding dialogue. The findings are reported below in relation to each of these elements:

- Conflictual content: recognition, expression, and engagement with contrasting and conflicting perspectives, and intersection of peacebuilding dialogue opportunities with regular classroom procedures and subject matter
- Pedagogical task structures: opportunities for diverse students to exercise agency and mutual engagement, and whether and how various students' imaginations, critiques, and lived experiences were invited into classroom conversations; and skill-building and normative climate; opportunities for diverse students (individually and collectively) to build peaceful conflict communication norms and skills
- Context factors that appeared to shape, help, and hinder dialogic peacebuilding pedagogies

The development of students' skills, beliefs, conceptual understandings, and classroom cultures conducive to high-quality educative discussion, "happens over time in a teacher's work, in many different activities. . . . [There are] routines, structures and skills learned at other times that may help to create a culture and a setting conducive to productive discussion" (Hatch & Grossman, 2009, p. 77). This presents a research challenge: a short series of observations (as in this study) *may* surface direct evidence of the pedagogies by which teachers fostered students' learning of norms and competencies, but often these had developed incrementally, prior to the lessons observed for this project. Thus the research goal was to recognize and interpret (inevitably partial) classroom observational evidence, supplemented by classroom materials and teacher interview evidence, about development over time of dialogic pedagogical content, spaces, norms, and competencies for handling social conflict.

RESULTS

This article summarizes cross-case analysis findings from the eleven public school classroom teaching cases—three to five cases associated with each of

three teacher professional development initiatives on dialogic peacebuilding education. All teacher participants had participated in one of three professional development initiatives relevant to facilitating conflictual discussion pedagogies (Bickmore, forthcoming 2014): a course on genocide history citizenship education that focused on building self-reflexive understanding of stigmatization, oppression, and human rights conflicts in historical and contemporary society; a restorative justice conferencing course that trained educators to lead a tightly scripted problem-solving procedure after incidents of harm and to apply related principles in simpler sharing circles; and a series of workshops on an elicitive peacemaking circle process in which a talking piece was passed around sequentially to invite each person to speak on conflicts that were either embedded in lesson subject matter or in post-incident interpersonal peacemaking. Although the three professional development initiatives approached facilitating conflictual dialogue pedagogies in very different ways, the research found as many differences within the clusters of teachers who participated in each initiative as between them.

The project did not collect teachers' professional histories other than seeking a diverse sample and ensuring that all had more than a year of post-graduate teaching experience. Participating teachers had much in common: We ended up with a sample of only white Anglophone women teachers, although encompassing Jews and gentiles, recent and non-recent family histories of migration to Canada, different socio-economic status, and small-town or urban backgrounds. Teachers taught a wide range of grade levels (K–12) and subject areas (language, science, history, geography, and drama). Primary teachers tended to emphasize skill and norm development for interpersonal communication and conflict management; secondary teachers tended to emphasize content-specific academic skills and subject matter. Yet there were also remarkable differences among teachers' pedagogies within grade levels.

Conflictual Content

All of the case study classrooms experienced implicit and explicit social difference and conflict—struggle or opposition among competing desires, needs, or demands—embedded in curriculum subject matter and in the social relations within each classroom community. However, most such conflict either was not confronted or was addressed in a peaceful manner, almost never escalating into hot disputes during the classroom observations. In keeping with Salomon's (2002) and Merelman's (1990) theories about peace education in relatively harmonious contexts like Canada's, and with the citizenship education research evidence (cited above) that open discussion of conflictual issues is fairly rare in North American public classrooms, this study found that many potentially educative conflicts (and many dissenting or subaltern perspectives) were not addressed in depth.

High School Settings. Among the three high school teachers who participated in the Genocide History Citizenship (GHC) professional development course, the two history teachers explicitly addressed social conflict, identity-linked social exclusion and scapegoating, and violence—in relation to Nazism and the Holocaust, immigration and discrimination in Canada, and more—in entirely different ways. One, Beth Samuels, presented primarily lectures and films emphasizing human rights violations in history and the ways individuals had resisted oppression, through cultural and political activities or daring acts of rescue. The other, Anna Georgalis, interspersed slide lectures with frequent whole-class discussions, comparing the escalating "Othering" policies and practices in Nazism and more recent genocide history to her students' lived experiences. The English teacher, Pam Taylor, engaged students in interpreting and occasionally discussing themes of social control, rigid gender and socio-economic role socialization, and inequality in relation to the film *Metropolis* and the novel *Brave New World*. In one exercise, small groups invented and performed skits in the format of a television dating show, in which various characters interpreted book themes ("How did [character John's] childhood influence his development as an adult?" "What is the role of 'truth' in this world as it relates to the government?"), and compared these characteristics to social relations in their contemporary world. Although the GHC professional development had emphasized learner reflection about their own in- and out-group identities in relation to the historical emergence and prevention of genocide—and all three teachers did mention links to students' experience—during our observations only Anna Georgalis encouraged her students to discuss their personal standpoints, for instance by examining their own intersecting identities and creating their own Holocaust memorials. Beth Samuels and Pam Taylor emphasized subject matter *about* social conflict including exploitation, more than developing students' dialogic skills, standpoints, or consciousness of their own and others' lived social differences in relation to that content.

These three teachers' lessons recognized diverse experiences and conflicting perspectives in history and literature, while communicating the teachers' own preferred human rights standpoints. Beth Samuels and Pam Taylor presented the conflicts embedded in their subject matter as "settled" (Hess, 2009) in the sense that students were not encouraged to express dissenting perspectives on human rights questions. Some of Anna Georgalis's lessons, such as those presenting anti-Semitic Nazi propaganda images, and evidence that newspapers had made Canadians aware of Nazi death camps well before the end of the war, similarly framed human rights matters as settled. She rejected a student's suggested thesis topic regarding whether the Holocaust had been just, explaining that she did not want to dignify that possibility as a legitimate argument. Other Anna Georgalis lessons, however, managed to re-open for conflictual discussion certain dimensions of human rights questions. For instance, while inviting students

to identify their outsider and insider identities on individual web charts, Ms. Georgalis disclosed that in elementary school she had been bullied as an immigrant outsider. She engaged students in disagreement dialogue about whether a particular video constituted an appropriate Holocaust memorial—asserting that she herself was unsure about its appropriateness. Moving the lens, inviting students to express conflicting opinions about how justice issues should be applied, provoked direct personal engagement by many students. The case of Anna Georgalis demonstrates how one might teach about conflictual issues from a human rights perspective, while at the same time engaging students in voicing opposing viewpoints to motivate them to take an interest and to take a stand. Presenting human rights conflicts as not entirely resolved, she framed students as potential actors in the still-unjust social and political world.

The Scripted Restorative Justice Conferencing (SRJC) training taught a formal process for facilitating problem-solving dialogue among offenders, victims, their supporters, and community representatives after incidents of harm, and reviewed an earlier workshop applying similar principles to more flexible, pro-active pedagogies for peacebuilding inside classrooms. Classroom case studies for this research examined the latter—infusion of restorative principles, including conflict dialogue, in regular subject area lessons. Development of skills, opportunities, and relationships for constructive communication about conflict were part of these three teachers' explicit curriculum, alongside drama, social science, or biology.

Laura Cole opened and closed every (grade 9 or 11) drama class with a community circle, beginning by inviting students to self-assess and disclose (by raising hands) how they were feeling ("On a scale of 1 [terrible] to 10 [wonderful], who's feeling like a 5 or 6 . . . a 1 or 2? . . . Everybody be gentle with those folks today: they're having a hard day"). Next, she asked every student in turn one open-ended opinion question, such as naming which famous person they would like to take to lunch or how they had liked an assembly attended the day before. Ms. Cole reminded students to listen respectfully to peers' diverse opinions, and normally did not allocate time for further discussion. In her whole-class drama exercises, students practiced interpersonal skills such as non-verbal communication and sometimes conflict role-play improvisations such as persuading a reluctant partner to leave a store or to get up from a chair. Debriefing circles after activities also invited expression of conflicting views, for instance one day about welfare policies. Laura Cole's drama curriculum created space for interpersonal conflict communication skill practice, explicitly inviting students' feelings and imaginations—important elements of peacebuilding—into classroom conversations.

Karen Davis's grade 12 social sciences course focused directly on social and political conflict issues, at local through global levels. Students presented and discussed results of their research on foreign policy "hot spots" and human rights issues. She chose cases of public policy and cultural

change likely to elicit students' lived experience, such as the social impacts of Internet-based technologies. She explicitly taught skills for constructively critical dialogue about these conflicts, as will be described below, and students were systematically encouraged and given space to constructively challenge peers' claims.

Biology teacher Mona Parisi regularly guided her students to apply science concepts to discussions of contentious contemporary science-in-society issues. In a university-bound grade 12 genetics unit, all students prepared and led small-group discussions on controversies such as genetically modified food, use and control of genomes, and genetically personalized medical treatment. In a non-university–bound grade 12 biology class, on a day when only nine (all non-White) students were present, Ms. Parisi facilitated dialogue on a controversial issue: whether and to what degree HIV-AIDS treatment should be covered by government-subsidized health care in relation to a scenario in which a couple had engaged in unsafe sex practices although the man knew he carried the HIV virus. Like Anna Georgalis (history), Mona Parisi presented human rights issues as not entirely settled, moving the lens to invite disagreement dialogue about how justice principles should be applied. To conclude that dialogue, Ms. Parisi invited the students to propose and build consensus on an action plan, to improve schoolmates' awareness about sexually transmitted disease risks.

The latter three teachers, and sometimes Anna Georgalis above, engaged all of their students in applying drama skills, social science research, history, or biology concepts to take stands, listen, and respond to peers' alternative viewpoints on relevant conflicts—linking students' own peacebuilding citizenship to regular school subject matter. The three SRJC-linked teachers also coached students on skills and norms for mutually respectful exchange of views, as well as substantive knowledge building: such explicit instruction presumably makes such procedural knowledge accessible to students entering the classroom with a range of cultural capital (Delpit, 1995). Five of these six teachers also invited students' affective engagement, by choosing issues relevant to students' lives and inviting expression of divergent opinions.

Primary and Middle School Settings. Two intermediate teacher participants in the Peacemaking Talking Circles workshops taught the same combined grades 7 and 8 social studies and language arts course in the same alternative school, in consecutive years, in remarkably different ways. Both Ellen Murphy and Tracy Walker told us that discussion of divergent perspectives on social conflict and justice issues was a main priority in their teaching. Ellen Murphy's students collected information and debated globally linked social conflict issues—such as private companies bottling and selling water in the context of clean fresh water scarcity, hunger and food security in relation to types of agriculture, and a simulation of municipal policy-making emphasizing environmental issues. Ms. Murphy chose not to

implement the peacemaking talking circle process taught in the professional development workshop, explaining in an interview that she believed her students were insufficiently mature. Instead, she assigned students viewpoints in competitive debates, emphasizing substantive command of subject matter rather than process or communicative skills.

Tracy Walker, in contrast, engaged her students in developing conflict analysis and communication skills and taught the peacemaking talking circle process. Her lessons examined questions of bias and unequal social power in relation to ethno-cultural difference: the entire unit observed was organized around one short story, "The Staircase," in which adolescent characters held divergent perspectives about an intolerance-based social aggression scenario. At one point, many students had adopted the perspectives of story characters, who blamed the target for provoking aggression by being different. In response, Ms. Walker arrived in role as the target's aunt (an extra character she had invented), inviting the class to interview her: this re-humanization of the target's perspective provoked evident rethinking by several students.

Both Ellen Murphy and Tracy Walker taught about human wants and needs as sources of conflict: In Ms. Murphy's hunger unit, small groups debated competing preferences in family budgets. Ms. Walker facilitated consensus-building dialogue around basic human rights and needs, subsequently applied to analyzing the "Staircase" conflict. Over all, Ellen Murphy's lessons typically framed conflicts as controversies to be debated and positions to be won, while Tracy Walker's lessons (in the same course) framed conflicts as emotionally laden relational issues, embedded in structures of inequality, to be reimagined and deliberated through dialogue toward mutual understanding.

The three primary teachers, who attended the same Peacemaking Talking Circles professional development, taught conflict communication, inclusive relational skills, and sharing circle processes, usually linked to language arts, expressive arts curriculum, and/or classroom social relations. All three taught and facilitated a quick no-blame approach for routine interpersonal conflict resolution: "What did you hear [from conflicting parties about their concerns]? How do you feel? What do you need?"

Nancy Holly, teaching kindergarten (ages 4–5), facilitated several peacemaking circles: She passed around a talking piece, inviting each child's input on questions such as how to improve their kindergarten or sharing experiences about social exclusion. She also facilitated dialogue probing the conflicting perspectives of characters in children's literature. One day, the class worked to paraphrase the wants and feelings of two characters in a story, *Hey Little Ant*. Then Ms. Holly invited the children to take perspectives themselves—to role-play and then share in a circle whether, had they been the child in the story, they would step on the ant that had annoyed them.

In Carol Kelly's arts lessons (grades K–4), students (simultaneously) practiced communicating emotions including anger, through facial

expressions and body movement, then sometimes each had an opportunity to debrief in a talking circle. For instance, on International Women's Day, before and after movement activities, Ms. Kelly invited comments on gender role fairness in relation to a children's story. In the kindergarten class, several students volunteered and heard one round of peers' brief questions and comments. In the grade 2/3 class, students each had two or three turns to answer open-ended questions, interpreting and responding to gender identities in the story and a song. As in Ms. Holly's class, sometimes less-confident children passed (did not take up the opportunity to speak) in these circles. Given young children's short attention spans and school time constraints, usually the talking piece circulated only once or twice; thus students heard, but did not respond aloud to or discuss, some of their peers' divergent viewpoints.

Fern Brown facilitated dialogue among her grade 1 students about interpersonal disputes (such as after a boy blocked a girl's access to a coveted seat to take it himself) and larger-group conflicts (such as how boys and girls could equitably share playground space for different activities). She also frequently engaged her class in interpreting and giving opinions about the conflicting wants, feelings, and needs of characters in children's literature, often addressing equity themes such as *The Hundred Dresses* (economic inequality), *Amazing Grace* (racism), *You're Mean, Lily Jean* (bullying and bystanders), and *William's Doll* (gender role pressures). Ms. Brown drew analogies between social difference and conflict scenarios in literature, and particular student behaviour, to help students to recognize alternate perspectives, social power inequalities, and peacebuilding choices in tangible terms.

Cross-Case Connections. Thus the teachers participating in this research incorporated expression of divergent (contrasting) perspectives, much more often than they facilitated dialogue among directly conflicting viewpoints on controversial issues. Beth Samuels (high school history) and Pam Taylor (high school English) taught *about* contrasting perspectives on social conflicts, but not usually *through* conflictual discussion. Ellen Murphy (intermediate language/social studies) taught about and through conflicting perspectives, while encouraging competitive argument rather than cooperative mutual exchange or joint search for understanding. Competition can be affectively engaging, but emphasizes separating winners from losers, which may have exclusionary, anti-peacebuilding consequences (Aronson, 2000).

In addition to the secondary history teachers, Nancy Holly (kindergarten), Carol Kelly (arts K–4), Ellen Murphy (grade 7–8), and especially Fern Brown (grade 1) and Tracy Walker (grade 7–8) sometimes taught about human rights conflicts such as racism, sexism, economic discrimination, social exclusion, and bullying on an interpersonal level. Like Beth Samuels, their basic message was that discrimination and social aggression were bad

behavior. For instance, after Nancy Holly had opened dialogue on whether the child in the story should step on the ant, she told us in an interview that she had been so disappointed that all children did not adopt the nonviolent position that she did not repeat the exercise with her afternoon class. In contrast, occasionally Fern Brown, and Anna Georgalis (HS 6 history), and Tracy Walker—such as when Ms. Walker's students interviewed the fictitious aunt of the boy targeted by ethnocentric harassment, and when Ms. Georgalis's students debated the appropriateness of a Holocaust memorial video—sometimes re-opened dialogue on alternate viewpoints in human rights conflicts without framing the conflict in simplistic terms (supporting *versus* opposing those rights).

Some of the teachers—Beth Samuels and Anna Georgalis in history, Pam Taylor in English, Mona Parisi in advanced biology (genetics), and Ellen Murphy in grade 7–8 social studies—presented large-scale social conflicts that were distant from students' contemporary lives. Other lessons observed addressed conflicts more explicitly embedded in students' lived experience: Mona Parisi's basic biology lessons on pathogens and disease examined HIV/AIDS transmission and healthcare policy; Laura Cole's drama lessons improvised interactions between store clerks and shoppers and between individuals who both wanted a chair; Karen Davis's social sciences lesson on cultural change examined the effects of Internet technologies. The primary teachers, in particular, invited discussion of interpersonal conflicts within the classroom group. These topics invited students into direct participation, encouraging them to take and to juxtapose (not merely to recognize or observe) conflicting viewpoints. A few classrooms eventually demonstrated the capacity to address escalated controversial issues. More classrooms discussed relatively ordinary, unpolarized conflicts. Each practiced interpersonal dialogue about conflicting perspectives they embedded in planned subject matter study, thereby framing students as thoughtful, actively communicative citizens.

Pedagogical Structures, Skill-Building, and Normative Climate

The 11 teachers' lesson content, discussed above, reflects pedagogical orientations that welcome, to differing degrees, various kinds of conflicting perspectives in classroom interactions and/or in subject matter content. Such recognition and respectful consideration of contrasting perspectives—implying school knowledge is non-neutral and conditional—embodies a kind of democratization (Apple, 1979; Davies, 2005), and a kind of peacebuilding (Salomon, 2011) in curriculum practice. Within such orientations, the key question addressed below is how teachers may develop task structures and classroom norms that include and equip all (diverse) students to participate, and to be heard, in practicing elements of peacebuilding dialogue.

Teaching About or Through Conflict. Several teachers regularly used task structures designed to facilitate expression of alternate views, for instance inviting students to disclose their viewpoints non-verbally, simultaneously—through hand signals, moving to locations marked disagree or agree, or (in the one classroom that had such technology) via electronic "clicker" answers. Although such perspective-taking did not constitute dialogue (except when time also was allocated for discussing those perspectives), these pedagogies required little class time, and gave every student opportunities to discern and communicate their own perspectives and to recognize the existence of alternate perspectives among peers. This enabled students to filter new learning through their own conflicting perspectives.

In contrast, history Anna Georgalis explained in an interview that she never "put students on the spot" by requiring them to speak up or to disclose their views (such as by standing on an opinion spectrum). Instead, she created confidential ways for students to examine their own viewpoints or to raise questions they were unwilling to ask in front of peers, such as journal entries and a place to leave her anonymous notes.

In between segments of PowerPoint slide lecture, Ms. Georgalis moderated whole-class discussions—"open" in that they invited divergent (occasionally outright conflicting) viewpoints on interpretive and values questions, and implemented no overt structures (such as pair sharing, assigned roles, or previewing students' range of viewpoints through show of hands) to encourage inclusion of more voices or viewpoints. A few students never responded aloud, a few spoke often, and about half the class spoke up in one or more conversations. Although some students quite often voiced agreement, disagreement, or extension of peers' comments, discussion proceeded in a triangular fashion—students spoke to the teacher, who directed comments or questions back to the whole class. Ms. Georgalis sometimes disclosed her own experience, opinions, or uncertainties to challenge consensus emerging among vocal students: for instance, to bolster the minority view in a discussion about whether members of a particular school club were "nerds," she told the class she had been a "nerd" in high school. She thereby modeled voicing independent-minded views, opening discursive space for a few students to explain views opposing those their peers had articulated thus far.

In further contrast, history teacher Beth Samuels transmitted provocative ideas about conflict in history and contemporary society almost entirely without student discussion. English teacher Pam Taylor's handout-guided group work invited students to express divergent perspectives on literature and society, but provoked almost no conflictual exchange about those views. In all three teachers' pedagogies, some students' voices and viewpoints (the vast majority in Ms. Samuels's class, many in Ms. Taylor's class, still several in Ms. Georgalis's class) were never heard: even when silent students listened intently, they practiced spectator—neither active citizen nor peacebuilder—roles in relation to conflict talk.

All three of the teachers who had participated in the Genocide History Citizenship professional development course emphasized subject matter content (*about* conflict) more than pedagogy, relationships, or skills (*through* conflict). They presented this content vividly, using multiple modalities to bridge cognitive and emotional distance—portraying the escalation, resistance to, and consequences of violent oppression (destructive social conflict) through film and photos, primary source narratives, news clippings, literature, and/or music from the time. All three teachers asked interpretive and values (decision) questions, but diverse students in the three classrooms had very different opportunities to take up those questions.

History teacher Beth Samuels's pedagogies involved almost entirely teacher (and video) presentation to the whole class. She asked many informational and some values questions in her lectures, primarily rhetorically, without allocating time for students to offer perspectives. Only the most confident and motivated 10% occasionally offered short answers, often inaudible across the classroom. In the only episode of group work (or slightly sustained dialogue) observed in Beth Samuels's class, students joined in groups of five to six (noticeably self-segregating by gender and ethnicity) to make 5-minute decisions on how to respond to each of five Cold War national security scenarios. With little time, and having been neither taught nor organized into any constructive process structure for discussion, many students were silent while a few high-status peers forced consensus by dominating the floor or putting down others' ideas: this was conflict talk, but not constructive peacebuilding talk.

Talking Circles. All of the high school teachers who had participated in the SRJC course, and the elementary teachers who had participated in the Peacemaking Talking Circles workshops except Ellen Murphy, implemented talking circles as part of their pedagogies (Bickmore, 2013). When a teacher asked an open question and passed a talking piece sequentially around a whole-class circle, these interactions were strikingly horizontal (peer-directed) and inclusive: often every student spoke to the questions in their own way, and usually differences were expressed. Talking circle processes slowed down dialogue compared to typical back-and-forth conversations, as each person listened to all others, waited their turn before speaking again, and tended to direct their contributions to the group rather than directing rebuttals to individuals or the teacher. Thus these conversations were more inclusive, but involved less direct back-and-forth exchange of divergent viewpoints than the more common open-structured discussion process in which confident students might volunteer comments. These same teachers also took time to explicitly teach norms and skills for respectful, inclusive, constructive dialogic interaction, and practice these through community circle sharing on low-risk topics, such as drama teacher Laura Cole's opening and closing circles.

Once their students were familiar with the talking-piece circle process, teachers Nancy Holly (kindergarten), Carol Kelly (arts K–4), Fern Brown (grade 1), and Tracy Walker (social studies/language arts grade 7–8) used this format to invite thoughtful speaking and peer listening about conflicts and their consequences, such as recognizing the contrasting perspectives of story characters or describing times the children themselves had felt angry or excluded. To accommodate short attention spans, the primary teachers interspersed talking circle rounds with physical activity such as role play, sharing, or quick decision exercises (such as "step into the circle if you . . . [like to play soccer, or agree to listen to the person holding the talking piece]"). These interactions approach the discussion purpose Parker (2010) calls enlightenment, except that differences that might have provoked new understandings were merely given a fair hearing, seldom probed, or challenged in extended conversations.

Only biology teacher Mona Parisi sustained the same basic circle process, beyond the voicing of divergent viewpoints, into actual argumentative mutual exchange (on HIV/AIDS health policy). Ms. Parisi was able to develop this discussion that day in part because only nine students were present: the 70-minute session allowed sufficient time for this sized group to carry out seven rounds of circle dialogue, pursuing a series of increasingly complex questions. For most of this discussion, she passed a talking piece sequentially, achieving 100% participation and remarkably intent peer–peer listening on each question. For part of this lesson's second half, Ms. Parisi allowed students with passionate opposing opinions to pass the talking piece back and forth across the circle: this increased the speed and intensity of the dialogue, but essentially eliminated speaking opportunities (during those segments) for the less confident half students present (Bickmore & Kovalchuk, 2012). This example illustrates a tension between different elements of peacebuilding: interrogative mutual exchange and inclusivity.

In the same high school, social sciences teacher Karen Davis elicited inclusive conflictual student–student discussion over time, by giving every student (in pairs or threes) a turn in a "fishbowl" inner circle. Students conducted background research including peer surveys, and in presenting their results took a stand, on the impacts of particular new electronic technologies: other students moved into empty chairs in the inner circles to challenge their peers' perspectives and findings, then returned to the outer listening circle while others took their places to raise further questions. Ms. Parisi and Ms. Davis both took time, using assessment rubrics and handouts such as "how to lead a good discussion" to model and name the skills they wanted students to practice in backing up and constructively critiquing opposing viewpoints. What was unique (in our sample) about these lessons was that they *both* involved every student in voicing divergent perspectives *and* facilitated in-depth disagreement dialogue about those topics in the public space of their classrooms.

Small-Group Work. Some small-group work also encouraged conflict dialogue. Fern Brown's (grade 1), Nancy Holly's (kindergarten), and Tracy Walker's (grade 7–8 social studies/language arts) students sometimes worked in pairs, speaking, listening, and paraphrasing or improvising role-play encounters between characters' contrasting viewpoints. Ellen Murphy's students, in threes, advocated the advantages of large-scale commercial, specialized, or subsistence agriculture, and in a municipal politics simulation represented particular job areas. Ellen Murphy sometimes told student groups to reach "consensus," but did not guide them in *how* to do so, and in fact told them to vote if they had not reached decisions before time ran out. Thus both grade 7–8 teachers used conflict and difference as learning opportunities, but, as Johnson and Johnson (2009) theorize, majority-rule norms and lack of process instruction in Ms. Murphy's classroom created different and narrower learning opportunities (especially for lower-status students) compared to Ms. Walker's cooperative environment. In Ms. Murphy's class, the risks of voicing unpopular views were high because put-downs and other domination behaviour were common; also, she assigned viewpoints rather than encouraging students to express their own perspectives. In contrast, Tracy Walker's and Fern Brown's students were guided in building respectful cooperative relationships, and practiced both discerning and voicing unfamiliar perspectives (in assigned roles) and speaking for themselves (in open discussion). Mona Parisi delegated specific process roles, in addition to content responsibilities, to each student for group tasks. For instance, in her grade 12 advanced biology, student facilitators prepared questions and led small-group seminars. All peers in each group carried out roles such as reporter or "skeptic," which facilitated engagement of most students in dialogue processes and injected opposing viewpoints in the content.

In contrast, when teachers implemented laissez-faire group work (leaving students to implicitly structure small-group tasks themselves, as in Beth Samuels's Cold War decision scenarios), preexisting hierarchies of peer status and academic confidence were reinforced, as Cohen (2004) theorizes, and less-dominant perspectives were often silenced or dismissed. In English teacher Pam Taylor's several group-work tasks, students chose their groups and were not explicitly taught process expectations (during observations, nor mentioned in interviews). However, Ms. Taylor's handouts scaffolded each task with open-ended interpretive questions. Some students remained isolated, working (or quietly off-task) alone. In an interview, Pam Taylor explained that she valued student "autonomy" and "responsibility to make their own decisions": she listened intently to students' reports and commentaries, avoiding teacher–student conflict by minimizing academic work demands and not challenging either what students said or how they chose to participate in the classroom. A few confident and motivated students occasionally voiced divergent opinions, but class exchanges of views were infrequent and short.

Some teachers guided students to interact in a variety of task structures—including pair dialogue, small-group deliberations both in role and speaking for oneself, and individual reflective writing, in addition to large-group presentations and discussions. This both invited and scaffolded more frequent opportunities for a wider range of students to participate in recognizing, voicing, and probing divergent perspectives, compared to the classrooms using a narrower range of task structures. In the latter more typical laissez-faire or teacher-dominated pedagogical climates, the voices of teachers and a few high-status students dominated. In contrast, more variegated and intentionally inclusive pedagogical structures built upon and contributed to skill-building and normative climates for constructive, mutually respectful dialogue about conflict. While most teachers *told* students to collaborate and listen to one another, only in the classrooms where they showed students *how* to do this well, and created task structures that reinforced students' agentic use of these norms and skills, did most of their differently situated students consistently practice constructive conflict communication (both speaking and being heard).

Contexts Encouraging and Impeding Classroom Dialogue

Although these classrooms were selected purposively because of the teachers' interest in—and belief that they did implement—constructive classroom dialogue about conflicts, the most common response to social conflict observed was partial avoidance. That is, interpersonal disputes and social justice conflicts typically were acknowledged briefly and incompletely, but rarely pursued. Contrasting viewpoints were sometimes voiced, but seldom probed in extended back-and-forth exchange (dialogue). Because not often challenged, teachers' perspectives tended to prevail in all the classrooms. Teachers tended to encourage students, as individuals, to not discriminate against peers and to handle disagreements amicably and quietly, rather than engaging in difficult peacebuilding conversations about unresolved social inequalities that found their way into the classroom. Interviews and observations demonstrate that this harmony-oriented approach to peace education was reinforced in every participating school context—through the general demands upon students to comply with the pedagogical processes and content presented, and upon teachers to control student behaviour and to cover a large breadth of mandated curriculum topics efficiently within pre-set timetables. However, despite these institutional barriers, to varying degrees all participating teachers did teach students how to constructively discuss some conflicts, and/or actually implement some dialogic pedagogies addressing conflicts.

An important context diversity was that the schools ranged from "alternative" magnet programs (populated by higher proportions of White, Anglophone, affluent students than the district average) to "regular"

comprehensive schools (serving non-affluent, ethno-culturally diverse neighbourhoods). Teacher participants in alternative school settings (all of the primary and intermediate grades above) reported encouragement by colleagues and administrators to teach peacemaking and social justice perspectives. They also reported somewhat flexible timetables and some collegial collaboration (such as team teaching) to develop innovative and multiple-subject integrated units of study. On the other hand, all three high schools were "regular" schools, and four of the six high school teachers worked with large proportions of racialized, non-affluent students. The high school serving the most diverse and least affluent population in the sample demonstrated an explicit commitment to restorative peacebuilding practices, equivalent to the practices at the alternative schools.

Even in the alternative schools, all teachers reported that curriculum coverage and timetabling demands impeded (to different degrees) their implementation of sustained dialogic pedagogies. In the high schools, some subject-matter departments supported such pedagogies while others actively opposed them. One social sciences department represented the most constraining context for dialogic peacebuilding pedagogies (with 55-minute or shorter class periods and an enormous list of mandated material to cover), while the equivalent departments in other schools were among the most supportive environments in our sample. Thus within the same official curriculum guidelines, teachers' working contexts differed significantly in their encouragement, tolerance, or discouragement of conflict dialogue pedagogies.

When conflict dialogue pedagogies were integrated into academic lessons, these synergies eased the strain of curriculum pressures and created considerable space for student-centred talk, compared to treating communicative skills or students' viewpoints as disconnected extras. The primary teachers and one intermediate teacher regularly invited students to discuss the divergent perspectives of literature characters in language arts lessons; the science teacher and some social sciences teachers regularly challenged students to apply their subject matter to taking stands on contemporary controversial issues. The biology teacher explained that she felt less constrained to cover as many curriculum expectations, and therefore had more time for conflict dialogue, in her non-university–bound compared to university-bound classes. One history teacher created and posted online PowerPoint slideshows, explicitly to save in-class time for student-centred discussion while ensuring content coverage. As Anna Georgalis explained: "that gives them the opportunity, and me the opportunity, to make sure that they are right there . . . that they are engaged." An English teacher in the same school, however, felt pressured by administrators who viewed student-centred discussion pedagogies as time off task. And, in the same history course in a different school, Beth Samuels was allowed to add material *about* controversial and peace-oriented perspectives to detailed lectures, but said the large quantity of mandated departmental curriculum

content did not allow time for student discussion *of* divergent perspectives. Infusion of peacebuilding dialogue pedagogies, for most teachers in this study, involved transforming (not merely adding to) curriculum content.

Thus, school context factors did clearly shape and limit teachers' opportunities to implement peacebuilding dialogue pedagogies addressing conflicts, although each teacher's commitments and capabilities also played an important part in shaping the implemented curricula they presented to students. What seemed to make the most evident difference was teachers' willingness, capacity, and support from colleagues and administrators to transform their regular implemented curriculum and pedagogy: teasing out conflictual questions, and engaging students in probing and expressing alternative viewpoints about those questions, embedded in subject-matter learning. This study examined a diverse set of classrooms and schools, and found no particular kind of context (such as grade level, affluence of populations, type of school, or subject area) that necessarily impeded (nor that inevitably included) such pedagogies. Even in the most supportive school environments for peacebuilding dialogue pedagogies, the observed implementation of such dialogue was rarely extensive and often truncated.

DISCUSSION

Conflict (even when not escalated) makes visible norms, values, and skills that otherwise would be assumed or implicit. Teachers participating in this study, to varying degrees and in varying ways, demonstrated to their students that they valued divergent, opposing, and non-mainstream viewpoints—difference and conflict—as learning opportunities, and that they respected students' (democratic) agency to discern, decide upon, express, and sometimes discuss their own diverse viewpoints in relation to social conflicts. Instead of assuming or promoting consensus, this communicated the contingency of curriculum as "truth-until-further-notice," and the value of both dissenting and conflicting viewpoints and the social identities linked to those viewpoints (Apple, 1979, p. 93). Further, many participating teachers prepared and guided students and classroom collectivities to stretch their capacities (understandings, skills, and norms) for constructive and *peacebuilding* dialogue, beyond merely engaging them in adversarial discussion that could reinforce disrespect for those holding contrasting viewpoints.

In the diverse Canadian classrooms observed in this study—social contexts of relatively peaceable conflict, not violence zones—teachers had the opportunity to focus less on de-escalating conflicts, and more on transforming a culture of avoiding, accepting at a distance (bystanding), and marginalizing conflicting perspectives—into a culture of constructive engagement with unfamiliar "Others" and conflicting perspectives (active democratic peacebuilding). The types of conflicts infused in these

implemented curricula included unsettled policy disagreements as advocated in the literature demonstrating the value of controversial issues discussions for democratic citizenship education (Hess & Avery, 2008; Schulz et al., 2010), complex social exclusion and bias challenges as in the social justice education literature (Kumashiro, 2000; North, 2009), and relational difficulties within the classroom community as in the conflict resolution and restorative justice education literatures (Jones, 2004; McCluskey et al., 2008). At the same time, observers in this study saw very little emotional, direct encounter across differences, and also very little attention to the violent conflicts occurring around the world: these classrooms experienced some conflict dialogue amid much conflict avoidance. On the other hand, the small conflicts evidently provided, at times, rich learning opportunities, without the kinds of escalation or controversy that some educators fear in broaching sensitive and explicitly political topics (Torney-Purta et al., 2005; Yamashita, 2006).

Teachers in these classrooms implemented a range of pedagogical structures that created different kinds of spaces and supports for diverse and unequal-status students to participate. The most common pedagogical orientation in the high school and intermediate classrooms was that a teacher posed questions to the class as a whole. Primarily the most motivated and high-status students spoke up in these sessions, while the majority of their (more diverse) peers practiced remaining silent. Although students could hear one another, and sometimes evidently adjusted their comments or were provoked to speak based on what they heard from peers, they addressed their comments to the teacher, not directly to one another. In these triangular configurations, the teachers carried most of the power and responsibility for the direction of the conversation and the range of viewpoints expressed. Thus students heard, and some occasionally articulated, perspectives that agreed, differed, or disagreed on conflictual questions. Such indirect and incomplete exchanges about contrasting viewpoints, embedded in pedagogical task structures that (while ostensibly open) rendered the majority of students silent, constituted only partial ingredients of democratic peacebuilding dialogue.

In contrast, Karen Davis (social sciences), Mona Parisi (biology), and Laura Cole (drama) at High School 8, and all of the primary and intermediate teachers except Ellen Murphy, structured some large-group pedagogical tasks in circle formats: this increased the proportion of students speaking up, redirected some attention to horizontal (peer-to-peer) listening, and delegated more agency in shaping conversations to a more diverse range of students. In these task structures, students had opportunities to increase their competence in practicing peacebuilding dialogue processes, skills, and norms, even though their conversations were rarely controversial or heated.

In small group pedagogies, students articulated perspectives and usually received peer responses. Because multiple groups or pairs worked

simultaneously, at least the more confident students in every group had considerable air time and autonomy to practice dialogue participation, although in the unstructured groups they received little direct teacher guidance or feedback on how to carry out such dialogue constructively, and so sometimes practiced domination and exclusion more than peacebuilding.

In this study, researchers did not observe directly many of the rapport-building activities teachers had facilitated at the beginning of the year. Thus analyses rely upon teacher interview data, and indirect information from classroom materials and observations, to discern whether and how various teachers took action to develop classroom community relationships that were inclusive and socially safe enough for conflictual discussion, and accepting of diverse identities, divergent viewpoints, and difficult conversations. All except one of the teachers who were trained by either of the two restorative justice initiatives continued to guide activities to reinforce inclusive classroom communication norms throughout the year, for instance regularly implementing circle sharing activities to encourage students to connect and enjoy one another. This explicit teacher leadership toward skill development, cooperation, and reciprocally respectful, equitable interaction seemed to create resilient classroom communities that were able to welcome graduated exposure to challenge, uncertainty, difference, and conflict as learning opportunities. Successful conversations about difficult issues, in turn, deepened those classroom communities' peacebuilding capacities.

Constructive conflict talk is a crucial element of democratic peacebuilding, and this project demonstrates it can be taught and practiced in the context of mandated curriculum in a wide range of classroom settings. These findings illustrate contrasting instances of dialogic education addressing conflict, infused into regular implemented academic curriculum and pedagogy in several subject areas (social sciences and history, language arts and literature, drama, basic and advanced biology) in public school classrooms serving diverse, including non-affluent, student populations.

School institutional support, such as that in the non-affluent, diverse immigrant-rich population of High School 8 (but not in similarly diverse High School 9), facilitated teachers' taking risks and building capacities to incorporate peacebuilding education. At the same time, teachers were able to implement at least some elements of peacebuilding dialogue education, even without such support. This research begins to demonstrate how teachers may do so in the context of regular work in public classrooms, and documents some observable implications of particular pedagogical choices for diverse student participants. The cases highlight complexities of both conflictual content knowledge (challenging ethnocentric ignorance about alternate perspectives) and pedagogical process (facilitating equitable, thoughtful, and engaged peacebuilding dialogue).

Despite purposive sampling, we did not observe many sustained episodes of peacebuilding dialogue addressing conflicts, that could adequately disrupt prevailing anti-democratic cultures of passivity, inequity, and violence. Tracy Walker's peacemaking circles with intermediate students in role as characters in a story about racist attack, Karen Davis's fishbowl discussions of students' peer survey research on the positive and negative social impacts of technology, Anna Georgalis's whole-class disagreement dialogue about the appropriateness of a Holocaust memorial video, and Mona Parisi's talking circle of non-college–bound science students persuading one another of reasonable boundaries for publicly funded health care in the context of HIV transmission each do begin to illustrate, however, feasible and exciting possibilities for peacebuilding dialogue pedagogies in ordinary public classrooms.

The cross-case comparison of classroom practices demonstrate that richly conflictual subject matter, pedagogical task structures that guide and support constructive and inclusive participation, explicit attention to building nonviolent norms and respectful relationships, and background support in the school professional context can make such classroom dialogue activities more feasible to implement and sustain, and relatively inclusive of previously marginalized voices. The teaching described in this research incorporated small conflicts and differences as learning opportunities, usually without escalation or controversy. As laboratories for peacebuilding citizenship education, these lived classroom curricula were inevitably partial (incomplete and biased), but many did appear to offer foundational knowledge, skills, and relationships upon which young people could later build capacities for more complicated and challenging peacebuilding.

NOTE

1. This article summarizes cross-case analysis. A report of full case studies with detailed vignettes is available by request.

TEACHING RESOURCES: CHILDREN'S LITERATURE AND FILM

Bell, William. (2005). "The Staircase." In *Just Some Stuff I Wrote*. Doubleday Canada.
Estes, Eleanor. (1945/2004). *The Hundred Dresses*. Harcourt.
Hoffman, Mary, & Caroline Binch. (2007). *Amazing Grace*. North Winds Press.
Huxley, Aldous. (1945/2007). *Brave New World*. Vintage Canada.
Lang, Fritz. (Director). (1927/2010). *Metropolis*. Film, Mongrel Media.
Wishinsky, Frieda, & Kady MacDonald Denton. (2009). *You're Mean, Lily Jean*. Frances Lincoln.
Zolotow, Charlotte. (1989). *William's Doll*. Trophy Picture Books.

REFERENCES

Anyon, J. (1981). Social class and school knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *11*(1), 3–39.
Apple, M. (1979). *Ideology and curriculum*. London: Routledge.
Applebee, A., Langer, J., Nystrand, M., & Gamoran, A. (2004). Discussion-based approaches to developing understanding: Classroom instruction and student performance in middle and high school English. *American Educational Research Journal*, *40*(3), 685–730.
Aronson, E. (2000). *Nobody left to hate: Teaching compassion after Columbine*. New York: Worth.
Bekerman, Z. (2007). Rethinking intergroup encounters: Rescuing praxis from theory, activity from education, and peace/co-existence from identity and culture. *Journal of Peace Education*, *4*(1), 21–37.
Bickmore, K. (2005a). Teacher development for conflict participation: Facilitating learning for "difficult citizenship" education. *International Journal of Citizenship and Teacher Education*, *1*(2), 2–16.
Bickmore, K. (2005b). Foundations for peacebuilding and discursive peacekeeping: Infusion and exclusion of conflict in Canadian public school curricula. *Journal of Peace Education*, *2*(2), 161–181.
Bickmore, K. (2008). Peace and conflict education. In J. Arthur, I. Davies, & C. Hahn (Eds.), *Sage handbook of education for citizenship and democracy* (pp. 438–454). London: Sage.
Bickmore, K. (2011). Education for "peace" in urban Canadian schools: Gender, culture, conflict, and opportunities to learn. In P. P. Trifonas & B. Wright (Eds.), *Critical issues in peace and education* (pp. 88–103). London: Routledge.
Bickmore, K. (2013). Circle dialogue processes in elementary classrooms: Locations for restorative and educative work. In H. Cremin, E. Sellman, & G. McCluskey (Eds.), *Restorative approaches to conflict in schools* (pp. 309–324). London: Routledge.
Bickmore, K. (forthcoming 2014). Incorporating peacebuilding citizenship dialogue in classroom curricula: Contrasting cases of Canadian teacher development. In R. Malet & S. Majhanovich (Eds.), *Building democracy in education on diversity*. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense.
Bickmore, K., & Kovalchuk, S. (2012). Diverse ways of creating classroom communities for constructive discussions of conflict: Cases from Canadian secondary schools. In P. Cunningham & N. Fretwell (Eds.), *Creating communities: Local, national and global* (pp. 590–605). London: CiCe. Retrieved March 20, 2014, from http://www.york.ac.uk/education/research/cresj/citizenship-communities/
Bickmore, K., & Parker, C. (in press 2014). Constructive conflict talk in classrooms: Divergent approaches to addressing divergent perspectives. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *42*(3).
Burrell, N., Zirbel, C., & Allen, M. (2003). Evaluating peer mediation outcomes in educational settings: A meta-analytic review. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, *21*(1), 7–26.
Bush, K., & Saltarelli, D. (2000). *The two faces of education in ethnic conflict: Towards a peacebuilding education for children*. Florence, Italy: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre.
Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 509–535). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Claire, H., & Holden, C. (Eds.). (2007). *The challenge of teaching controversial issues*. London: Trentham Books.

Cohen, E. (2004). Producing equal-status interaction amidst classroom diversity. In W. Stephan & W. P. Vogt (Eds.), *Education programs for improving intergroup relations* (pp. 37–54). New York: Teachers College Press.

Cook, S. A. (2007). "Sisters are doin' it for themselves": The price of ignoring gender in modern peace education. *Peace Research: The Canadian Journal of Peace and Conflict Studies*, *39*(1/2), 59–74.

Cook-Sather, A. (2006). Sound, presence, and power: "Student voice" in educational research and reform. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *36*(4), 359–390. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-873X.2006.00363.x

Davies, L. (2004). *Education and conflict: Complexity and chaos*. London: Routledge/Falmer.

Davies, L. (2005). Teaching about conflict through citizenship education. *International Journal of Citizenship and Teacher Education*, *1*(2), 17–34.

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: New Press.

Donnelly, C., & Hughes, J. (2006). Contact, culture and context: Evidence from mixed-faith schools in Northern Ireland and Israel. *Comparative Education*, *42*(4), 493–516.

Dull, L., & Murrow, S. (2008). Is dialogic questioning possible in social studies classrooms? *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *36*(4), 391–412.

Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, *59*(3), 297–322.

Flynn, N. (2009). Toward democratic discourse: Scaffolding student-led discussions in the social studies. *Teachers College Record*, *111*(8), 2021–2054.

Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research*, *6*(3), 167–192.

Galtung, J. (1985, May). *Peace education: From peace movement ideals to ministry of education ideals, or How to succeed in peace education without really trying*. Lecture, Université Nouvelle Transnationale, Paris. [Presented in Tromsø, Norway (January 1984), Kanton Zürich (September 1984), Stockholm (November 1984), and Provincia di Torino (April 1985)]. Retrieved November 1, 2007, from http://www.transcend.org

Garrard, W., & Lipsey, M. (2007). Conflict resolution education and antisocial behavior in US schools: A meta-analysis. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, *25*(1), 9–38.

Gordon, T. (2006). Girls in education: Citizenship, agency and emotions. *Gender and Education*, *18*(1), 1–15.

Hadjioannou, X. (2007). Bringing the background to the foreground: What do classroom environments that support authentic discussions look like? *American Educational Research Journal*, *44*(2), 370–399.

Hahn, C. (2010). Comparative civic education research: What we know and what we need to know. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, *6*(1), 5–23.

Harber, C., & Sakade, N. (2009). Schooling for violence and peace: How does peace education differ from "normal" schooling? *Journal of Peace Education*, *6*(2), 171–187.

Harris, I. (2004). Peace education theory. *Journal of Peace Education*, *1*(1), 5–20.

Hatch, T., & Grossman, P. (2009). Learning to look beyond the boundaries of representation: Using technology to examine teaching. Overview for digital exhibition: Learning from the practice of teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *60*(1), 70–85.

Hemmings, A. (2000). High school democratic dialogues: Possibilities for praxis. *American Educational Research Journal*, *37*(1), 67–91.

Hess, D. (2002). Discussing controversial public issues in secondary social studies classrooms: Learning from skilled teachers. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *30*(1), 10–41.

Hess, D. (2009). *Controversy in the classroom: The democratic power of discussion*. New York: Routledge.

Hess, D., & Avery, P. (2008). Discussion of controversial issues as a form and goal of democratic education. In J. A. I. Davies & C. Hahn (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of education for citizenship and democracy* (pp. 506–518). Los Angeles: Sage.

Hess, D., & Ganzler, L. (2007). Patriotism & ideological diversity in the classroom. In J. Westheimer (Ed.), *Pledging allegiance: The politics of patriotism in America's schools* (pp. 131–138). New York: Teachers College Press.

Howard, T. (2003). Culturally relevant pedagogy: Ingredients for critical teacher reflection. *Theory Into Practice*, *42*(3), 193–202.

Johnson, D., & Johnson, R. (2009). Energizing learning: The instructional power of conflict. *Educational Researcher*, *38*(1), 37–51.

Jones, T. (2004). Conflict resolution education: The field, the findings, and the future. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, *22*(1–2), 233–267.

Kahne, J., & Middaugh, E. (2008, February). *Democracy for some: The civic opportunity gap in high school*. Retrieved July 20, 2010, from http://www.civicyouth.org

Kahne, J., & Sporte, S. (2008). Developing citizens: The impact of civic learning opportunities on students' commitment to civic participation. *American Educational Research Journal*, *45*(3), 738–766.

Kaufman, E. (2005). Dialogue-based processes: A vehicle for peacebuilding. In P. van Tongeren, M. Brenk, M. Hellema, & J. Verhoeven (Eds.), *People building peace II: Successful stories of civil society* (pp. 473–487). Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Kennelly, J., & Llewellyn, K. (2011). Educating for active compliance: Discursive constructions in citizenship education. *Citizenship Studies*, *15*(6–7), 897–914.

Kumashiro, K. (2000). Toward a theory of anti-oppressive education. *Review of Educational Research*, *70*(1), 25–53.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, *35*, 465–491.

Levinson, M. (2003). Challenging deliberation. *Theory and Research in Education*, *1*(1), 23–49.

McCluskey, G., Lloyd, G., Kane, J., Riddell, S., Stead, J., & Weedon, E. (2008). Can restorative practices in schools make a difference? *Educational Review*, *60*(4), 405–417.

Merelman, R. (1990). The role of conflict in children's political learning. In O. Ichilov (Ed.), *Political socialization, citizenship education, and democracy* (pp. 47–65). New York: Teachers College Press.

Miller, J., & Glassner, B. (1997). The "inside" and the "outside": Finding realities in interviews. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (pp. 99–112). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Morrison, B., & Vaandering, D. (2012). Restorative justice: Pedagogy, praxis, and discipline. *Journal of School Violence*, *11*(2), 138–155.

Morrison, K., Robbins, H., & Rose, D. (2008). Operationalizing culturally relevant pedagogy: A synthesis of classroom-based research. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, *41*(4), 433–452.

Nagda, B. R., & Gurin, P. (2007). Inter-group dialogue: A critical-dialogic approach to learning about difference, inequality, and social justice. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *111*, 35–45.

North, C. (2009). The promise and perils of developing democratic literacy for social justice. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *39*(4), 555–579.

Novelli, M., & Lopes Cardozo, M. (2008). Conflict, education and the Global South: New critical directions. *International Journal of Educational Development, 28*, 473–488.

Parker, W. (2010). Listening to strangers: Discussion in democratic education. *Teachers College Record, 112*(11), 2815–2832.

Peck, C. L., Thompson, L. A., Chareka, O., Joshee, R., & Sears, A. (2010). From getting along to democratic engagement: Moving toward deep diversity in citizenship education. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning, 6*, 61–75.

Pranis, K. (2005). *The little book of circle processes: A new/old approach to peacemaking*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books.

Salomon, G. (2002). The nature of peace education: Not all programs are created equal. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo (Eds.), *Peace education: The concept, principles, & practices around the world* (pp. 3–25). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Salomon, G. (2011). Four major challenges facing peace education in regions of intractable conflict. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 17*(1), 46–59. doi: 10.1080/10781919.2010.495001

Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Kerr, D., & Losito, B. (2010). *ICCS 2009 international report: Civic knowledge, attitudes and engagement among lower secondary school students in thirty-eight countries*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

Simon, K. (2001). *Moral questions in the classroom*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Smith, S., & Fairman, D. (2005). The integration of conflict resolution into the high school curriculum: The example of workable peace. In N. Noddings (Ed.), *Educating citizens for global awareness* (pp. 40–56). New York: Teachers College Press.

Stevahn, L. (2004). Integrating conflict resolution training into the curriculum. *Theory Into Practice, 43*(1), 50–58.

Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H., & Schultz, W. (2001). *Citizenship and education in 28 countries: Civic knowledge and engagement at age 14*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

Torney-Purta, J., Richardson, W. K., & Barber, C. H. (2005). Teachers' educational experience and confidence in relation to students' civic knowledge across countries. *International Journal of Citizenship and Teacher Education, 1*(1), 32–57.

Vibert, A., & Shields, C. (2003). Approaches to student engagement: Does ideology matter? *McGill Journal of Education, 38*(2), 221–240.

Weikel, B. (1995). "Girlspeak" and "boyspeak": Gender differences in classroom discussion. In J. Kleinfeld & S. Yerian (Eds.), *Gender tales: Tensions in the schools* (pp. 7–11). New York: St. Martin's.

White, J. W. (2011). Resistance to classroom participation: Minority students, academic discourse, cultural conflicts, and issues of representation in whole class discussions. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 10*, 250–265.

Yamashita, H. (2006). Global citizenship education and war: The needs of teachers and learners. *Educational Review, 58*(1), 27–39.

Young, E. (2010). Challenges to conceptualizing and actualizing culturally relevant pedagogy: How viable is the theory in classroom practice? *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(3), 248–260.