PEACE EDUCATION EVALUATION

LEARNING FROM EXPERIENCE AND EXPLORING PROSPECTS

Edited By

Celina Del Felice
Aaron Karako
Andria Wisler

A VOLUME IN: PEACE EDUCATION

Peace Education

Series Editors:

Dr. Jing Lin
University of Maryland, College of Education

Dr. Edward Brantmeier
James Madison University

Dr. Ian Harris
University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee

Peace and Conflict Studies Research: A Qualitative Perspective (2014)
Robin Cooper and Laura Finley

Understanding Peace Cultures (2014)
Rebecca L. Oxford

Peace Education from the Grassroots (2013)
Ian Harris

The Language of Peace: Communicating to Create Harmony (2013)
Rebecca L. Oxford

More than a Curriculum: Education for Peace and Development (2013)
Johan Galtung and S. P. Udayakumar

Think, Care, Act: Teaching for a Peaceful Future (2011)
Susan Gelber Cannon

Building a Peaceful Society: Creative Integration of Peace Education (2011)
Laura Finley

Books, Not Bombs: Teaching Peace Since the Dawn of the Republic (2010)
Charles F. Howlett and Ian Harris

Spirituality, Religion, and Peace Education (2010)
Edward J. Brantmeier and John P. Miller

For the People: A Documentary History of The Struggle for Peace and Justice in the United States (2009)
Charles F. Howlett and Robbie Lieberman

Peace Education: Exploring Ethical and Philosophical Foundations (2008)
James Page

Transforming Education for Peace (2008)
Jing Lin, Edward J. Brantmeier, and Christa Bruhn

Encyclopedia of Peace Education (2008)
Monisha Bajaj

Educating Toward a Culture of Peace (2006)
Yaacov Iram

CHAPTER 1

PEACEABLENESS AS RAISON D'ÊTRE, PROCESS, AND EVALUATION

Hakim Mohandas Amani Williams

INTRODUCTION

Pressure emanates from many constituent groups interested in increased accountability for peace education activities; they want to know if peace education is indeed accomplishing what it purports (Harris, 2003). Within donor countries there are mounting calls for increased accountability of investments made for peacebuilding efforts in other countries (Stave, 2011). While most stakeholders would acknowledge the utility of peace education evaluations, there is a concern that pressure from donors and policymakers may foster exaggerated expectations of evaluations, thereby impelling the measurement of more short-term results of peace efforts to the exclusion of a focus on more longer-term processes (Fischer, 2009). Since peace education is concerned with negative and, especially with, positive peace (Reardon, 1988), "drive-by," donor-driven evaluations could engender some not insignificant issues, the least of which is the reductionist risk

Peace Education Evaluation: Learning from Experience and Exploring Prospects,
pages 3–18.

of hyper-instrumentalizing peace education efforts, thereby diminishing the panoramic reach of peace education itself.

This chapter intends to shed light on the incongruence of positivist evaluation with the epistemological and ontological logics of peace education. To provide sufficient, solution-oriented contrast, the latter part of the chapter will then present the case for the types of evaluation methodologies commensurate with critical peace education. The chapter is organized into various subgroups, which are tagged by several subheadings. I discuss how the lofty vision of peace education is its inspiration and its curse, as well as its potential incongruence with the logic of positivist evaluation. I also address the challenges that the discipline of evaluation itself faces and present the concept of peaceableness as a potential way for augmenting peace education's evaluability. I conclude with participative evaluative methodologies as well as a brief example from personal research experience to highlight the need for such methodologies, especially when working with less empowered and marginalized communities.

DEFINITION

Peace education unabashedly posits rather lofty objectives. It is concerned not only with the cessation of violence, otherwise called negative peace, but is transfixed on positive peace, the dismantling of structural violence. Peace education "is generally defined as educational policy, planning, pedagogy, and practice that can provide learners—in any setting—with the skills and values to work towards comprehensive peace" (Bajaj, 2008, p. 1), and it often includes "the areas of human rights education, development education, environmental education, disarmament education and conflict resolution education" (p. 2). In sum, peace education's raison d'être is the rebuke of the current global culture of war and violence, and the germination and sustainable flourishing of a global culture of peace (Reardon, 1988).

ADMITTED PAUCITY OF EVALUATION

There are obviously several perspectives on how to engender and sustain a global culture of peace; some of these perspectives are not without their discontents. Defining peace in itself is quite contentious; ergo, its operationalization and measurement will perhaps be as doubly controversial. Because peace efforts are often neither linear nor fully predictable (Stave, 2011), measuring long-term effects becomes extremely complicated (Harris, 2003). While the moral imperative of peace education's necessity seems apparent, the "peace research community is also interested in peace education evaluation to understand how educational efforts contribute to reducing violence and building peaceful societies" (Harris, 2003, p. 6). There has been quite a bit of work done in demarcating the definitional and descriptive parameters of peace education, but "less work has been done on evaluating its [peace education's] effectiveness" (Ashton, 2007, p. 41). Research

by Nevo & Brem (2002) support this claim; they analyzed about three hundred peace education related items over a 1981–2000 literature span and found that approximately only a third featured "elements of effectiveness evaluation," prompting them to infer that

> [t]his figure by itself is a testimony to the relative scarcity of evaluation studies in [Peace Education]. It is quite clear that hundreds of programs are initiated and operated around the globe, at any particular period, without being subjected to any act of empirical validation (p. 275).

Indeed, the moral heft of peace education seems inadequate in satiating the clamoring calls from the donor community for more accountability of peace efforts. These calls for increased accountability are not exclusive to peace education, but to many neighboring fields and efforts: peacebuilding, development work, aid assistance, peace mediation, and conflict resolution. Peace education can learn much from the evaluation challenges and growth that have taken place in the field of peacebuilding, just as peacebuilding has been encouraged to learn from international development (Blum, 2011). For example, within peacebuilding, the Local Capacities for Peace Project brought together varied development NGOs working in conflict areas to determine the effect of aid. Simultaneously, the International Development Research Centre developed the Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment (PCIA) methodology, which "focused on assessing the actual impact of a particular project in a conflict context before, during and after its implementation" (Lanz et al., 2008, p. 8). However, these efforts have been subsequently critiqued for being too linear in measuring complex, non-linear real life processes. Peace mediation provides yet another example of this challenge; peace mediators have said that "the process of mediation is often more important than its measurable outcomes and a linear evaluation framework does not sufficiently capture these dynamics" (Lanz et al., 2008, p. 11). In part, this applies to peace education as well, although the capacity to measure gains in knowledge, skills, and attitudes does exist. Peace education thus represents a good place to combine both process-oriented and outcome-oriented approaches (Nevo & Brem, 2002).

Accountability, per se, is not necessarily the issue at hand, for peace efforts stand to gain through increased accountability. Peace efforts, including those of peace education, are often in avid pursuit of sustainable peace or peace writ large—a peace that is lasting and stable. The enterprise of engendering sustainable peace, however, takes years, even decades, with regressions and digressions along the way. It is this non-linearity and long-term aspect that excessively and frustratingly complicates the evaluability of some peace efforts. This commingling of increased pressure for evaluations with the pursuits of a rather amorphous phenomenon called peace highlights the evaluative challenges that peace education faces.

LOFTY VISION: INSPIRATION *AND* CURSE

Because peace education is centered on comprehensive peace (Reardon, 1988)—that is, it is not only concerned with the cessation of violence (negative peace), but also the dismantling of structural violence—peace educators aspire to transcend the educating-about-peace paradigm, and to embrace the educating-*for*-peace paradigm (Reardon, 1997). This is an educative venture that involves the dispensation of knowledges and skills, and the consequent fostering of attitudinal and behavioral changes: a panoramic vision indeed. But peace education's lofty reach is also its challenge: "debates continue on the undefined boundaries of the field, its shifting terminology and focuses, and the varied philosophies it exhibits" (Fitzduff & Jean, 2011, p. 8). As regards evaluating knowledges and skills, one can conduct pre—and post-intervention comparisons, but what is far more complicated is evaluating "the affective, dispositional, and behavioral outcomes" (Harris, 2003, p. 16). While the need for peace education programs has been demonstrated by large organizations such as UNICEF, UNESCO, the Soros Foundation, and the Ford Foundation, there does not exist a persuasive body of evidentiary support for the impact or effectiveness of said programs (Ashton, 2007). Additionally, longitudinal studies, necessitated by an educative project that has long-term goals, are sorely lacking (Harris, 2003). The prospect of many longitudinal studies seems dim in light of the fact of stringent resources. There are risks to simply applying generalized evaluative norms to peace education without a critical interrogation of the potential problems.

INCONGRUENCE WITH THE LOGIC OF POSITIVIST EVALUATION

The discipline of evaluation has indeed come a long way; the interpretive and postmodern paradigms have left their indelible intellectual footprints. However, the ensuing upheaval is anything but settled; there are still ongoing and rigorous debates within the discipline of evaluation among the adherents of the positivist and of the postmodernist approaches, and those in between.

The positivist camp asserts that the evaluator's credibility rests on her professional distance from the evaluand, and that her independence is vital for procuring any credence for the evaluation that she will eventually produce. That some evaluations can engender policy shifts is testimony to the caliber of the evaluations themselves and augments the overall professionalization of the field of evaluation. The positivist approach is undergirded by certain beliefs and assumptions that are differentiated from those of the interpretive approach. The former views reality as single; that the "knower and known are independent"; that "generalizations are possible, and are time—and context-free"; that "there are real causes, that precede or are simultaneous with their effects"; that "inquiry is value-free"; and that predicting phenomena is possible by objectively investigating them (Adapted from Lincoln & Guba, 1985, as cited in Neufeldt, 2007, p. 7). Conversely, those

within the interpretivist camp believe that "realities are socially constructed"; that "there can be multiple constructions and realities"; that "knower and known are interactive and inseparable"; that "only time—and context-bound working hypotheses are possible"; that "all entities are in a state of mutual simultaneous shaping, so that it is impossible to distinguish causes from effects"; that "inquiry is value-bound"; that "research is a type of practice that affects the context and can be a deliberate intervention strategy", and that this approach can offer penetratingly deep understandings of phenomena (Adapted from Lincoln & Guba, 1985, as cited in Neufeldt, 2007, p. 7). These distinctions emanate from starkly different epistemological orientations and thus, depending on which is employed, can engender wide-ranging ontological ramifications. The choice of approach can profoundly influence the design of the evaluation, the methodologies that are utilized, the types of data sought and subsequently collected, what the final products are, and how they are presented and ultimately used.

> Nevertheless, it is without a doubt that evaluations are essential: In terms of the evolution of the human race, evaluation is possibly the most important activity that has allowed us to evolve, develop, improve things, and survive in an ever-changing environment. Every time we try something new—a farming method, a manufacturing process, a medical treatment, a social change program, a new management team, a policy or strategy, or a new information system—it is important to consider its value. Is it better than what we had before? Is it better than the other options we might have chosen? How else might it be improved to push it to the next level? What did we learn from trying it out? (Davidson, 2005, p. 1)

Despite the potentially noteworthy benefits derived from evaluations, for many persons and organizations, evaluation connotes "judgment": "the systematic determination of the quality or value of something" (Scriven, 1991, as cited in Davidson, 2005, p. 1). Here, the 'systematic' aspect is not the source of consternation for many program implementers, but rather the adjudicative component: ascertaining the "merit" or "worth." However, through the positivist lens, and for the sake of 'objective' distance between the evaluator and the evaluand, there exists an attendant risk of over-objectifying the evaluand. This objectivist arrangement between the evaluator and evaluand features a form of power disequilibrium that is incongruent with the elemental postulates of peace education. It is not dissimilar from the traditionalist teacher/student dyad, upon which Freire (2003) rendered a stinging critique because of the power imbalance therein, whereby the student is objectified in this intensely hierarchized relationship:

> [T]he methods for evaluating "knowledge", the distance between the teacher and the taught...everything in this ready-to-wear approach serves to obviate thinking. ...Based on a mechanistic, static, naturalized, spatialized view of consciousness, it transforms students into receiving objects. It attempts to control thinking and action, leads women and men to adjust to the world....(Freire, 2003, pp. 76–77).

This hierarchical relationship between evaluator and evaluand is exacerbated by the ever-increasing pressures for accountability from donors. Donors (including agencies, governments, policy makers, and tax payers, especially in this era of global fiscal austerity), lobby for reliable evaluations (Fischer, 2009). Although these robust calls for accountability are a "relatively recent development," such as in the field of peacebuilding, (Kawano-Chiu, 2011, p. 7), large government aid agencies are quite explicit in seeking to "obtain maximum value for money in [their] development assistance" (DANIDA, 2005, p. 3). As a result, evaluations can be quite high stakes for many implementers, with the risk of losing funding altogether (Kawano-Chiu, 2011). These top-down pressures, coupled, with the objectifyingly surveilling gaze of the evaluator upon the evaluand, may not be empowering in the sense that peace education promulgates, essentially representing a dissonance between some aspects of the logic of evaluation and aid agencies and that of peace education.

Evaluation and Its Own Discontents

In a world where donors want programs to demonstrate quick, measurable results, evaluations are increasingly being fashioned by a business ethic (Church, 2011). This business ethic has helped usher in an era of "managing for results" into the discipline of evaluation. No longer is the focus merely on deliverables but now on impact assessment (Conlin & Stirrat, 2008). In international development, agencies aim to boost donor aid coordination, (DANIDA, 2005; Lawson, 2010), with specific interest in the alignment and harmonization of aid objectives. However, harmonization among the "often contrasting systems of evaluation employed by donors and partner countries" has remained a problem (Conlin & Stirrat, 2008, p. 196; Lawson, 2010). This harmonization has witnessed a corollary focus on sector wide approaches (SWAPs), and a concomitant diminution of interest in disparate projects. While, many laud SWAPs, it ought to be noted that their use has made the task of evaluators more difficult:

> The sector approach addresses a wide range of activities—from reforming the regulations in the sector to improving physical infrastructure and supporting training and capacity development. ...increasingly donor assistance takes the form of pooled support of both financial and technical assistance. Thus the role of individual donors becomes much less clear and the evaluator's task much more complex. But this is not the only problem facing today's evaluators. The shift to SWAPs has only exacerbated the problem of attribution in that it is increasingly difficult to disentangle the results of donor assistance from the overall processes at work in any particular sector. ...As far as the evaluator is concerned, the challenge of reaching firm conclusions as to attribution of results to inputs and the chain of causation becomes more and more difficult (Conlin & Stirrat, 2008, p. 196).

This issue of causal attribution is especially pertinent to peace education since peace education programs are usually focused on long-term and macro effects. At

the macro level, some studies have indicated that quantifiably discerning impacts of individual interventions is near impossible (Fischer, 2009):

> Evaluations which combine qualitative and quantitative procedures for data collection can offer important entry points, but generally only identify impacts achieved in the immediate project context. The expectation that beyond this evaluations can draw well-found conclusions about the benefits and impact of individual measures on the bigger picture, i.e. peace writ large, in a crisis region is not just overly ambitious (given that evaluations are usually limited in resources and timeframes): it is also questionable from a (funding) policy perspective. Peace actors engaging in overzealous debate about this issue should be clear that they are thus raising excessive and unrealistic expectations among donors about the demonstrability of impacts—expectations which can never be fulfilled, at least not within the framework of the short term evaluations that the donors usually fund (p. 91).

Difficulties in gauging causal linkages between interventions and outcomes therefore present the field of peace education with a challenge that cannot go unaddressed: evaluability.

EVALUABILITY: A CORE CHALLENGE

Apart from having insufficient evaluations conducted within the field of peace education, a related issue thus becomes evaluability. If the goals and objectives of a peace education program are so extravagant or unclear and not matched to impact, then the program can be deemed un-evaluable. Since the moral imperative of peace efforts offers an insufficient buffer against calls for increased evaluation of peace education programs, un-evaluability of peace programs only exacerbates the challenges that this field faces. It is vital that peace education learn from neighboring fields, such as peacebuilding, international development, peace mediation, and conflict resolution, to ascertain potential ways forward, as those fields are also subject to the challenges of overclaiming and evaluability (Kawano-Chiu, 2011). A starting point, as proffered by noted peace educator Ian Harris (2003), is for peace education to avoid overclaiming:

> Bringing peace to this world is a complex activity that ranges in scope from political leaders negotiating arms agreements to lovers amicably settling disputes. Influencing community and school-based politics seems outside the classroom realm. Peace educators have certain cognitive and affective goals for their students, but they should avoid extravagant claims that their efforts will stop violence. Teachers many want their students to become aware of the role of violence in their lives, but awareness does not necessarily lead to action. What happens as a result of a particular instructional act is quite outside a teacher's control. The activities of educators do not seem so much to be changing political structures as creating both a belief system and a way of life that embraces peace. Building such beliefs and skills may be a necessary condition for building a culture of peace (p. 24).

An evaluable direction for peace education would seem to be more realistic goal-setting, with more measureable discrete objectives. There is a risk to these efforts to 'downsize' lofty aims and goals, as has been witnessed in peacebuilding efforts. As a result of the efforts to not overclaim the expectations with evaluations, there is "a clear danger now that evaluations are mainly targeted at 'measuring' short-term results of peace activities and thus tend to ignore longer-term processes, changes in the political context and consequently the needs for the change of strategies" (Fischer, 2009, p. 90). The emergent critique is that these short-term foci are tantamount to "technical peacemaking rather than conflict transformation...which are not robust or sustained enough to address major problems of structural inequalities" (Fitzduff & Jean, 2011, p. 21). Additionally, research has shown that discrete, measureable interventions may have limited long-lasting effects; for example, "in diversity workshops, new perceptions of and more positive attitudes toward the outgroup may have little or no effect on intergroup behavior because of countervailing pressures from other determinants of behavior" (McCauley, 2002, p. 252). This presents an obvious conundrum for peace education: its concern for structural violence complicates its evaluability, and in attempts to become more evaluable, it may end up reductionistically aiming for short-term interventions that may not contribute to a sustainable peace.

AUGMENTING EVALUABILITY

A balance is needed, one that simultaneously upholds the principles of peace education and allows the field to gain increased legitimacy. Part of this augmented legitimacy is indeed evaluability. What may boost the evaluability of some peace education programs is not aiming to create a culture of peace, but perhaps aiming to foster more peaceableness in human beings. As Harris (2003) notes, "peace educators may not be changing the social structures that support violence, but they are attempting to build a peace consciousness that is a necessary condition for creating a more peaceful world", and "in teaching about peace and violence they (teachers) take one small step towards creating a less violent world, and they should appreciate the importance of that step" (p. 20). As opposed to a culture of peace, it is perhaps more evaluable to measure a posture of peaceableness in students:

> Teachers can control both the information given students and the manner in which it is presented, peace educators can evaluate at the end of educational programs whether students have acquired knowledge about the roots of violence and strategies for peace. The effectiveness of peace education, therefore, cannot be judged by whether it brings peace to the world, but rather by the effects it has upon students' thought patterns, attitudes, behaviors, values, and knowledge stock (Harris, 2003, p. 19).

Measuring peaceableness may sound especially unquantifable to a positivist evaluator, but, much to the benefit of peace education, the discipline of evaluation has undergone, and continues to endure, major epistemological renovations, with

far-ranging theoretical and methodological implications. Additionally, the global atmosphere around peacebuilding and international development seems to be embracing an ethic of mutual transparency and partnership. These changes bode well for enlarged spaces in which peace efforts can enjoy increasingly differentiated ways of being.

SHIFTS IN DONOR LOGIC

These enlarged spaces, in which peace efforts may not have to monolithically follow a narrow trajectory, are occurring because of shifts within donor agencies in terms of their thinking about their relationship with aid recipients and program/project implementers. Large donor agencies are recognizing the necessity of conceptualizing the efficacy of aid within a framework of 'mutually committing' partnerships (DANIDA, 2005; OECD, 2011). Funders are being taken to task for fostering reciprocal transparency. For example, one report offers funders this advice:

> As you ask for transparency from your implementing partners, it is important that transparency is reciprocated. An evaluation with an end goal of solely accountability which can have consequences on future funding, is different in scope and nature from an evaluation with an end goal of learning, which can allow an implementer to try newer program designs. It is important to clearly communicate your goals and consequences of an evaluation (Kawano-Chiu, 2011, p. 15).

Here, there is vital space and need for implementers to manage up, a scenario in which implementers actively educate their donors about their own context-specific strengths, values, and limitations, so that donors come to understand how "well-designed, focused programs can contribute to peace writ large with sustained investment over time" (Kawano-Chiu, 2011, p. 21). A win-win situation is therefore the goal.

The notions of top-down accountability have also morphed into mutual accountability (Conlin & Stirrat, 2008) to match this emerging partnership framework. It is not only a matter of funders' accountability to implementers and vice versa, but also implementers' accountability to those they serve; a veritable constitution of top-down, bottom-up, and middle-out processes (Lederach, 1997, as cited in Fischer, 2006). Evaluations have thus evolved beyond merely aiming for accountability but are heavily tasked with learning. Funders are increasingly pressing for the inclusion of feedback mechanisms in evaluations and programming, and more encouragingly for the field of peace education, donors are registering genuine interest in "exploring a range of evaluation methods, including empowerment evaluation, action evaluation, [and] developmental evaluation" (Kawano-Chiu, 2011, p. 35). It is these types of evaluations that seem best suited for a field as varied as peace education, and a goal as complex as peaceableness.

IMMERSION IN PEACE EDUCATION PHILOSOPHY

The starting point for any peace education evaluator has to be an educative engagement with the main guiding principles of the field. The concept of *conscientizaçao*, or conscientization (consciousness-raising), posited by the Brazilian educator Paulo Freire (2003), is central to peace education. Seminal to conscientization is another Freireian notion, that of praxis, constituted by the confluence of reflection *and* action aimed at ultimately fostering transformation (Bartlett, 2008). In light of this, a definition of peace education, as used by UNICEF, is enlivened:

> The process of promoting the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values needed to bring about behavior changes that will enable children, youth, and adults to prevent conflict and violence, both overt and structural; to resolve conflict peacefully; and to create the conditions conducive to peace, whether at an intrapersonal, interpersonal, intergroup national or international level (Fountain, 1999, p. 1).

Peace knowledges, skills, values, and attitudes are meant to energize a social imagination towards sustained and impactful action. But all of this is not possible in an environment where traditional hierarchies and false binaries are maintained. In the peace educative milieu, knowledge is co-constructed with the teacher viewing herself also as a student and truly respecting that students are teachers as well (Bartlett, 2008).

Beyond content issues, peace educators are also equally concerned with form. Noted peace theorist Johan Galtung (2008), lays out the argument most lucidly:

> First, the form of peace education has to be compatible with the idea of peace, that is, it has to exclude not only direct violence, but also structural violence. This is important because schools and universities are still important means of education and in the structure is the message. ...But structural violence remains and takes the usual forms: a highly vertical division of labor manifesting itself in one-way communication; the fragmentation of those on the receiving end preventing them from developing horizontal interaction that will allow them to organize and eventually turn the communication flow the other way (p. 51).

If a critical pedagogue fails to employ critical methods then the message s/he is attempting to impart is diminished, as modeling is another key component of peace education. With that said, one understands why any evaluation will not do. In peace education, everyone is responsible for this sought-after culture of peace, and for this, dialogic relationships are imperative. Ergo, evaluative methodologies employed in the field of peace education must be those that can competently and genuinely imbue, appraise, and foster this participative ethic. Since, peace education's content and form must be conscientizational (i.e. engendering conscientization), then so too must its evaluation. Perhaps it is a serendipitous gift, that as the calls for evaluation of peace education programs have been increasing, the discipline of evaluation itself has been affected most deeply by the epistemological interpretive turn. Therefore, there are now types of evaluative methodologies

whose core objectives are compatible with those of peace education: bolstering participation and fostering empowerment.

In peace education's struggles to mainstream, increased rigorous evaluations that indicate what works and what does not can assist with this challenge. Despite this aspiration by some peace educators, there are others who fervently denounce any attempts to "promote regulation, universalization, and development of rigid normative standards for what peace education ought to be" (Bajaj & Brantmeier, 2011, p. 221). These two camps are not necessarily mutually exclusive, so long as the focus remains on activating "transformative agency" (Bajaj, 2009), a concept that is elemental to critical peace education (Bajaj, 2008). It is apparent that "peace education requires continued reinforcement" so that, as it is elevated to more mainstream heights, it maintains its core and distinguishing features (Brahm, 2006, p. 1).

This tension is demonstrated in the raging debate within the discipline of evaluation about a distinguishing feature of peace education: its focus on fostering a shift in values. Those evaluators on the positivist end of the spectrum aim for value-free scientific inquiry, yet there are others who say that no evaluation is void of values (Davidson, 2005). Others view this dichotomization of objectivism and subjectivism as a false argument (Freire, 2003). This author takes the position that it is preferable to explicitly declare, in a transparent manner, the values that inhere to one's e(value)ative choices. Action evaluation, fourth generation evaluation, empowerment evaluation, inclusive evaluation, and youth participatory evaluation, in some form or the other, all ally themselves with the values of social justice. They represent a postmodern semi-collapse of panoptical surveillance—semi-collapse because even if one evaluation is in the interpretivist tradition, it may be meta-evaluated through a positivist evaluative lens to facilitate, for example, comparisons. Positivist evaluation, with its objectivist distance from the evaluand, runs the risk of docilizing evaluated subjects into objects (Foucault, 1995). *The interpretive turn in evaluation is a reflexive interrogation of the role of power; which, in form, is an affirming reflection and reification of peaceableness and transformative agency.*

PARTICIPATIVE EVALUATIVE METHODOLOGIES

Peace education has been characterized as empowerment education, one that reinforces diverse participation (Harris & Morrison, 2003), and the evaluative methodologies that focus on participation can help to facilitate this empowerment. They fully embrace the participation hypothesis which posits that with increased participation comes increased commitment (Ross, 2001).

One such methodology is action evaluation, in which goal setting, monitoring, and evaluation are rolled into one, instead of viewed as distinct components. In this manner, implementers become more self-aware of their own goal setting and of the iterative and incremental nature of such an endeavor (Ross, 2001). This

aims to build capacity among implementers and, in so doing, becomes a "means of intervention itself" (Eliott, d'Estrée & Kaufman, 2003, p. 4).

There is also empowerment evaluation, popularized by David Fetterman (2003), in which

> [evaluation] concepts, techniques and findings [are used] to foster improvement and self-determination....It is designed to help people help themselves and improve their programs using a form of self-evaluation and reflection. Program participants—including clients, consumers, and staff members—conduct their own evaluations; an outside evaluator often serves as a coach or additional facilitator depending on internal program capabilities. By internalizing and institutionalizing self-evaluation processes and practices, a dynamic and responsive approach to evaluation can be developed (p. 64).

This type of evaluation commences with the implementers self-defining their mission, then taking inventory of the elements key to their program, followed by goal setting and strategizing about attaining these goals.

Fourth generation evaluation explicitly rebukes positivist evaluation's lock on truth, and is akin to inclusive evaluation (Lincoln, 2003). In inclusive evaluation, the evaluator, who believes in social transformation, is willing to challenge the status quo. Donna Mertens (2003) offers this exhortation: that "the principle of objectivity need not find itself on the opposite side of the fence from addressing the needs of marginalized and less empowered groups" (p. 96). It is a type of evaluation that may use quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods, but the key is having members of the evaluated community be a part of the decision-making around the design of the study. The evaluator here must be sensitive about diversity, even within subgroups of seeming homogeneity, must remain critical about his own values and about the penetrating questions that must be asked, while striving to blunt the potency of power imbalances in distorting the study's findings (Mertens, 2003).

Yet another evaluation that is being utilized is youth participatory evaluation (YPE). It entails the recruitment of youth, within the evaluated community, to be a part of developing an evaluative agenda; youth are trained how to conduct interviews, surveys, and focus groups, and do journaling and report writing (Flores, 2008). YPE offers an opportunity for youth to be self-reflective about their own personal and inner-growth, in essence, a reflexivity about their own peaceableness—certainly a key trigger for transformative agency. In being explicit about their social change directionality, YPE and the other afore-mentioned evaluative types constitute peace action, an integral component of peace education. By imbuing praxis—reflection and action—they demonstrate the necessity and potency of conscientizational evaluations.

PERSONAL RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

Participative evaluations do indeed require a certain posture; as regards critical peace education, evaluations should be inclined towards inclusion of less empowered and marginalized groups. From November 2009 to June 2010, I spent seven months conducting a case study at a secondary school in Trinidad and Tobago (in the Caribbean). I was interested in how constituents conceptualize school violence, its influences, and interventions. This was a school (Survivors Secondary School, or SSS) where many, if not most, of the students came from economically depressed communities. SSS was deemed by the Ministry of Education as a high-risk school in terms of youth violence; it was subsequently selected as part of a violence-prevention project called the Violence Prevention Academy (VPA), conducted by an American criminologist. The VPA was a pilot study of twenty-five schools where data were collected and a school-specific plan was crafted to deal with one selected form of violence at the respective schools. At SSS, school personnel selected gambling as its biggest issue related to violence. After a year and a half of the pilot project, the VPA final report indicated that gambling at SSS had decreased exponentially. As part of a VPA-conducted evaluation of its project, questionnaires were filled out by students and teachers and other school personnel. Despite these efforts, the majority of the teacher respondents could not articulate the aims and findings of the VPA; student respondents did not fare any better in their knowledge of the VPA. The design of this project did not directly involve student input nor did the evaluative components. Although the VPA final report indicated that gambling had decreased at SSS, conversations with respondents revealed that perhaps gambling was more a symptom of deeper issues, such as students resorting to gambling because of a lack of money to facilitate their return trips home after school or to purchase lunch. These were not the sole reasons for gambling, for it is possible that some students were simply gambling for the sake of it. However, an entire project created to assist schools with violence prevention omitted the supposed beneficiaries of this project (i.e. students) from the design of both the project and its evaluation. While students did fill out questionnaires about the impact of the project, none of the eighty-four student respondents could articulate the VPA's aims and impact, perhaps indicating that they were merely objects of the project and its subsequent evaluation. Tackling gambling as an issue ignored the deeper issues at play and the more structural factors that contributed to violence at SSS. The VPA strategies seemed to have been of a negative peace orientation, ones merely centered on a cessation of violence, and not focused on, as positive peace postulates, empowerment and genuine transformation of structural violence. Although the VPA was not explicitly self-framed as peace education, its design, and implementation were of a negative peace orientation; a vital, but insufficient posture, which may sometimes reinforce the status quo instead of exposing and upending societal inequities that may undergird manifestations of youth violence.

CONCLUSION

While participative evaluations are lauded for their potential to empower, we are reminded that participation does exist along a continuum and that there may be some types of participatory evaluations that veer towards the lower end of participation because of power differentials, stemming from the professional expertise of the evaluator, or because of resistances among subgroups in the evaluated community. Those in the field of evaluation have noted a dearth of how-to information on successfully carrying out participatory evaluations (Gregory, 2000). However, the interpretive turn in evaluation is a step in the right direction. It is a clarion call to reject neither accountability nor participation; both can co-exist (Fetterman & Wandersman, 2007). Both peace education and the discipline of evaluation must remain flexible in recognizing that there is not any one-size-fits-all approach. In fact, the evaluative approach shall depend on the context and what is to be evaluated (Bledsoe & Graham, 2005).

Peace education's legitimacy crisis is understandable. It has lofty goals but wishes to be taken seriously. Intellectual rigor is indeed the order of the day. In the rush to procure legitimacy, peace education must ardently stay true to its principles. Peace educators must remind ourselves, funders, and the wider society that sustainable peace requires time, effort, and patience. Inculcating peaceableness and the transformative agency necessary to envision and actuate a different world where a culture of peace is a naturalized existential ethic will not occur overnight. We may need to embrace the notion of success as a continuum with setbacks and triumphs, celebrate the incremental breakthroughs, and utilize multiple measures of success (Ross, 2000)—successes that need to be centered on peaceableness as raison d'être, as process, and as evaluation.

REFERENCES

Ashton, C. V. (2007). Using theory of change to enhance Peace Education evaluation. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly, 25*(1), 39–53.

Bajaj, M. (2009). 'I have big things planned for my future': the limits and possibilities of transformative agency in Zambian schools. *Compare, 39*(4), 551–568.

Bajaj, M. (2008). Introduction. In M. Bajaj (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of peace education.* North Carolina: Information Age Publishing, Inc. 1–11.

Bajaj, M., & Brantmeier, E. J. (2011). The politics, praxis, and possibilities of critical peace education. *Journal of Peace Education, 8*(3), 221–224.

Bartlett, L. (2008). Paulo Freire and peace education. In M. Bajaj (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of peace education* (pp. 39–46). North Carolina: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Bledsoe, K., & Graham, J. (2005). The use of multiple evaluation approaches in program evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation, 26,* 302–319.

Blum, A. (2011). *Improving peacebuilding evaluation: A whole-of field approach.* Washington, DC: USIP. Retrieved November 1, 2011from http://www.usip.org/files/resources/Improving_Peacebuilding_Evaluation.pdf.

Brahm, E. (2006). *Peace education. Beyond intractability* (G. Burgess & H. Burgess, Eds.). Boulder: University of Colorado. Retrieved October 15, 2011 from http://www.beyondintractability.org/bi-essay/peace-education .

Church, C. S. (2011). *The use of reflecting on peace practice (RPP) in peacebuilding evaluation.* Colloborative Learning Projects (CDA). Retrieved November 1, 2011 from http://www.cdainc.com/cdawww/pdf/other/rpp_use_in_evaluation_scharbatke_church_05232011_Pdf.pdf.

Conlin, S., & Stirrat, R. (2008). Current challenges in development evaluation. *Evaluation, 14*(2), 193–208.

DANIDA. (2005). *Globalisation—Progress through partnership: Priorities of the Danish government for Danish development assistance 2006–2010.* Denmark: Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. Retrieved October 15, 2011 from http://www.amg.um.dk/NR/rdonlyres/BD805561-B40B-462D-BC2F-C541823EFB29/0/GlobalisationProgressThroughPartnership.pdf.

Davidson, E. J. (2005). *Evaluation Methodology Basics: The nuts and bolts of sound evaluation.* London & New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Elliott, M., d'Estrée, T., & Kaufman, S. (2003). *Evaluation as a tool for reflection.* Retrieved October 15, 2011 from http://www.beyondintractability.org/bi-essay/evaluation-reflection.

Fetterman, D. (2003). *Empowerment Evaluation Strikes a Responsive Cord.* In S. I. Donaldson & M. Scriven (Eds.), *Evaluating social programs and problems: Visions for the new millennium* (pp. 63–76). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Fetterman, D., & Wandersman, A. (2007). Empowerment evaluation: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *American Journal of Evaluation, 28,* 179–198.

Fischer, M. (2006). *Civil society in conflict transformation: Ambivalence, potentials and challenges.* Retrieved October, 1, 2011 from http://www.berghof-handbook.net/documents/publications/fischer_cso_handbook.pdf.

Fischer, M. (2009). *Participatory evaluation and critical peace research: A precondition for peacebuilding.* Retrieved October 15, 2011 from http://www.berghof-handbook.net/documents/publications/dialogue7_fischer_comm.pdf.

Fitzduff, M., & Jean, I. (2011). *Peace education: State of the field and lessons learned from USIP Grantmaking. No. 74.* Washington, DC: USIP. Retrieved November 1, 2011 from http://www.usip.org/files/resources/PW74.pdf.

Flores, K. S. (2008). *Youth participatory evaluation: Strategies for engaging young people.* California: Jossey-Bass.

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison.* New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published in France in 1975).

Fountain, S. (1999). *Peace education in UNICEF.* New York: UNICEF. Retrieved October 1, 2011 from http://www.unicef.org/education/files/PeaceEducation.pdf.

Freire, P. (2003). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Continuum Press. (Original work published in 1970).

Galtung, J. (2008). Form and Content of Peace Education. In M. Bajaj (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of peace Education* (pp. 49–58). North Carolina: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Gregory, A. (2000). Problematizing participation: A critical review of approaches to participation in evaluation theory. *Evaluation, 6,* 179–198.

Harris, I. (2003). *Peace education evaluation.* Retrieved July 15, 2011 from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED480127.pdf.

Harris, I., & Morrison, M. L. (2003). *Peace education.* North Carolina & London: McFarland & Company, Inc.

Kawano-Chiu, M. (2011). *Starting on the same page: A lessons report from the Peacebuilding Evaluation Project.* Washington, DC: Alliance for Peacebuilding. Retrieved October 15, 2011 from http://www.allianceforpeacebuilding.org/resource/collection/9DFBB4C8-CABB-4A5B-8460-0310C54FB3D9/Alliance_for_Peacebuilding_Peacebuilding_Evaluation_Project_Lessons_Report_June2011_FINAL.pdf.

Lanz, D., Wählisch, M., Kirchhoff, L., & Siegfried, M. (2008). *Evaluat*ing Peace M*ediation. Brussels: Initiativ*e for Peace*building*. Retrieved October 15, 2011 from http://id.cdint.org/content/documents/Evaluating_Peace_Mediation.pdf.

Lawson, M. L. (2010). *Foreign aid: International donor coordination of development assistance.* DC: Congressional Research Service. Retrieved January 30, 2012 from fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/142758.pdf.

Lincoln, Y. S. (2003). Fourth generation evaluation in the new millennium. In S. I. Donaldson & M. Scriven (Eds.), *Evaluating social programs and problems: Visions for the new millennium* (pp. 77–90). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

McCauley, C. (2002). Head first versus feet first in peace education. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo (Eds.), *Peace education: The concept, principles, and practices around the world* (pp. 247–258). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Mertens, D. M. (2003). The inclusive view of evaluation: Visions for the new millennium. In S. I. Donaldson & M. Scriven (Eds.), *Evaluating social programs and problems: visions for the new millennium* (pp. 91–107). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Neufeldt, R. (2007). *"Frameworkers" and "Circlers"—Exploring assumptions in peace and conflict impact assessment.* Retrieved October 15, 2011 from http://www.berghof-handbook.net/documents/publications/neufeldt_handbook.pdf.

Nevo, B., & Brem, I. (2002). Peace education programs and the evaluation of their effectiveness. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo (Eds.), *Peace education: The concept, principles, and practices around the world* (pp. 271–282). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

OECD (2011). *DAC Global Relations Strategy.* Organisation de Coopération et de Développement Économiques. Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/dac/49102914.pdf

Reardon, B. (1988). *Comprehensive peace education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Reardon, B. (1997). Human rights education as education for peace. In G. J. Andreopoulous & R. P. Claude (Eds.), *Human rights education for the twenty-first century* (pp. 21–34). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press..

Ross, M. H. (2001). Action *Evaluation in the Theory and Practice of Conflict Re*solution. *Peace and Conflict Studies, 8*(17), 2–47.

Ross, M. H. (2000). "Good-enough" Isn't so bad: Thinking about success and failure in ethnic conflict management. *Peace and Conflict Studies, 6*(1), 27–47.

Stave, S. E. (2011). *Measuring peacebuilding: Challenges, tools, actions.* Norway: The Norwegian Peacebuilding Resource Centre (NOREF). Retrieved October 15, 2011 from http://www.peacebuilding.no/var/ezflow_site/storage/original/application/906762cb32e2eed5dc810bafa139f4ce.pdf.