

**LITERATURE REVIEW ON OUTCOMES OF SCHOOL-BASED
PROGRAMS RELATED TO “LEARNING TO LIVE TOGETHER”**

**UNESCO
International Bureau of Education**

**Compiled by Felisa Tibbitts
Human Rights Education Associates (HREA)
P.O. Box 382396
Cambridge, MA 02238 USA
Tel: +1 978 341 0200 Fax: +1 978 341 0201
www.hrea.org**

January 2005 (revised)

Acknowledgements

I would like to gratefully acknowledge the assistance of the following individuals in identifying resources for inclusion in this compilation: Dennis Barr, Terrice Bassler, Kevin Chin, Auxiliadora Sales Ciges, Barry van Driel, Diana Hughes, Martha Montero-Sieburth, Teresa Pozo Llorente, Jeff Plantilla, Ana Maria Rodina, Tatiana Serrano, Gloria Perez Serrano, Rebecca Shaw and Robert Trocmé.

I would also like to thank Isabel Byron and her colleagues at the International Bureau of Education at UNESCO for their most useful input into shaping this review, and for the opportunity to work with them in compiling these studies.

This review could never be complete, as limits on space and time constrain what can be identified and included. Undoubtedly there were studies I could not review because they were inaccessible in some way. I invite those who read this document to contact me with additional sources for inclusion in a future hard copy version of this compilation.

Many thanks,

Felisa Tibbitts
Executive Director
Human Rights Education Associate (HREA)
P.O. Box 382396
Cambridge, MA 02238-2396 USA
(tel) +1 978341 0200 (fax) +1 978 341 0201
(e-mail) <ftibbitts@hrea.org> (web) www.hrea.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	4
II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS FOR PROGRAMMING	8
Conflict resolution	8
Peace and global education	8
Moral and character education	10
Civics and human rights education.....	11
Intercultural and anti-racist education	12
Pro-social behavior programming	13
III. SUMMARY OF RESEARCH FINDINGS ON YOUTH	15
Self concept/self esteem	15
Perspective taking	16
Resiliency	17
Empathy	17
Tolerance	19
Relationship competence/connectedness	21
Reduced social distance	23
Friendships	25
Support for democratic values	26
Social responsibility and civic participation	27
Pro-social behavior (general)	29
Pro-social behavior (reduction in violence)	30
IV. SUMMARY OF RESEARCH FINDINGS ON CHARACTERISTICS OF SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS	33
Teaching methodology	34
Learning environment	35
Teacher quality	36
V. IMPLICATIONS FOR PROGRAMMING AND FUTURE RESEARCH	39
VI. BIBLIOGRAPHIC RESOURCES	41

I. INTRODUCTION

Learning to live together: Vision for educational programming

The term “learning to live together” is central to UNESCO’s mission. It is identified as one of the four pillars of knowledge or fundamental types of learning essential to full personal and social development in the 21st century. The other three pillars are learning to know, learning to do and learning to be. The concept of learning to live together is centered on the development of understanding, consideration and respect for others, their beliefs, values and cultures. This is considered to provide the basis for the avoidance of conflicts or their non-violent resolution and for ongoing peaceful coexistence. Beyond that, it implies recognizing differences and diversity as opportunity rather than danger and as a valuable resource to be used for the common good. The concepts of similarity, diversity and interdependence which define the human experience form the basis of the ideal of learning to live together.¹

UNESCO’s initiative “learning to live together” resonates with ideological, political, technological, economic and socio-cultural changes that are taking place in all regions. These changes have led to multiple new tensions as societies grow more diverse, and also as there are increasing inequalities within and among them. Schools are being increasingly required to develop programming that assists young people in “learning to live together”- something that cannot be taught from a book and which the life experience of students may not otherwise provide. As the humanist philosopher Bertrand Russell pointed out “tolerant citizens are not born – they are created.” So the challenge for educators willing to tackle this challenge is understanding how best to facilitate this among students.

More than ever in this age of global migration when democratic societies experience demographic transformations and people of different cultures and ethnicities are engaged in a variety of social, political and economic relations with each other, the preparation of tolerant and knowledgeable citizens becomes a vital necessity.

Source: Iftikhar Ahmad, *Diversity and Citizenship Education: Global Perspectives*, Teachers College Record, 2/16/04, www.tcrecord.org.

Learning to live together: What this entails

The concept of “learning to live together” entails the capacity to develop one’s own potential while learning to successfully manage relationships with others. It involves development of self awareness and self esteem as well as empathy and respect for others and requires the capacity for active citizenship, development of a sense of both local and

¹ UNESCO, IBE website: “Learning to live together – the concept”. www.ibe.unesco.org

global identity and an ability to understand others and appreciate diversity. These demand knowledge of and respect for social rules and organization, ethics, human rights and responsibilities, knowledge of one's own history and culture and that of other groups in society. Learning other languages can enhance learning to live together.²

A range of skills are necessary for learning to live together including skills for self-control, handling emotions, communication (self expression, empathetic listening), interpretation of behaviors, critical thinking, relationship building and cooperation, negotiation, mediation and refusal, problem solving and decision making. Many or all of these are referred to as life skills being seen as essential to meaningful personal development and social relationships in today's world.³

The promotion of these skills, attitudes and awareness are sometimes grouped together in a field called "socio-emotional learning." This category describes both the holistic methods (i.e., involving "heart and head") that are used to promote this kind of development, as well as the areas of intended outcomes of organized learning experiences.

If you think of working with young people in this holistic way, it necessarily involves creating supportive partnerships with families and understanding school as a context for children's development. The related tenets for educators are:

- The child must be viewed from an ecological perspective –that is, in the context of the family, community and larger society.
- Rather than diagnosing and remediating "the problem", professionals form partnerships with families.
- Both families and children need supportive environments for healthy development. Link families with health and social service agencies.⁴

There are innumerable programs in schools and community settings that address socio-emotional learning. Some of these naturally place a stronger emphasis on psychological and social dimensions of development because they are focused on very young children (e.g., Montessori methods). Other programs, such as conflict resolution or "emotional intelligences", are organized with the intention to bring about certain kinds of behavior in students, whether it is more peaceable resolutions of conflict or improved academic performance.

No single paper could possibly capture this full range of programming, nor their documented outcomes. What this compilation attempts to do is present the typologies of classroom- and school-based programs which relate to the UNESCO goals of "learning to live together", and to summarize some of the available research about their impact. The

² UNESCO, IBE website: "Learning to live together – what to teach and how?". www.ibe.unesco.org

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, "Child and Family Support Programs: Fostering Resiliency and Emotional Intelligence" www.nwrel.org

intention in doing so is to provide general guideposts for the educator concerning core, successful features of educational experiences. We are also hoping to illuminate the many areas of outcomes that have been identified for youth - that is, to “break down” the specific socio-emotional areas of impact that programs might influence.

Although this literature review is intended to “complicate” the thinking of the reader in terms of program design and its relationship to outcomes, in fact you will see that most of the programs share common approaches and methods. The foundation of these programs is remarkably similar and research consistently demonstrates their value: cooperative learning, open discussion in the classroom, a trusting and respectful environment for students. Thus, in the end, we will come full circle in terms of UNESCO’s identification of what a “child-centered” classroom looks like, and the research-affirmed qualities of programs intended to promote “learning to live together.”

Limits of this report

In order to have a more manageable parameter to the programs studied, this compilation is focused on classroom- and school-based programs for which literature could be found in the following areas: conflict resolution; global and peace education; moral and character education; civic and human rights education; intercultural and racist education; and other programs that intend to promote general “pro-social” behavior. The area of “bullying prevention” was not fully researched, although a few studies are referenced.

There are, regrettably, several limitations to this review. The first is that developing this report in a short time frame during the summer months has restricted the availability of sources – particularly those that are in non-English languages and available only in hard copy. Thus, sources are strongly skewed towards North America and Western Europe.

The reader’s concern about these sources may be eased somewhat by the following observations. The first is that the findings of studies that were obtained for regions such as Latin America are highly consistent with those from North America and Western Europe. In other words, there is no contradiction in findings in terms of general program design and student outcomes.

Another observation is that socio-emotional programs are “non-traditional” both in approach and in subject area (with the exception of civics). Thus, we would expect such programs to be more prevalent in educational systems that are more flexible, decentralized and “progressive” in outlook. This is truer for certain systems than others, although as the UNESCO schools project has demonstrated, there are educators everywhere who are willing to try new programs in the interest of promoting their students’ development.

A final observation about the sources referenced in this review is that certain individual types of educational approaches have received more research attention than others, thus affecting the number of available studies. Conflict resolution, peace education and civic education programs appear to have been studied more extensively. This is probably due

to the fact that citizenship education is considered a core subject in most countries; that peace education has been offered for several decades now; and that pro-social, violence reduction and conflict resolution programs are typically offered by specialists external to the school system with an interest in demonstrating the effectiveness of their programs. The educational approaches where there are relatively fewer studies include human rights education, intercultural and character education. One can speculate that this is because these approaches tend to be infused within other subject areas (and thus difficult to separate out and study), do not necessarily have commercial vendors that would initiate research, and –in the case of human rights education – is a fairly new area.

Despite these caveats, there is much to be gleaned from the research that has been done. The message is clear: well designed programs can have a significant impact on students' personal development, relationships, and tolerance and acceptance of others. Of course, the programs should be implemented well: teachers should be motivated and prepared to teach them and there should be sufficient contact hours with the program. Our educator instincts would tell us as much. The studies presented here say this, and more.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS FOR PROGRAMMING

Several categories of educational programming – taking place both inside and outside of the classroom - are intended to affect social and emotional learning in ways that promote “learning to live together.” The kinds of programming identified as being especially relevant for this literature review are:

- conflict resolution;
- global and peace education;
- moral and character education;
- civic and human rights education;
- intercultural and racist education; and
- other programs that intend to promote general “pro-social” behavior

Most of these programs make use of active learning methods and are constructivist in approach, drawing on students’ earlier experiences and conceptual structures. However, it is important to note the overall typologies for these varied programs, as these differences influence both how the programs are designed as well as the intended outcomes on students. We now present these briefly.

Conflict resolution

Conflict resolution programs take place are typically implemented throughout a school, in response to disturbing levels of violence among students or high drop-out rates. Such programs are often introduced in either general conditions of social conflict or interpersonal conflict, and such programs concentrate on self perceptions, self monitoring and certain social skills that include listening, negotiating, and being helped by mediation. Some programs can also include cross-cultural issues and bias awareness. The focus here is mainly on the interpersonal aspect of conflicts aimed at changed behaviors that will lead to the conflicts’ peaceful resolution.⁵

One of the premises of conflict resolution programs can be a change in attitudes in general towards conflict, understanding that they can be creative rather than destructive processes. “Learning to live together” means accepting that conflict is inevitable and not to be avoided, but worth examining, managing and, if necessary, reducing in order to promote social harmony.

Peace and global education

Peace education deals with relations between groups, not individuals. In peace education the focus is the inter-group aspect of a conflict, aiming at changed perceptions, attitudes

⁵ Gavriel Solomon, *Does Peace Education Make a Difference?*, University of Haifa, Center for Research on Peace Education, April 2003 p. 4.

and feelings that will lead, so one hopes, to a different way of relating to the other collective side of the conflict. Programs try to promote more mutual understanding, tolerance and bring about some reduction of violence.⁶

Peace education in out-of-school settings

Peace education taking place in a setting of protracted conflict can be realized through joint school-based or campus-based programs and learning projects, weekend workshops, summer camps, community-based seminars, theater clubs and other creative enterprises.

(Gavriel Solomon, *Does Peace Education Make a Difference?*, University of Haifa, Center for Research on Peace Education, April 2003, p. 3.)

There is, of course, some overlap between conflict resolution and peace education, such as being able to examine one's own (or one's own group's) contribution to the conflict, which is common to both. Still the core is different: The acquisition of conflict resolution skills is not an important part of peace education while coming to acknowledge the humane side of one's collective adversary is not a central part of conflict resolution.⁷

It can be confusing to try to distinguish between peace education and conflict resolution educational programming at times. For example, the UNESCO Schools of Peace project that was carried out in Rio de Janeiro in Brazil aimed at violence reduction in youth by providing cultural, sports and reading activities for youth after school and on weekends.⁸ Although the overall aim of the program was to promote the personal development and safety of participating students, this program did not use a "peace education" learning approach.

Global Studies is focused on the individual's search for meaning in various cultures as well as the more traditional study of world cultures. A typical objective of the approach is to motivate students by introducing them to global studies through concepts which are already part of their understanding, and then by developing and expanding these concepts across space and through time. Specific concepts around which the global studies concept approach is organized include heritage and change (social organization, environment, communication, the arts); power and conflict resolution (laws, imperialism, political processes, governmental structure); and interdependence and human rights (religion, philosophy, education, economic organization).⁹

⁶ Solomon (2003), p. 3.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁸ Miriam Abramovay – Research Coordinator, *Schools of Peace UNESCO* (Brasilia: UNESCO, Government of the State of Rio de Janeiro/State Secretariat of Education, University of Rio de Janeiro, 2001), p. 24.

⁹ Bureau of Curriculum Services, *An Integrated Approach to Global Education* (Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania State Department of Education, October 1979).

Moral and character education

Conceptual differences in definitions of morality and in theories about how one becomes a moral person underlie the various approaches to moral education. These approaches differ according to whether the emphasis is on the learning of specific behaviors, the internalization of specific values or character traits, the internalization of mental constructs (e.g., conscience) or the development (construction) of a personal understanding of moral values. Many of these approaches foster social understanding, perspective taking and moral discourse – all goals related to “learning to live together.”

In the 1970s and 1980s, a considerable amount of research was carried out on moral education programming, as moral development was first recognized as a subject in the psychology field. There are three general theoretical approaches to moral education: direct approach, cognitive developmental approach, and the caring approach. These are presented in the footnote below.

While the distinctions are fairly clear in theory, most of the existing comprehensive school programs combine several of these goals and processes. The Just Community approach emphasizes cognitive development, but also stresses the role of adult guidance. The Child Development Project includes all three, including direct teacher guidance, emphasis on collaboration, discussion of moral issues, and an emphasis on developing close and supportive relationships between teacher and students, and between students and students.¹⁰

¹⁰ The direct approach aims at the transmission, acquisition, and exercise of what are seen as the accepted moral values of the culture (such as honesty and responsibility). It emphasizes the principle of learning and social learning theory. It is hypothesized that students will learn and internalize the taught principles and values both because they are rewarded for doing so and because it is seen as a way of complying with the norms of the school and classroom with which they identify.

The cognitive developmental approach – as expounded in the work of Piaget, Kohlberg, and others – stresses the importance of noncoercive interpersonal interaction with peers and of confronting challenges to one’s accustomed ways of thinking. These features are expected to help students to construct personal moral meaning and to progress to higher stages of moral-prosocial reasoning, as well as to apply this reasoning in relevant situations. The approach emphasizes classroom practices that promote students’ reflection and participation in open-ended discussions of moral issues (both hypothetical and “practical”).

The caring approach, promoted in the work of Noddings and Gilligan, stresses the importance of experiencing and participating in close, mutual, and reciprocal caring relationships – with adults, primarily, but also with peers. The approach involves meaningful dialogue between and among students and teachers, responsive teacher guidance, and a supportive and caring community, all of which are expected to help students learn the importance of caring for others and to develop caring orientations. The caring approach overlaps with the other two in some respects. It shares the emphasis on the importance of the teacher-student relationship (direct approach) as well as the importance of dialogue (cognitive developmental). Daniel Solomon, Marilyn S. Watson and Victor A. Battistich, “Teaching and Schooling Effects on Moral/Prosocial Development” in Richardson, V., (ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, 4th ed., 2001, pp. 566, 594.

Character education has been defined as “any deliberate approach by which school personnel, often in conjunction with parents and community members, help children and youth become caring, principled and responsible.” It is an umbrella term that covers diverse approaches, philosophies and programs. There are four commonalities among the approaches:

- (a) direct instruction wherein youth are inculcated with virtues of society through training on habits of virtuous behavior;
- (b) indirect instruction
- (c) community building that is intended to enhance moral character through caring relationships and environments
- (d) adults used as role models.

These programs include teaching materials designed to infuse such character values as trustworthiness, responsibility, respect, fairness, caring and citizenship into the school curriculum, and can be integrated within a school community strategy to help re-engage students, deal with conflict, keep students on task in the learning environment, and reinvest the community with active participation by citizens in political and civic life.¹¹

Civic and human rights education

Education for citizenship has always been a clear mandate for schools and is traditionally incorporated as both a formal subject as well as an objective for school life and school-based activities. The specific learning agenda of citizenship education will be determined by the state educational system, with some attention to global trends. In European societies, for example, there is now interest in the idea of “compound citizenship” because of the advent of the European Union and intra-state relationships.¹²

Citizenship – or civic – education has several core concepts, including civic knowledge and cognitive civic skills (such as understanding the principles of representative democracy, constitutionalism/rule of law, and rights responsibilities of citizens.¹³ The goals of citizenship education most closely related to “learning to live together” relate to participatory civic skills and civic dispositions.

These skills and dispositions can be summarized as follows:

¹¹ Kimberly A. Vess and Duane A. Halbur, *Character Education: What Counselor Educators Need to Know*, June 2003, ERIC/CASS Digest ED475389.

¹² Tschoumy, Jacques Andre. *Montee en Puissance d'une Europe des Citoyennetes Composees* (The Coming into Force of a Europe of Compound Citizenships). Neuchatel, Switzerland: Institut Romand de Recherches et de Documentation Pedagogiques (IRDPA), 1993.

¹³ Gregory E. Hamot, *Civic Education Trends in Post-Communist Countries of Central and Eastern Europe* (November, 2003), University of Indiana website.

- (a) helping students become self-confident, well-informed citizens who are able to think rationally and who are committed to the values of human dignity and human rights;
- (b) fostering a willingness and capacity to participate in political affairs on local, national and international levels; and
- (c) developing a strong recognition of the need to balance individualism and self-interest with human interdependence and social as well as environmental responsibility.¹⁴

Human Rights Education in many countries intersects with democratic citizenship education, by taking the core concepts of citizenship education and applying them both more universally and more critically. Thus, knowledge areas and issues of civic disposition and civic skills are applied to the areas of global social responsibility, justice and social action. In the school setting, human rights education places a relatively stronger emphasis on values acquisition and cognitive skill development. However, human rights education is also intended to foster social responsibility and action among students.¹⁵

Because the human rights education approach takes a critical stance towards governments and institutional abuses of power, topics of school-based programs are influenced by problem areas such as child labor, genocide, refugees or issues of local concern identified within the school community. The organizing values of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and other key human rights documents are used to examine the sources of violations of rights and to encourage action to resolve them. A “critical human rights consciousness” is a key goal for human rights educators.¹⁶ Human rights education supports “learning to live together” by promoting an agenda of international justice (as a precondition for peace) and by encouraging the development of personal power, group support and critical awareness.¹⁷

Intercultural and anti-racist education

¹⁴ Schuetz, Peter. *Political Culture in the School and Classroom: Preparation for Democratic Citizenship*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Individualism and Community in a Democratic Society, Washington, DC, 1996.

¹⁵ Tibbitts, Felisa (2002). “Understanding What We Do: Emerging Models for Human Rights Education” in *International Review of Education*, 48 (3-4): 159-171.

¹⁶ Critical human rights consciousness might have the following criteria:

- (a) the ability of students to recognize the human rights dimensions of, and their relationship to, a given conflict- or problem-oriented exercise;
 - (b) an expression of awareness and concern about their role in the protection or promotion of these rights;
 - (c) a critical evaluation of the potential responses that may be offered;
 - (d) an attempt to identify or create new responses;
 - (e) a judgment or decision about which choice is most appropriate;
- an expression of confidence and a recognition of responsibility and influence in both the decision and its impact.

Garth Meintjes, “Human Rights Education as Empowerment: Reflections on Pedagogy” in *Human Rights Education for the Twenty-First Century*, eds. George J. Andreopoulos and Richard Pierre Claude (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997), p. 68.

¹⁷ Bonne Sue Adams and Nancy Schniedewind, “A Systemwide Program of Human Rights Education” in *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 45, No. 8, May, 1988, pp. 48-50.

Intercultural education programs are focused both on cultural diversity and the preparation of tolerant and knowledgeable citizens. To be cultural literate is to minimally have a detailed knowledge of the cultural characteristics of specific groups. However in order to promote intercultural understanding, this knowledge is not merely about holidays, food, dances and music but also values, behavioral norms, acceptable and effective reinforcements, and patterns of interpersonal relationships. Thus, programs can address the personal development and interpersonal relations of students – especially with respect to their own ethnic/racial identity, self esteem, and inter-group relations.¹⁸

In the U.S., the multicultural education approach has developed, stressing the appreciation of differences. A widely used curriculum is that of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) called A World of Difference, which is a comprehensive campaign against prejudice, including curriculum materials and public relations strategies organized by schools, the media and community groups to celebrate the differences among people and to further the cause of human rights. Recent research and other writing on intercultural education and multicultural education has gone beyond issues of race and ethnicity ...to include other groups that have been targets of prejudice and discrimination.¹⁹

Anti-racist education programs are intended to directly address the causes of ethnically or racially-related prejudice and conflict between groups. These programs overlap with the goals and approaches of many of the previously mentioned programs, with a special recognition of problems in the immediate environment. Anti-racist approaches add a critical perspective to intercultural- and multi-cultural programs by calling for an analysis of class and the construction of “race” in society as contributing factors to racism. Anti-bias education uses similar techniques to anti-racist education and focus on all groups that are an object of discrimination.

Pro-social behavior programming

“Learning to live together” incorporates both the personal development of individual students and the ability of youth to thrive and interact positively with others in their community. Certain youth are recognized as being particularly “at risk,” that is, having difficulties at school or at home that may them more likely to be involved in conflicts, drop out of school, use drugs or engage in other behaviors seen as anti-social.

Certain educational programs, which can be characterized as general “pro-social”, focus on social and emotional development, that is, helping children to develop a positive sense of self, and to recognize and appropriately express emotions. Behavior is not seen as

¹⁸ Kathleen Cotton, “Fostering Intercultural Harmony in Schools: Research Finding”, *School Improvement Research Series (SIRS)*, Northwest Regional Laboratory, www.nwrel.org

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

something to be ‘managed.’ Instead, children are helped to think through their emotions, to reflect on their actions, and to imagine how others think and feel.²⁰

Other universal prevention programs are aimed at addressing symptoms of psychopathology such as aggression, depression or anxiety; and commonly accepted risk factors associated with psychopathology such as impulsiveness, cognitive skill deficiencies or antisocial behavior. These programs are slightly broader, intending to address violence prevention and general social/emotional cognitive skill-building.²¹

All the programs presented above share a common thread. They want to affect the socio-emotional lives of children in ways that promote their personal development and positive cultural features in their classrooms, schools and community. In some cases, the programs are simply focused on the growth of the child, knowing that well adjusted, secure children will grow into adults who are more likely to exhibit characteristics consonant with “learning to live together.” In other cases, the programs are designed to address needs identified in the school environment or in broader society.

In either case, the programs hold the child’s well being “front and center.” The outcomes of some of these efforts are presented in the next section.

²⁰ Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, “Child and Family Support Programs: Fostering Resiliency and Emotional Intelligence” www.nwrel.org

²¹ Mark T. Greenberg, Celene Domitrovich and Brian Bumbarger, “The Prevention of Mental Disorders in School-Aged Children: Current State of the Field” in *Prevention & Treatment*, Volume 4, Article 1, March 30, 2001.

III. SUMMARY OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

The research studies that are presented here are as diverse as the social and emotional life of human beings. In the previous section, we presented a series of programs identified as promoting “learning to live together.” In this section we present research according to two general areas of impact: *youth development outcomes involving self* and *youth development outcomes involving other*.

As many of the programs involve a portfolio of approaches intended to touch on more than one outcome area, it is not easy to present the results in one area of another. However, we have tried to do this in order to facilitate comparisons, look for common program elements, and advance our understanding of the key questions related to impact in each of these areas.

Certain program areas – such as pro-social approaches intending to reduce violence in schools – have commercially available programs with well documented impacts. These are too numerous to list. Rather, a sample was selected in order to demonstrate popular program characteristics and their impact on students.

Studies whose main focus related to socio-emotional learning and “learning to live together” outcomes – and whose research design or authors appeared credible – are referenced in this literature review. Their inclusion in this summary is not a guarantee of their high quality. In general, there is a lack of research that is comparative, involves the use of control/comparison classrooms or is longitudinal in nature.

The research studies are presented separately, using the language of the original authors. The implications of these results for program implementation are discussed in Section IV.

Youth development outcomes involving self

Impacts on youth can be clustered in numerous ways. One division is impacts on attitudes, values and skills that are relatively self-contained. They are not directly linked with behaviors involving others although they clearly affect those interactions. Some areas of impact include self concept/self esteem, attitudes of empathy, and tolerance. Most programs address several outcome areas simultaneously, in some cases building towards other, related behaviors. For example, the fostering of self esteem – and end in itself – is associated with resiliency and tolerance. Thus, when reviewing youth development outcomes, one should bear in mind that these are typologies of a sort. They are intended to help clarify clear areas of impact in programming but are often interrelated with one another.

Self concept/self esteem

Self concept and self esteem relate to one’s view or opinion of oneself. Programs attempting to influence self esteem have addressed this concept directly using didactic

methods; building skills and – by extension – confidence in areas such as conflict resolution and moral discourse; and in the conditions of the learning environment.

Linkages between student opportunities to participate in open classroom discussions and pro-social/moral outcomes have been demonstrated in several studies...In his analysis of the field of moral education, Oser (1986) considered moral discourse to be the “common denominator” that underlies various approaches. Engaging children in moral discourse implies a trust in their social and moral capabilities.²²

Program: Conflict resolution – A 16-week intervention to improve primary school children’s conflict resolution skills and to enhance their self esteem. Three types of interventions were used 1) providing lessons on self esteem; (2) adapting a life skills unit; and (3) teaching conflict resolution strategies. The five themes for activities were implemented twice weekly in thirty minute lessons and adapted to grade level were self awareness, cooperation, individual responsibility, identification and expression of feelings, and conflict resolution.

Target group: primary school children

Findings: An action research project evaluated the impact of the impact. Findings indicated that there was a decrease in the negative classroom behaviors of physical and verbal aggression and negative social interactions. Student surveys revealed more positive self esteem and more insight into the feelings of others.²³

Perspective-taking

Perspective taking involves the identification and understanding of the thoughts and feelings of others. The outcome of perspective taking is related to relationship building, among other outcomes.

The benefit of engaging in conflict in an atmosphere that is open and instructional is significant. In a series of studies examining the impact of academic conflict and controversy within cooperative, competitive and individualistic learning environments, Johnson, Johnson and their colleagues found that controversy within a cooperative learning structure promotes motivation, the search for and exchange of information, the reevaluation of one’s position, positive attitudes about controversy, a sense of self-esteem, supportive relationships among students, as well as enjoyment of the subject matter and the instructional experience.²⁴

Program: Civic education program - The authors of the curriculum identify its goal as seeking “to foster cognitive growth and historical understanding by using content and

²² Solomon et al (2001), p. 578.

²³ Diana L. DiGuido et al, “Positive Social Interaction Strategies”, Masters Thesis at Saint Xavier University, 1997.

²⁴ (Johnson & Johnson, 1985; Johnson et al., 1985; Lowry & Johnson, 1981; Johnson & Johnson, 1981; Tjosvold, Johnson & Johnson, 1984; Tjosvold, Johnson & Johnson, 1981) as quoted in Sheldon Berman, *Children’s Social Consciousness and the Development of Social Responsibility* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1997), pp. 112-113.

methodology that induce conflict and continually complicate students' simple answers to complex problems". The curriculum is an eight- to ten-week civic education unit designed for middle and high school students. Its focus is on the study of the roots of the twentieth century genocide of the Holocaust.

Target group: middle and high school students

Findings: The Facing History and Ourselves curriculum (Strom & Parsons, 1982) exemplifies the power of an open classroom environment that raises important moral and political conflicts. Studies of the curriculum (Bardige, 1988; Lieberman, 1981, 1991) reveal that it significantly enhances students' interpersonal perspective-taking skills, their moral reasoning abilities, their ability to think about subject matter in complex ways, and their interest in social and political participation.²⁵

Resiliency

Research on social development indirectly supports the value of conflict resolution education, especially for at-risk youth. Some youths whose social or economic circumstances place them at risk for violent or self-destructive behavior are able to avoid outcomes such as dropping out of school, using drugs, getting pregnant, or participating in gang activities. These young people have been identified as possessing "resilience" derived from such factors as a sense of belonging, the ability to communicate effectively, flexibility, and good problem-solving skills. Resilience is characterized as a combination of qualities, including the ability to overcome the effects of a high-risk environment and to develop social competence despite exposure to severe stress....The relationship between resiliency and conflict resolution is clear and significant. In developing conflict resolution education programs, schools can create environments that support the development of resilient characteristics in children in three ways.

First, resolving conflicts in principled ways promotes and preserves relationships, thereby facilitating the bonding that is essential to the development of resilience. Second, conflict resolution fosters resiliency by conveying to youth that they have the power to control their own behavior by making choices that satisfy their needs. This would appear to also be related to self esteem. Finally, in giving youths the opportunity to resolve their conflicts peacefully, a conflict resolution education program sends to involved youth a powerful enabling message of trust and perceived capability. The foundational abilities of conflict resolution – orientation, perception, emotion, communication, creative-thinking, and critical-thinking abilities –are the same abilities and skills that form the foundation for developing and strengthening resiliency in youth.²⁶

Empathy

Empathy involves understanding and entering into another's feelings. Studies related to empathy as a social construct have been able to show program impact on pre-dispositions

²⁵ Sheldon Berman (1997), p. 115.

²⁶ Richard J. Bodine and Donna K. Crawford, *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution Education: A Guide to Building Quality Programs in Schools* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers), 1998, pp. 111-4.

towards more empathetic attitudes, but it remains challenging to show the relationship between expressed empathy and what might be called “moral action.”

Program: Pro-social, emphasizing affective and cognitive components (e.g., storytelling, written exercises, group discussions), identification of emotions, role playing and perspective taking. Also included a cognitive component including discrimination of social cues about thoughts, intentions and probable future behavior of others) 45-minute sessions, met 3 times a week for 10 weeks.

Target group: third and fourth grade children

Findings: In a pilot experiment, third and fourth-grade children, some of them highly aggressive, who received the affective-cognitive treatment showed positive effects on teacher ratings of aggressiveness and pro-social behavior. In a later study with a larger sample, children with the empathy training condition – as compared with those in two control conditions – showed gains in social sensitivity to others’ feelings, and pro-social behavior. They also showed declines in aggressiveness that were greater than those in a nonparticipating control group but not in a control group with an alternative set of activities.²⁷

Program: Human rights - development of empathy for victims of human rights abuses. A unit in “Comparative World Studies: Global Human Rights” course focused on the stories of victims and simulation activities, with the primary purposes being to elicit an affective response from students.

Target group: 11th grade children

Findings: Students seemed empathetic towards human rights victims as a result of the unit. From the survey results [n=81 students in 11th grade], we cannot theorize about the generalized nature of empathy and concern as understood by the students or about the long-term effect of the curriculum on student attitudes. We have some evidence, however, that some students understood that those values were foundational to citizens acting to improve society. A few students in 2003 indicated their efforts to take action beyond the scope of the classroom. Four of the 81 students surveyed in both years indicated in their open-ended responses a commitment to advocating for human rights beyond the course. The contrast between those claiming empathy and concern and those acting on their concern seems to indicate that most students view caring and empathy as internal responses, rather than social ones.²⁸

Program: “March of Life” visit to death camps in Poland (“*The March of Life*”). The research question was whether this visit would positively affect the empathy of Israeli students to the suffering of Palestinians.

Target group: Israelis high school students

Findings: Results showed that participation in the program was correlated with changes in empathy in the experimental group, such that the empathy with the Palestinians of the more hawkish participants tended to reduce whereas the empathy of the more dovish participants tended to increase. The kinds of lessons derived from the March of Life

²⁷ Daniel Solomon et al (2001), pp. 589-90.

²⁸ William Gaudelli and William R. Fernekes, “Teaching About Global Human Rights for Global Citizenship” in *The Social Studies* (January/February 2004), p. 22.

tended to be a crucial variable. Young people who drew more nationalistic morals from their visit to the death camps (e.g., “Jews have to keep protecting themselves against anti-Semitism”) tended to express identification with the victims and feelings of power and pride, but these lessons or feelings had no bearing on expressed empathy towards the Palestinians. On the other hands, youngsters who initially had more dovish views also drew more universalistic morals from their visits to the death camps, expressed more feelings of fear and helplessness and tended to manifest increased empathy towards the Palestinians.²⁹

Tolerance

Tolerance has been variously defined and the concept continues to be debated. A starting point is ‘the willingness to recognize and respect the beliefs or practices of others.’

Studies of adults indicate that psychological characteristics play a much more important role in influencing tolerance levels than do traditional demographic characteristics such as social status, income and residence. Individuals with higher self esteem, who are less dogmatic and less authoritarian, tend to better withstand the “threat” of ideas at odds with their own. Level of education achieved also consistently predicts a person’s level of tolerance. Post-secondary educational experiences in particular may help people become more comfortable with diverse beliefs. These experiences tend to increase self esteem and to lower dogmatism and authoritarianism.³⁰

Findings from different research show that engaging in dramatic presentations, cooperative learning, critical thinking, and self-esteem-building activities are identified as particularly effective in reducing levels of prejudice within and outside of school settings.

Source: G. S. Pate, “Research on Reducing Prejudice” in *Social Education* 52/4 (1988): 287-289.

Traditional secondary texts and classroom practices are unlikely to foster tolerance because they tend to avoid controversy, but research suggests that curricular specifically designed to teach young people about the role of tolerance in a democracy can have an impact on levels of tolerance. A three-week civil liberties unit (American Civil Liberties Union) that had students involved in conducting in-depth investigations of how abstract “slogans of democracy” are applied in concrete situations, and interviewing community members demonstrated greater levels of tolerance in students at the end of the unit, when compared to a control group. Similarly, students who were using “We the People” materials calling for discussion of the application of civil liberty principles with a range

²⁹ Solomon (2003), pp. 18-19.

³⁰ (Sullivan, Piereson & Marcus, 1982) as quoted by Patricia G. Avery, *Developing Political Tolerance* (December 2001), University of Indiana website.

of traditional “out groups” demonstrated greater levels of tolerance than did students not using the materials.³¹

One study examined the effects on political socialization of students in grades five and six, based on teachers’ use of local newspapers in classrooms throughout Argentina (except Buenos Aires) during the 1995 school year. Data were collected by self administered questionnaires filled out by students (to measure educational outcomes) and by teachers (regarding teaching methods) throughout the country. Results indicated that use of the newspaper in the classroom significantly and positively affected students’ political knowledge, democratic norms, and communication behaviors. Strong effects were found on tolerance, support for democracy, the formation of political opinions, and on communication behaviors such as discussing politics with family members and reading the newspaper at home.³²

In both the above examples, learning experiences that give learners the opportunity to be exposed to and explore diverse points of view from a critical perspective – whether through research in the community or through exposure to newspapers – helped to promote tolerance, at least from a cognitive point of view. These studies did not examine evidence of changed behavior.

There is some evidence to suggest that students’ level of political tolerance is related to their perception of the classroom and school environment. First, teachers who actively create an “open classroom climate” demonstrate that they value divergent viewpoints. Second, when students practice listening to different perspectives, they may come to appreciate how such discussions may increase their understanding of an issue. Finally, when students regularly engage in discussions about controversial issues, they are less likely to feel threatened by views that are opposed to their own.³³

What specific methods seem to be effective in addressing prejudice and improving inter-group understanding among young people?

- *Cooperative learning.* Numerous research studies have shown that learners of all ages, when organized into culturally heterogeneous teams and achieving success at the completion of a task or activity, experience significant decreases in inter-group tension, noted by both observers and participants.
- *Empathy development.* Effective practices that are aimed at developing understanding, positive regard, and pro-social behavior (empathy) have proved to foster more positive inter-group relations in the classroom.

³¹ Patricia G. Avery, “Teaching Tolerance: What Research Tells Us” in *Social Education* (66)(5), September 2002, pp. 271-2.

³² Chaffee, Steven H. and others. *Political Socialization via a Newspaper-in-Schools Program in Argentina: Effects of Variations in Teaching Methods*. Final Report to the Spencer Foundation. Alexandria, VA: EDRS, 1997.

³³ *Ibid*, p. 274.

- *Developing critical thinking skills.* Activities that assist students in the ability to identify and challenge faulty thinking or common fallacies, which are often associated with prejudice and bias, have proven to reduce prejudice in some subjects by revealing that it is not logically supported.
- *Developing high self-esteem.* Probably the most widely-proven link is between developing a positive self-regard and having a positive regard for those who are culturally different from oneself. Individuals who feel good about themselves and their identity are less likely to be prejudiced and biased towards others.³⁴

Many anti-bias reform efforts focus on bringing diverse groups of individuals together to discuss concerns and improve inter-group relations. Some of these are referred to in the section addressing conflict resolution. With respect to school-based efforts, research has found that diversity programs rarely improve cross-cultural relations if the treatment of diversity is too brief/or superficial. Presenting facts and information about other cultures has little or no effect on attitudes or behaviors. Additionally, “one shot” or limited exchanges rarely result in the reduction of bias or prejudice.³⁵

In situations of intractable conflict, an approach that does appear to have some results is to study a foreign conflict. Even when no direct connections are drawn to a local conflict (as was the case for Israeli and Palestine students studying the conflict in Northern Ireland), research shows that students are able to draw their own analogies. Research carried out with the Israeli students showed positive shifts in attitudes towards Palestinians and an ability to understand both sides of the Northern Ireland conflict. “More generally, it may well be the case that studying another conflict, one in which students have no stake and no emotional involvement, circumvents defenses such as entrenchment and reaction which would arise if direct persuasion would be attempted”.³⁶

Youth development outcomes involving other

The majority of educational programs involving social and emotional learning are oriented towards outcomes for youth that involve interactions with others. Those programs oriented towards “learning to live together” are interested to promote, among other things, *relationship competence, connectedness and friendships, reduced social distance, reduced aggression and conflict, and social responsibility.*

Relationship competence/connectedness

Relationship competence is the establishment and maintenance of healthy and rewarding connections with individuals and groups. Moral and political development is fostered by experiencing healthy relationships, caring for others, listening to and appreciating the

³⁴ “The A World of Difference Institute Philosophical Framework”, Anti-Defamation League website, www.adl.org

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ (Tormala & Petty, 2002) as quoted in Solomon (2003), pp. 12, 14.

other's perspective, and entering into dialogue with those whom one is in conflict with in order to reestablish balance in the relationship. These need to be experienced in both the interpersonal and the larger social arena. Relationship competence is linked with the overall classroom environment but it can also be cultivated through a specific curriculum or organized activities in the learning environment.

The processes that foster development are not independent of one another. They are, in fact, inextricably linked. The environments that foster development are ones that are open, nurturing and participatory, where people model and live pro-social values and where conflict is handled instructively and effectively. They are environments where young people are provided opportunities for taking the perspective of others and reflecting on their own attitudes and beliefs. They are places where young people are able to learn from conflict and engage in equalizing dialogue about meaningful issues....These processes are deeply relational in nature.³⁷

Program: Civic education - 10-week Facing History and Ourselves curriculum emphasizing self reflection, exploring questions of identity, group membership, obligation to other, the Nazi rise to power, the Holocaust as a case study, choices made by perpetrators, victims and bystanders

Target group: middle and high school students

Findings: A study on the impact of the Facing History and Ourselves program funded by the Carnegie Corporation of New York was published in the *Journal of Moral Education* in 2002. The study demonstrated that eighth-grade students in 14 Facing History classrooms showed increased relationship maturity, and decreases in racist attitudes and self-reported fighting behavior relative to comparison students. In the domain of relationship maturity, the Facing History students gained (over and above comparison students) in their interpersonal understanding, hypothetical and real-life interpersonal negotiation, and – most strongly – in their capacity to reflect on the personal meaning of relationships....There was congruence between the developmental theory on which the measure was based and the goals of the FHAO program: the assumption that character development is based on growth in children's and adolescent's capacity to coordinate their own perspectives with those of others through engagement in personally meaningful interaction with teachers, other students, curriculum materials, and writing.³⁸

Caring relationships between teachers and students

In participating schools, it was clear that social relationships among students were influenced by the pedagogy promoted by teachers. Evaluators noticed a stronger "emotional" connotation of the relational aspect, rather than instructional: 'we are very good friends, we help each other', 'if one is suffering, we all suffer'...Teachers described a "partnership" with students, openness towards students, and a continuing

³⁷ Berman (1997), pp. 101-2.

³⁸ Lynn Hickey Schultz, Dennis J. Barr and Robert L. Selman, "The Value of a Developmental Approach to Evaluating Character Development Programs: An Outcome Study of Facing History and Ourselves", *Journal of Moral Education*, Vol. 30, No. 1, 2001, pp. 20-22.

strong personal relationship even after completion of studies.

Source: Catalina Ulrich, Alexandru Crisan, Simona Moldovan and Nancy Green, *Evaluation Report for the Project "Equal Opportunities for Roma Children through School Development Programs and Parents' Involvement"*, A Project of Center for Education 2000+, Romania, and SLO, National Institute for Curriculum Development, The Netherlands, 28 April 2002, pp. 24-5.

Program: Integration of Roma and non-Roma students. Program inputs included school development/improvement, intercultural education including Roma language and culture in the school curriculum and activities, and parent and community involvement.

Target group: school community members, including students and teachers

Findings: Most of the interviewed teachers, students or respondents in three Romanian pilot schools with integrated Roma and non-Roma school populations stated that relationships between children with different ethnic backgrounds (Roma specifically) were either good or very good (90%). Fifty seven percent (57%) of respondents reported that relationships had improved during the previous six months because of project activities. None of the teachers thought the relationships had worsened over the last six months... Teachers from participating schools noted that relationships among students were "very good" because students were sharing the same educational environment and contributing to its improvement; students were involved in common activities (e.g., Romani language is taught to both Roma and non-Roma students). In participating schools, it was also clear that social relationships among students were influenced by the pedagogy promoted by teachers. Evaluators noticed a stronger "emotional" connotation of the relational aspect, rather than instructional: 'we are very good friends, we help each other', 'if one is suffering, we all suffer'... Teachers described a "partnership" with students, openness towards students, and a continuing strong personal relationship even after completion of studies.³⁹

Reduced social distance

Social distance is the perceived similarity/dissimilarity between individuals and/or groups on the basis of characteristics such as ethnicity, culture, language, gender, class and other defining features of groups.

Different kinds of peace education involve meeting between members of the two sides, joint theater activities, joint training of young leaders, and the like. In all of these, the conflict is openly discussed or acted out in improvised plays. Maoz (2001) has studied 47 such ongoing encounters, trying to ascertain the extent to which certain necessary conditions such as symmetry and equitable interactions were met. She found that in many of the peace education programs she observed these conditions were indeed met. Katz, Malov and Salomon (2003) studied a number of programs, examining immediate post-program attitudinal changes as well as those measured a whole year later. Ninety-one

³⁹ Catalina Ulrich, Alexandru Crisan, Simona Moldovan and Nancy Green, *Evaluation Report for the Project "Equal Opportunities for Roma Children through School Development Programs and Parents' Involvement"*, A Project of Center for Education 2000+, Romania, and SLO, National Institute for Curriculum Development, The Netherlands, 28 April 2002, pp.24-5.

Jewish and Arab youth participating in peace education programs in 2000-1 were administered a battery of questionnaires. The results showed that participation in the programs yielded positive effects particularly on willingness for social contact, on trust, agreement with the other side's perspective, willingness to study the other's language, and openness to the other side's view. Some of the effects of the peace education programs were recorded a whole year after the termination of the programs. Also, whereas Jews received higher scores on most pretest measures, it was the Arab participants that showed the greatest changes from pre- to posttest and maintained the changes over a full year.⁴⁰

A series of quasi-experimental studies carried out with Israeli and Arab youth revealed that despite the ongoing violence, participation in various programs yielded positive attitudinal, perceptual and relationship changes manifested in, for example, more positive views of "peace," better ability to see the other's perspective, and a greater willingness for contact. These changes (a) continued to be manifested even a whole year after the programs' completion; (b) depended upon participants' initial political views, thus play a reinforcing function; (c) were mainly cognitive in nature, not mediated by changed emotions, thus play a selective function; and (d) prevented the worsening of perceptions of and attribution to the other side, thus serving a preventive capacity.⁴¹ It is important to note that the latter change could serve as a "stop gap" measure in preventing a further widening of social distance at the interpersonal level in periods of enhanced stress and conflict at the national level.

How effective multicultural programs have been in bringing about improvements is difficult to determine, partly because of the lack of specificity in the use of the term "multicultural education" but also because there is not a great deal of systematic research on the effects of such programs. One thing we do know is that programs...are unlikely to improve cross-group relations if their treatment of cultural diversity is too brief or too superficial. Programs designed to expand students' knowledge of other cultures through, for example, the presentation of facts and other information, generally have little or no effect on attitudes or behavior. Neither do "one shot" or other brief activities, regardless of their content.⁴²

Program: Peace education – "Education for Peace Project" with 10 hours of teacher training; 3 teachers minimum per school; 2 hours per week for 24 weeks; followed by a 2-day intensive encounter between Israeli and Palestinian students

Target group: high school students

Findings: A preliminary evaluation of the "encounters" portion of the program, commissioned by Israel/Palestine Center for Research and Information (IPCRI), showed that the vast majority of participants (about 80%) said they were very eager to participate. Most said that prior to the encounters their impressions of the other side were quite negative, and were based mainly on television images featuring violence, and on stressful

⁴⁰ Solomon (2003), p. 15.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

⁴² (Byrnes and Kiger 1986-7; Garcia, Powell and Sanchez 1990; Gimmestad and De Chiara 1982; Hart and Lumsden 1989; Merrick 1988; Pate 1981, 1988) as quoted in Cotton (no date).

encounters with authorities from the other side. Most of these prior impressions were of course highly stereotypical. But most participants indicated that the encounters had the effect of breaking these stereotypes down: for example, in most cases, participants indicated that they had come to see their counterparts as more friendly, tolerant, considerate and open to change than they had believed them to be before the encounter.⁴³

Friendships

Going beyond the reduction of social distance, one can find programs that actively cultivate friendships. There appears to be a strong link between the development of interpersonal relations, or friendships, across barriers of animosity and the growing acceptance of the other side's members and its collective narrative. The emphasis that some peace educators put on the establishment of interpersonal relations appears to have merit as it can generalize to perceptions of the other group as a collective. Bar-Natan carried out a study with 170 Jewish and Israeli-Palestinian young people who participated in Givat Haviva's standard two-day joint workshops, dealing with conflict. Her study yielded consistent positive correlations between the number and perceived depth of inter-group friendships developed during the workshop and both agreement for closer contacts with other members of the opposite group as well as the legitimization of the other group's collective narrative.⁴⁴

Research indicates that both direct and indirect friendship with outgroup members (that is, knowledge of in-group members' friendship with out-group members) can reduce prejudice towards the out-group. Two surveys of cross-community relations in Northern Ireland, using a student sample (N=341) and a representative sample of the general population (N=735) tested whether (1) direct and indirect friendships had generalized effects on both prejudice and out-group variability and (2) reduced anxiety about future encounters with out-group members mediated such relationships. Structural equation modeling confirmed that, in both samples, direct and indirect cross-group friendships between Catholics and Protestants were associated with reduced prejudice towards the religious out-group and increased out-group variability, via an anxiety-reduction mechanism. Emerging generalization hypotheses help to integrate both cognition and effect and interpersonal and inter-group approaches to contact.⁴⁵

School practices regarding academic tracking, extracurricular activities and student mixing by grade can help promote friendships among students of different races...The results showed that the likelihood of segregated friendships increased as a school's racial diversity moved from moderately low to moderately high, but declined at the highest

⁴³ Morris Lipson, *Educating Youth Against Racism*, Report prepared for the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights for the World Conference Against Racism, Durban, South Africa, August 2001, p. 20.

⁴⁴ Solomon (2003), pp. 20-21.

⁴⁵ Stefania Paolini, Miles Hewstone, Ed Cairns, Alberto Voci, "Effects of Direct and Indirect Cross-Group Friendships on Judgments of Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland: The Mediating Role of an Anxiety-Reduction Mechanism" in *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* (in press).

level of diversity. When you get larger minority populations, they reach a size where you can have a viable single-race community.⁴⁶

Support for democratic values

Democratic values are typically defined in relation to the notion of constitutional democracy, including beliefs related to individual rights and freedoms, popular sovereignty, representative government (voting), justice and human rights. This list is not comprehensive.

Researchers have found that knowledge is not sufficient if one wishes to enhance democratic values, efficacy or participation. Teaching political concepts and knowledge has not had an impact on the development of political attitudes (Ehman, 1980; Leming, 1992). Langton and Jennings (1968), in their interviews with over 1,600 high school seniors, reported little effect of the civics curriculum on political efficacy. Torney, Oppenheim, and Farnen (1975), in their study of civic education in ten democracies, found the same pattern among fourteen- and seventeen-year-olds. “The acquisition of knowledge does not correlate highly with support for democratic values, and even less as children get older. It is therefore unwise to assume that knowledgeable students will automatically support democratic values. Neither does knowledge of civics correlate highly with various measures of political participation” (p. 19).

However, the lack of relationship between knowledge and efficacy was not the same for early elementary children. More, Lare and Wagner (1985) observed that the more politically knowledgeable young children were, the more likely they were to have a strong sense of political efficacy and to become involved in political life.⁴⁷

Among adolescents, political tolerance tends to be associated with older age, higher moral reasoning, higher empathy, and higher self-esteem. Tolerant students tend to make connections between abstract democratic principles and concrete situations, to make multiple perspectives, and to see alternative solutions to problems. Intolerant students have difficulty relating principles to practice or seeing beyond their own viewpoint...Secondary school experiences can increase students’ level of political tolerance, but their impact tends to be far less significant than that of post-secondary experiences because while college instruction tends to highlight divergent perspectives, secondary teachers and textbooks have traditionally avoided conflict.⁴⁸

The political socialization study that most extensively examined the issue of classroom environment was Torney, Oppenheim, and Farnen’s (1975) study of ten-, fourteen- and seventeen-year-olds in ten democracies. The major emphasis in their study was

⁴⁶ Jeff Grabmeier, *Mix It Up Research: Diverse Student Body Does not Guarantee Integrated Friendships*, www.tolerance.org

⁴⁷ Berman (1997), pp. 107-108.

⁴⁸ Avery (2001).

examining the relationship between civic instruction and knowledge of civic processes, democratic values, efficacy, and interest in participation. Data were collected from 30,000 students and teachers. They operationalized democratic values as freedom to criticize the government, equal rights for all citizens, tolerance for diversity, freedom of the mass media, respect for others, equality in voting, belief in the freedom of the individual, the right to vote, and the right to be represented. The results from all ten countries affirmed the importance of an open atmosphere on all the major variables. “On the whole, the results showed that specific classroom practices were less important than what is often called the ‘classroom climate’; more knowledgeable, less authoritarian, and more interested students came from schools where they were encouraged to have free discussion and to express their opinion in class. (p. 18) The characteristics of classroom climate that was most significant in promoting democratic values was the open expression of student opinions. The use of printed drill in class, the stress on factual information, and the engagement of the students in various patriotic rituals had the most counter-productive effect.⁴⁹ Thus, educators serious about promoting democratic values will need to practice what they preach.

Social responsibility and civic participation

In general, the moral education studies of student participation in decision making in classrooms and schools show that young people grow from this experience in ways that support the development of various aspects of social responsibility. Social responsibility refers to the notion of contributing positively towards one’s community. Students in schools with participatory structures showed significantly higher levels of moral development (McCann and Bell, 1975; Clinchy, Lief and Young, 1977; Cole and Farris, 1979). In addition a number of studies have reported specific behavioral changes. Power and Reimer (1978) reported a reduction in theft. Kohlberg (1980) reported improved racial integration. Kohlberg, Lieberman, Power and Higgins (1981) reported reductions in the use of alcohol and drugs. And Power and Higgins (1992) reported increases in attendance, participation, and educational aspirations.⁵⁰

In Chile, Colombia and the U.S. among 14- and 17-year-olds, school factors such as open classroom climate for discussion, confidence in school participation, and learning in school to solve community problems were related to students’ expectations that they would participate in political and social-movement activities as adults. One of the most significant predictors of both the 14-year-old and 17-year-old students’ expectations of participating in civic activities as adults was the frequency with which they read the newspaper.⁵¹

It is in the just community approach recommended by Kohlberg (1985) that we see the clearest and most significant impact of student decision making on the development of

⁴⁹ Berman (1997), pp. 109-110.

⁵⁰ *Ibid*, pp. 127-8.

⁵¹ Judith Torney-Purta and Jo-Ann Amadeo, *Strengthening Democracy in the Americas through Civic Education: An Empirical Analysis Highlighting the Views of Students and Teachers* (Washington, DC: Unit for Social Development and Education, Organization of American States, January 2004).

social responsibility. The just community, in Kohlberg's formulation, is a small political community that is based on equal political rights. The just community focuses on building moral community through involving students in democratic decision making. Students experience real power in making meaningful decisions about the management, care, and direction of the school, and they experience real conflicts with other students and teachers who have different perspectives on these issues. Power, Higgins and Kohlberg (1989) found that the sense of community and collective interest that developed in these just communities significantly enhanced the level of students' social responsibility. They credit this increase in social responsibility to the fact that the just community develops strong interpersonal connections. Students are aware of the needs of others and are concerned about the welfare of others and the welfare of the community as a whole.⁵²

Pateman (1970), a political scientist who studied the relationship between workplace environment and political participation, argued that "we learn to participate by participating and...feelings of political efficacy are more likely to be developed in a participatory environment" (p. 105). The data, for the most part, bear her out. Almond and Verba (1963) in their classic study of civic culture, found that individuals in five nations who had participated in decision making in their family, school, and workplace were more likely than others to participate in politics....The relationship between participation in one's environment and political efficacy has been the subject of research on school governance and climate as well. Ehman (1980), in his review of the relationship between schooling and political socialization, found a strong, although not conclusive, link between decision-making participation in school governance structures and democratic political attitudes.⁵³

Sigel and Hoskin (1981), in their study of adolescents, found that participation in school activities and school governance as consistently and strongly related to higher levels of political knowledge and efficacy. Hanks and Eckland (1978), using longitudinal data from a national sample of adolescents followed up twenty five years later, found that there was a strong and direct correlation between participation in extracurricular school activities and both membership in adult voluntary associations and increased voting. Although extracurricular participation may form habits of participation and increased efficacy, it is impossible to conclude that there is a causal relationship between the two from these studies. Students who are more active in school may have been more inclined to be socially active in general. However, a number of studies of school governance structure and climate do confirm that there is a relationship between climate and efficacy. Humanistic schools, where there is cooperative interaction between faculty and students, where self-discipline is used as a substitute for teacher control, and there is an atmosphere in which students can express opinions and have some influence in school decisions, do not produce students who express feelings of alienation, powerlessness, isolation and normlessness (as opposed to custodial schools)⁵⁴

⁵²*Ibid.*, pp. 132-4.

⁵³ Berman (1997), pp. 124-125.

⁵⁴ Rafalides and Hoy, 1971, as quoted in Berman, 1997, pp. 125-126.

Pro-social behaviors (general)

Pro-social behaviors are voluntary actions intended to help or benefit another individual or group of individuals. Two programs are highlighted, because of their high degree of documentation. Each offers a combination of individual skill development and social supports.

The Child Development Project (CDP) focuses primarily on changing school ecology to create schools that are “caring communities of learners.” CDP provides school staff training in the use of cooperative learning and a language arts model that fosters cooperative learning, as well as a developmental approach to discipline that promotes self control by engaging students in classroom norm-setting and providing them with opportunities to actively participate in classroom decision-making. School-wide community building activities are used to promote school bonding, and parent involvement activities such as interactive homework assignments reinforce the family-school partnership.⁵⁵

In a study involving 4,500 3rd through 6th graders in 24 diverse U.S. schools, the program was found to produce significant reductions in self-reported delinquent behaviors including weapon carrying, skipping school, and vehicle theft.⁵⁶ In other studies, children were observed engaging more often in such spontaneous pro-social behaviors as helpfulness, cooperation, concern for others’ needs and feelings, giving of affection, support and encouragement than students in comparison schools. Second, students in the CDP schools developed more effective ways of social problem solving and of resolving conflicts. Third, these students had a greater commitment to democratic values than those in the comparison schools. They operationalized democratic values as support for equal participation and representation among group compromise as a possible solution to differences, and the right to influence group decisions and be involved in group activities.⁵⁷

Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS) is another elementary-based program to promote social/emotional competence through cognitive skill-building. With an emphasis on teaching students to identify, understand and self-regulate their emotions, PATHS also adds components for parents and school contexts beyond the classroom to increase generalizability of students’ newly-acquired skills. In a randomized controlled trial involving 200 2nd and 3rd grade U.S. students, PATHS produced significant improvements in social problem solving and understanding at post-test. Compared to controls, general education intervention children show one-year follow-up improvements on social problem-solving, emotional understanding, self report of conduct problems,

⁵⁵ Mark T. Greenberg, Celene Domitrovich and Brian Bumbarger, “The Prevention of Mental Disorders in School-Aged Children: Current State of the Field” in *Prevention & Treatment*, Volume 4, Article 1, March 30, 2001.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

⁵⁷ Berman (1997), pp. 142-143.

teacher ratings of adaptive behavior, and cognitive abilities related to social planning and impulsivity. These improvements were maintained at 1- and 2-year follow-ups.⁵⁸

The Chaco province of Argentina has a state-approved school mediation program, in which trained teachers integrate the concepts of negotiation and mediation within their curriculum and also mediate conflicts that emerge between students. Results of the program include an impact in the following areas: increased autonomy of educators and students (agreement, collaboration, joint responsibility), the formation of ties with other educational, health and cultural institutions, the active participation of parents, opportunities for teachers to air their own conflicts, and the promotion of the value of authority (rather than authoritarianism).⁵⁹

Pro-social behaviors (reduction in violence)

Numerous studies have been carried out on the effectiveness of various conflict resolution programs operating in schools. These programs are primarily classroom based but often have a strong, school-wide component. Most of the research has focused on the ability of students' to manage their conflicts constructively following participation in the program. The various studies have documented

- the students' participation in the program
- students' knowledge of mediation and negotiation procedures
- the application of such procedures in hallways the lunchroom and playground
- positive classroom climate
- teacher reporting on the number of discipline problems they had to handle
- positive attitude towards conflict
- increased student academic achievement
- enhanced communication skills

The numerous studies cannot be summarized succinctly, but there is ample evidence of the efficacy of conflict resolution education. Within the area of conflict resolution, there are varied approaches. Johnson & Johnson conducted 11 studies on the "Teaching Students to be Peacemakers" program, which is directly based on the research and theory of integrative negotiation, perspective reversal and constructive conflict resolution. The results showed a 60% decrease in the number of discipline problems a teacher had to handle and a 95% decrease in the number of referrals to the principal.⁶⁰

Program: Violence prevention – Second Step, aims to reduce or prevent aggression by teaching anger management, empathy and impulse control.

Target group: primary school students

⁵⁸ Greenberg et al (2001).

⁵⁹ Irma Zalazar de Porfirio, Teresita Noemi Codutti and Daniel F. Martinez Zampa, "Experiments in conflict management and school mediation" in UNESCO's *Best Practices of Non-Violent Conflict Resolution In and Out-of-School. Best Practices* (Paris: UNESCO), no date, pp. 11-14. www.unesco.org

⁶⁰ Bodine et al (1998), pp. 103-110.

Findings: A randomized controlled trial with 800 Caucasian elementary school students from 12 schools in Washington State, USA showed significant reductions in aggression and increases in neutral or pro-social behavior.⁶¹

Program: Conflict resolution - Resolving Conflicts Creatively Program (RCCP). The program is designed to promote constructive conflict resolution and positive inter-group relations. The program is build around a set of core skills: communicating clearly and listening carefully, expressing feelings and dealing with anger, resolving conflicts, fostering cooperation, appreciating diversity, and countering bias. The RCCP is also implemented through the training of student-based peer mediation groups and school administrators, and by continued outreach to parents.

Target group: elementary school students

Findings: The U.S.-based evaluation found that the RCCP had a significant positive impact when teachers taught a high number of lessons from the RCCP curriculum. Among other findings, children receiving a high number of lessons had significantly slower growth in self-reported hostile attributions, aggressive fantasies, and aggressive problem solving strategies, compared to children receiving a low number of lessons or no lessons at all.⁶²

There is increasing literature becoming available in relation to anti-bullying programs. Two examples are included here in order to illustrate the relationship of such programs to pro-social behavior that brings about reductions in violence in the school.

A typical feature of bullying is the group nature of it. Unlike many other forms of aggression, bullying often gets encouraged and sustained within peer group...As many as 35%-40% of school-aged children and adolescents take on roles of bully, assistant or reinforcer, and the frequency of those who withdraw and silently accept the bullying going on is around 25%-30%.⁶³

Successful classroom-based interventions in Helsinki and Turku, Finland showed the importance of the following program features:

- taking up the issue of bullying regularly with students, discussing especially the participant roles involved in it
- formulating, together with students, class rules against bullying, and
- organizing systematic follow-up discussions each time after intervening in an acute case of bullying.

⁶¹ Greenberg et al (2001).

⁶² Lawrence J. Aber, Joshua L. Brown, and Christopher C. Henrich, "Teaching Conflict Resolution: An Effective School-Based Approach to Violence Prevention. Research Brief", New York: Ford Foundation, 1999.

⁶³ Christina Salmivalli, "Making use of the peer group power in preventing and intervening in bullying" in UNESCO's *Best Practices of Non-Violent Conflict Resolution In and Out-of-School. Best Practices* (Paris: UNESCO), no date, pp. 41-44. www.unesco.org

In a successful project school, the number of victims was reduced from 22.1% to 8.6% during the first six months. However, the preliminary observations show that there were lots of variations between schools.⁶⁴

Program: Violence prevention – “Bullying Prevention Program” utilizes bullying/victimization questionnaire to both assess the level of the program and to serve as a catalyst for increasing awareness and involvement. Additional intervention components including holding a school conference day to discuss the results of the survey and potential intervention activities; formation of a bullying prevention coordinating committee to oversee the intervention; and the development of a coordinated structure for monitoring student behavior during periods of increased student interaction (e.g., recess, lunchtime, etc.) Classroom level intervention components include establishing and enforcing specific rules against bullying and holding regular classroom meetings to discuss bullying and other antisocial behavior. At the individual level, the intervention calls for individual discussions with bullies, victims, and parents of involved students.

Target group: primary and middle school students

Findings: A quasi-experimental study involving 2500 students in grades 4-7 from 42 elementary and middle schools in Bergen, Norway reported reductions of 50% or more in bully/victim problems for boys and girls across all grades (4-9), with more marked effects after 2 years than 1 year. The study also reported significant reductions in general antisocial behavior such as vandalism, fighting, drunkenness, theft and truancy.⁶⁵

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

⁶⁵ Greenberg et al (2001).

IV. SUMMARY OF RESEARCH FINDINGS ON CHARACTERISTICS OF SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS

The characteristics of successful programs can, to a certain extent, be extrapolated from the research already presented. Individual studies have also focused on programming elements such as course design and the quality of instruction. One comparative study found that civic education programs in South Africa, Poland and the Dominican Republic were most effective when:

- *Sessions are frequent.* There appears to be a “threshold effect” in terms of number of courses, where one or two sessions have little to no impact, but, when the number increases to three or more, there is the prospect for significant changes.
- *Methods are participatory.* Breakout groups, dramatizations, role-plays, problem solving activities, simulations, and mock political or judicial activities led to far greater levels of positive change than did more passive teaching methods such as lectures or the distribution of materials.
- *Teachers are knowledgeable and inspiring.* Not surprisingly, teachers who fail to engage their students have little success in transmitting information about democratic knowledge, values, or ways to participate effectively in the democratic political process.⁶⁶

Researchers found similar results for anti-bias education efforts. In order to effectively address bias and prejudice and promote inter-group harmony among students, researchers have found that certain dynamics must be in place. Anti-bias efforts are most beneficial:

- when all students are involved
- when it is in-depth, long-term and infused into the overall curriculum
- when students are introduced to multicultural activities as young an age as possible

⁶⁶ Office of Democracy and Governance, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance, *Approach to Civic Education: Lessons Learned* (Washington, DC: US Agency for International Development, June 2002), pp. 1-2, 29. Similar results were found in the study “Civic Education across Countries: Twenty-four National Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project.” There was unanimity among the authors of the national case studies that civic education should be based on important content that crosses disciplines, and that it should be “participative, interactive, related to life, conducted in a non-authoritarian environment, cognizant of the challenges of social diversity, and co-constructed with parents, the community, and non-governmental organizations, as well as the school” Judith Torney-Purta, John Schwille, and Jo-Ann Amadeo, *The IEA Civic Education Study: Expectations and Achievements of Students in Thirty Countries* (December 1999), ERIC Digest.

- when teachers have the attitudes, training, materials and support needed to deliver the activities and lessons⁶⁷

Research that can illuminate our understanding of the characteristics of successful “Learning to Live Together” programming can be divided into three general categories: methodology of teaching, the learning environment and teacher qualities. These are now presented in greater detail.

Teaching methodology: Cooperating learning, group activities and participation

A review of the research on the social and particularly the achievement effects of cooperative learning groups found that cooperative learning produced outcomes equal or superior to those of other learning structures. This was true regardless of race, sex, academic ability level, and other factors.⁶⁸ This is a generalized finding.

A U.S. national assessment of 4th and 8th grade civic education classrooms (1998) found that students’ participation in group activities and projects tended to outscore those who rarely or never participated in this kind of classroom assignment.⁶⁹ More specialized studies have not contradicted this finding. In Roma-integrated schools, more than ¾ of teachers considered that a range of socio-emotional improvements were stimulated by the different project-related activities: group work (34%), cooperative learning activities (24.5%), extra-school activities (reading clubs, exhibitions 23.4%), intercultural activities (10.6%) and other activities promoting Roma culture (9.6%). Positive effects generated by those activities were: “better understanding to each other, mutual acceptance,” “respect for cultural values,” “diminished prejudices and stereotypes.” At the same time, extra school activities “improve student-student, students-teacher and students-teachers-parent relationships.”⁷⁰

Cooperative learning is not merely a methodology for learning but a medium for promoting more general socio-emotional outcomes in children. Research also suggests that the same can be said for programs promoting “helping” behaviors and self-directed learning.

The importance of the “helping” variable has been demonstrated in both family socialization studies (focusing on performance of household chores) and in some experimental research. Some of the pro-social development programs described include participation in helping activities in the classroom, school and wider community as an important element, but its most direct application has been in the form of community

⁶⁷ (Campbell and Farrell 1985; Garcia, Powell and Sanchez 1990; King 1983; Merrick 1988; Rich 1990; Ruiz 1982; and Swadener 1986, 1988) as referenced in “The A World of Difference Institute Philosophical Framework”, Anti-Defamation League website, www.adl.org

⁶⁸ R. E. Slavin, “Cooperative Learning and Student Achievement”, Chapter 5 in *School and Classroom Organization*, edited by R. E. Slavin, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1989.

⁶⁹ John J. Patrick, *The National Assessment of Educational Progress in Civics* (March 2000), University of Indiana website.

⁷⁰ Catalina Ulrich, et al (2002), pp. 24-5.

service programs, which have shown some positive effects on interpersonal attitudes and beliefs and commitment to further helpful action.⁷¹

Programs and approaches that promote student autonomy and self-direction in learning have been positively associated with students' sense of community, moral reasoning, democratic values, and positive interpersonal behavior. Although the relative contribution of this set of independent variables to the overall effects of the program cannot be determined, the apparent link has been shown in research relating to programs in progressive education, open education, constructivist classrooms, and cooperative learning, and in a number of specific programs (such as Just Community and CDP).⁷²

The learning environment: Open and inclusive classroom climate

The same educational approaches and programs that emphasize student autonomy typically also emphasize student interaction and discussion. Research on small groups has confirmed the importance of peer interaction for child development. Other approaches, such as moral dilemma discussion, focus on these interaction processes specifically and have shown small but consistent effects on moral reasoning. Thus, along with student autonomy-influence, student interaction and active participation in discussions has been shown to help bring about various outcomes in a broad range of studies.⁷³

In a classroom setting, learning how to effectively manage conflict and engage in dialogue can also be a powerful instructional tool. When teachers welcome conflict and controversy they are affirming its naturalness, revealing its beneficial aspects, and taking away some of the negativity and ominousness that gets attached to it. When they structure conversations that allow students to express opinions, hear divergent perspectives, and respectfully consider alternative explanations, they are teaching basic skills in coping with conflict as well as a tolerance for diversity and a respect for democratic values. And when they facilitate real engagement in conflict, whether it is around issues of school life in a democratic classroom or just community, in classroom dialogue about moral and political perspectives, or in direct engagement in real political controversy, they are teaching students the skills they will need to effectively participate in our political process.⁷⁴

Studies have shown that teachers working in culturally diverse classrooms can foster respect and inclusiveness by actively responding to intercultural tension and involving students in multi-cultural and inter-cultural activities. Successful teachers take issue with

⁷¹ Solomon et al (2001), p. 593.

⁷² *Ibid.* In addition, in three international studies, students' level of political tolerance has been associated with their perception of an open classroom climate, one in which they feel free and secure to express their ideas and opinions (Hahn, 1998; Nielson 1997; Turney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald & Schwartz, 2001) as referenced in Avery (2001).

⁷³ Solomon et al (2001), p. 593.

⁷⁴ Berman (1997), pp. 122-3.

cultural demeaning statements, jokes, and graffiti, and use racial or other intercultural incidents as a springboard for providing information and skills to avoid such incidents.⁷⁵

Teachers can promote a tone and climate in the classroom environment that promotes positive inter-cultural relations, in addition to socio-emotional learning in students more generally. Teachers in inter-culturally harmonious environments arrange their classrooms for movement and active learning; interact one-on-one with each child at least once a day; communicate high expectations for the performance of all students; give praise and encouragement; communicate affection for and closeness with students through verbal and nonverbal means; give children responsibility for taking care of things in the classroom; and treat all students equally and fairly.⁷⁶

Teacher quality: Teacher preparation and motivation

Although it may seem self evident, it worth mentioning directly that a curriculum is only as powerful as the teacher using it. Put another way, a well designed learning program in the hands of a well trained, skilled and motivated educator is much more likely to achieve its stated goals than a curriculum implemented under any variation of the above.

Existing research indicates that the effective implementation of new curricula depends on several variables including teachers' agreement with the goals of a new program, its impact on workload, and opportunities for professional development. The purpose of one study in a human rights education classroom was to assess how far 31 grade 8 teachers implemented a new children's rights curriculum, whether the implementation changed their and their students' attitudes about children's rights, and to identify factors that encouraged implementation. Major findings were as follows: Workload, defined in terms of years of experience and class size, was predictive of curriculum use.⁷⁷ Specifically, the greater the years of experience and the smaller the class size, the more likely it was that the curriculum was used.

If workload is the major predictive of how likely a teacher is to try a new curriculum, outlook is close behind. A Finnish study presented the results and activity ideas created by a peace and international education project. The project found that teachers needed to have a positive attitude towards new ideas in order to create a new model of teaching. Problems of implementation were alleviated somewhat by keeping all the staff and parents informed of all the new activities.⁷⁸

⁷⁵ Aviram, 1987; Campbell and Farrell 1985; Garcia, Powell and Sanchez 1990; King 1983; Mock 1988; Roberts 1982; Sanders and Wiseman 1990; Simpson 1981; and Swadener 1988, as quoted in Cotton (no date).

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷⁷ Katherine Covell, Johanna L. O'Leary, R. Brian Howe, "Introducing a New Grade 8 Curriculum in Children's Rights" in *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 48 (4), Winter 2002, pp. 302-313.

⁷⁸ Riitta Walstrom, "Growth towards Peace and Environmental Responsibility: From Theory to Practical Implications" (Jyvaskla, Finland: Institute for Educational Research, University of Jyvaskla, 1991).

In some cases, the program itself will be instrumental in altering teacher perceptions and increasing their enthusiasm. This may be particularly the case for potentially sensitive subjects such as “anti-bias education” or in a situation where a new curriculum is mandated rather than voluntarily undertaken by educators.

In Spain, a review was made of the multiculturalism educational programs and strategies developed in the country. Based on this review, a training course was developed for teachers in order to improve the attitudes of teachers and educators towards intercultural education and the growing cultural diversity in Spain. Initially the teachers in both groups (experimental and comparison) indicated that intercultural education in schools and teacher training were necessary in their opinion. However, they also indicated that the issue only concerned cultural minorities. It was seen as irrelevant to the pupils belonging to the cultural majority, nor did it have relevance for transformation of the school.

However, following the participation in the training course, the attitudes of the teachers in the experimental groups improved significantly with respect to the objectives and their predisposition towards intercultural education programs. Both groups of teachers also had negative expectations of pupils from minority cultures. Teachers blamed such pupils for diminishing the quality of teaching in the classroom as well as creating disciplinary problems. They demonstrated very little intercultural sensitivity in their work; they exhibited a rejection of other cultural values and refused to question their own values. The experimental groups after the course, however, showed a marked attitudinal improvement in all the attitudinal nuclei: cultural diversity in teaching, intercultural sensitivity and multicultural coexistence.⁷⁹

This aforementioned finding is closely linked with that of another – the habit of self examination and improvement among teachers. Effective teachers of culturally diverse classes reflect on their own values, stereotypes, and prejudices and how these might be affecting their interaction with children and parents.⁸⁰

In addition to identifying various characteristics of successful programs, research has begun to answer the question of how to promote “learning to live together” through social integration at the school level. Genova and Wahlberg’s large scale correlation study on this topic identified the following characteristics of inclusive schools:

- *Racial/ethnic mixing.* While insufficient to guarantee positive outcomes, cultural mixing was found to be an important precondition for their development.
- *Positive staff role models.* Visible and healthy interracial/ethnic relations prevailed.
- *Security.* Students expressed feeling safe from the threat of intercultural conflict.

⁷⁹ Auxiliadora Sales Ciges & Rafaela Garcia Lopez, “Teacher Training with a View Towards Developing Favourable Attitudes Regarding Intercultural Education and Cultural Diversity” in *European Journal of Intercultural Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 1, 1998, pp. 72-74.

⁸⁰ *Op cit.*, Aviram, et al.

- *Staff support for integration.* Beyond role modeling, this refers to openly expressed opinions in favor of integration.
- *Multicultural exposure.* These minimally include activities that present students with a factual accounting of the contributions of various cultures.
- *Intercultural fairness.* Students perceived that different racial/ethnic groups were treated equally and fairly by school personnel.⁸¹
- *Contact with parents.* Effective teachers engage parent involvement; demonstrate interest in and respect for the family's culture when interacting with parents; find out as much as they can about each child's experience and family situation that can help them to understand and meet the child's needs.⁸²

Child-friendly school system in Asia

UNICEF has an initiative called child-friendly school system (CFSS) in Asia, which draws on many of the principles of good practice that have been documented. The CFSS initiative promotes a new appreciation of and approach to basic education in that the school, to become truly child-friendly, needs to be where students, teachers, parents and the community work together in support of children's education and development. A checklist of traits for the child-friendly school program in the Philippines includes:

- inclusive, gender-sensitive and non-discriminating
- caring and protective of all children
- is child-centered
- encourages children to think and decide for themselves, ask questions and express their opinions
- encourages children to participate in school and community activities
- encourages children to work together to solve problems and to achieve what they aim to do
- encourages children to express their feelings through art – music, drama and other forms.

Source: HURIGHTS OSAKA, "The Practice Aspects of Learning Human Rights", Part II, posted on hre-asiapacific@hrea.org listserv on 5 July 2004.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*

⁸² *Op cit.*, Aviram, et al.

V. IMPLICATIONS FOR PROGRAMMING AND FUTURE RESEARCH

As we can see, there is ample “good advice” available for understanding what program designs and implementation strategies are most promising for incurring positive social and emotional development in children, leading them to be more knowledgeable, accepting and responsible members of their society. The challenge for motivated educators may be in creating the opportunities to identify and carry out these approaches with their students.

The range of programs relating to “learning to live together” already suggest that there is a careful selection process that educators, administrators and policymakers needs to undergo before initiating a program. The numerous considerations include the following:

- student needs identified in the classroom or school environment
- opportunities to introduce a program within the formal or non-formal school environment, including
 - integration into existing subjects or school programming
 - opportunity to use active learning methods
- sufficient time in the curriculum to carry out the program over an extended period of time
- motivation of teachers and possibility to provide them with necessary training

Numerous conditions could conceivably affect the selection of these programs, which only the local educator can fully account for. Many of the approaches profiled in this report are chosen because of special needs for the school community, including the reduction of violence, the promotion of tolerance/acceptance or the need to revitalize the school culture. In developed democracies, there may be a strong interest in promoting active citizenship. In societies marked by changing demographics, intercultural and anti-bias education may be important tools for fostering understanding and relationships among individuals and groups. In societies marked by trauma (such as a post-conflict situation), children’s needs will be strikingly unique.

Research cannot substitute for thoughtful analysis of which programs will best fit the needs of classrooms and schools, but additional research can certainly help us understand the qualities of programs are most promising. In particular, longitudinal studies that try to capture long-term attitudinal and behavioral impacts of participation in socio-emotional programs would be highly desirable.

There are also specific topical areas of research that would help inform program development and choice. Ideally, both teachers and students would be involved collaboratively in this research.

Take a more in-depth look at the development of **social consciousness**. Currently, developmental studies have focused on cognitive aspects of political understandings or moral reasoning. We need data on the evolution of emotional and relational aspects of

social and political consciousness. Researchers could use in-depth interviews and conduct a longitudinal study that examines issues of attachment, identification, interest, efficacy, meaning, democratic values and participation.⁸³

We should examine particular educational interventions in terms of their impact on moral integrity, sense of **connectedness, meaning, and participation**. Does a particular intervention have an impact on students' sense that they can make a meaningful contribution in the social and political arena? Does it encourage them to feel a sense of social responsibility and to participate in making a difference on issues of public concern in their daily lives, in their immediate environment, and in the larger society? The research tools – questionnaires, interview schedules, observational inventories – for doing this kind of research are already available.⁸⁴

The outcomes in the moral-character education field are inherently complex and difficult to assess in a meaningful way, particularly if one is interested in assessing the development of **enduring moral-pro-social characteristics**. Determining whether a particular program or sequence of educational experiences has produced such enduring effects will require long-term, longitudinal studies...There is a need for long-span, longitudinal studies that assess the effects of various sequences of school experiences on the development of students' moral character, defined and assessed comprehensively.⁸⁵

Further research of conflict resolution education programs – and potentially other programs presented in this review - should address **cultural issues and developmentally appropriate practices**. This type of information is invaluable in strengthening the rationale for adopting and implementing conflict resolution education in schools programs. Additionally, data from future studies may illuminate lessons learned from successful use of conflict resolution by young people in all aspects of their lives.⁸⁶

Related to this last suggestion is a plea for more studies to be done in those regions and programs currently underrepresented in the socio-emotional learning literature. The current research is fairly robust in demonstrating the value of certain pedagogical and learning processes for student development. However, there is less known about the **adaptation of programs to particular settings** – how these decisions were made and how successfully they were implemented.

There is also relatively little known about the **impact of human rights education, intercultural and anti-bias education**. As these areas seem particularly responsive to the increasing diversity of our classrooms and societies, it might well be worth investing some time to better understand what they can contribute to our “learning to live together.”

⁸³ Berman (1997), p. 200.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

⁸⁵ Solomon et al (2001), pp. 594, 596.

⁸⁶ Bodine and Crawford (1998), p. 111.

VI. BIBLIOGRAPHIC RESOURCES

Print publications

Lawrence J. Aber, Joshua L. Brown, and Christopher C. Henrich, "Teaching Conflict Resolution: An Effective School-Based Approach to Violence Prevention. Research Brief", New York: Ford Foundation, 1999.

Miriam Abramovay – Research Coordinator, *Schools of Peace UNESCO* (Brasilia: UNESCO, Government of the State of Rio de Janeiro/State Secretariat of Education, University of Rio de Janeiro, 2001), p. 24.

Bonne Sue Adams and Nancy Schniedewind, "A Systemwide Program of Human Rights Education" in *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 45, No. 8, May, 1988, pp. 48-50.

Iftikhar Ahmad, *Diversity and Citizenship Education: Global Perspectives*, Teachers College Record, 2/16/04, www.tcrecord.org.

Audigier, F. and Lagelee, G. *Civic Education: Teaching About Society, Passing on Values*. Report of the Council of Europe Teachers' Seminar, Donaueschingen, Germany, 1992)

Patricia G. Avery, "Teaching Tolerance: What Research Tells Us" in *Social Education* (66)(5), September 2002, p. 274.

Sheldon Berman, *Children's Social Consciousness and the Development of Social Responsibility* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1997, pp. 141-2.

Michael Bergsgaard, "Gender Issues in the Implementation and Evaluation of a Violence-Prevention Curriculum", *Canadian Journal of Education*, Vol. 22, No 1, 1997, pp. 33-45.

Richard J. Bodine and Donna K. Crawford, *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution Education: A Guide to Building Quality Programs in Schools* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers), 1998, pp. 103-110.

Centro de Desarrollo y Asesoría Psicosocial, *Mejorando el clima emocional del aula: guía para docentes de primaria* (Lima, CEDAPP, 1995).

Céspedes Rossel, Nelida, *El docente como promotor de la salud mental* (Lima, TAREA, 1998).

Chaffee, Steven H. and others. *Political Socialization via a Newspaper-in-Schools Program in Argentina: Effects of Variations in Teaching Methods*. Final Report to the Spencer Foundation. Alexandria, VA: EDRS, 1997.

Bureau of Curriculum Services, *An Integrated Approach to Global Education* (Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania State Department of Education, October 1979).

Alain Clemence, Thierry Devos and Willem Doise, "Social representations of human rights violations: Further evidence" in *Swiss Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 60 (2), June 2001, pp. 89-98.

Katherine Covell, Johanna L. O'Leary, R. Brian Howe, "Introducing a New Grade 8 Curriculum in Children's Rights" in *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 48 (4), Winter 2002, pp. 302-313.

Diana L. DiGuido et al, "Positive Social Interaction Strategies", Masters Thesis at Saint Xavier University, 1997.

El Salvador, Ministerio de Educacion, *Culture of peace programme in El Salvador* (San Salvador: Ministerio de Educacion; UNESCO, 1993).

K. Pieter Fritzsche and Valerie Morgan (eds.) *Tolerance Matters: International Education Approaches* (Guttersloh: Bertelsmann Foundation Publishers, 2003), p. 285.

William Gaudelli and William R. Fernekes, "Teaching About Global Human Rights for Global Citizenship" in *The Social Studies* (January/February 2004), p. 22.

B. J. Gimmestad and E. De Chiara, "Dramatic Plays: A Vehicle for Prejudice Reduction in the Elementary School" in *Journal of Educational Research* 76/1 (1982: 45-49).

Mark T. Greenberg, Celene Domitrovich and Brian Bumbarger, "The Prevention of Mental Disorders in School-Aged Children: Current State of the Field" in *Prevention & Treatment*, Volume 4, Article 1, March 30, 2001.

Ian M. Harris, "Peace Education Evaluation", paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 21-25, 2003).

Marcia L. Johnson, *Trends in Peace Education*, ERIC Digest, February 2002, ED417123.

Neyda H. Long, "Diversity, Human Rights, and Curriculum in Canada", August 5, 1999.

Office of Democracy and Governance, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance, *Approach to Civic Education: Lessons Learned* (Washington, DC: US Agency for International Development, June 2002), pp. 1-2, 29.

G. S. Pate, "Research on Reducing Prejudice" in *Social Education* 52/4 (1988): 287-289.

John J. Patrick, *The National Assessment of Educational Progress in Civics* (March 2000), University of Indiana website.

Auxiliadora Sales Ciges & Rafaela Garcia Lopez, "Teacher Training with a View Towards Developing Favourable Attitudes Regarding Intercultural Education and Cultural Diversity" in *European Journal of Intercultural Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 1, 1998, pp. 72-74.

Salmivalli, "Making use of the peer group power in preventing and intervening in bullying" in UNESCO's *Best Practices of Non-Violent Conflict Resolution In and Out-of-School. Best Practices* (Paris: UNESCO), no date, pp. 41-44. www.unesco.org

Stefania Paolini, Miles Hewstone, Ed Cairns, Alberto Voci, "Effects of Direct and Indirect Cross-Group Friendships on Judgments of Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland: The Mediating Role of an Anxiety-Reduction Mechanism" in *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* (in press).

Schuetz, Peter. *Political Culture in the School and Classroom: Preparation for Democratic Citizenship*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Individualism and Community in a Democratic Society, Washington, DC, 1996.

Lynn Hickey Schultz, Dennis J. Barr and Robert L. Selman, "The Value of a Developmental Approach to Evaluating Character Development Programs: An Outcome Study of Facing History and Ourselves", *Journal of Moral Education*, Vol. 30, No. 1, 2001, pp. 20-22.

Sears, Alan. "What Research Tells Us About Citizenship in English Canada." *Canadian Social Studies* 30 (Spring 1996): 121-27.

R. E. Slavin, "Cooperative Learning and Student Achievement", Chapter 5 in *School and Classroom Organization*, edited by R. E. Slavin, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1989.

Daniel Solomon, Marilyn S. Watson and Victor A. Battistich, "Teaching and Schooling Effects on Moral/Prosocial Development" in Richardson, V., (ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, 4th ed., 2001, p. 591.

Gavriel Solomon, *Does Peace Education Make a Difference?*, University of Haifa, Center for Research on Peace Education, April 2003 p. 3.

Juan Francisco Aguilar Soto and Jose Javier Betancourt Godoy, "Contstruccion de Cultura Democratica en Instituciones Educativas de Sante Fe de Bogota" (Sante Fe de Bogotal, Colombia: Instituto de Investigacion en Innovaciones Educativas, 2000).

Tschoumy, Jacques Andre. *Montee en Puissance d'une Europe des Citoyennetes Composees* (The Coming into Force of a Europe of Compound Citizenships). Neuchatel,

Switzerland: Institut Romand de Recherches et de Documentation Pedagogiques (IRDP), 1993.

Judith Torney-Purta and Jo-Ann Amadeo, *Strengthening Democracy in the Americas through Civic Education: An Empirical Analysis Highlighting the Views of Students and Teachers* (Washington, DC: Unit for Social Development and Education, Organization of American States, January 2004).

Catalina Ulrich, Alexandru Crisan, Simona Moldovan and Nancy Green, *Evaluation Report for the Project "Equal Opportunities for Roma Children through School Development Programs and Parents' Involvement"*, A Project of Center for Education 2000+, Romania, and SLO, National Institute for Curriculum Development, The Netherlands, 28 April 2002, pp.24-5.

Kimberly A. Vess and Duane A. Halbur, *Character Education: What Counselor Educators Need to Know*, June 2003, ERIC/CASS Digest ED475389.

Riitta Walstrom, "Growth towards Peace and Environmental Responsibility: From Theory to Practical Implications" (Jyvaskla, Finland: Institute for Educational Research, University of Jyvaskla, 1991).

Web sources

"The A World of Difference Institute Philosophical Framework", Anti-Defamation League website, www.adl.org

Patricia G. Avery, *Developing Political Tolerance* (December 2001), University of Indiana website.

Bisquerra Alsina, Rafael, *Orientacion psicopedagogica y education emocional en la education formal y no formal*.

<http://www.uhu.es/agora/digital/numeros/02/02-rticulos/monografico/bisquerra>

Kathleen Cotton, "Fostering Intercultural Harmony in Schools: Research Finding", *School Improvement Research Series* (SIRS), Northwest Regional Laboratory, www.nwrel.org

Jeff Grabmeier, *Mix It Up Research: Diverse Student Body Does not Guarantee Integrated Friendships*, www.tolerance.org

Guell Barcelo, Manel and Munoz Redon, Joseph, El misterio del nino que se guardaba los caramelos (La education emocional). <http://www.pop-up.org/college/eminteles.htm> (Consultado el 28 de junio de 2004).

Gregory E. Hamot, *Civic Education Trends in Post-Communist Countries of Central and Eastern Europe* (November, 2003), University of Indiana website.

HURIGHTS OSAKA, “The Practice Aspects of Learning Human Rights”, Part II, posted on hre-asiapacific@hrea.org listserv on 5 July 2004.

Martha Montero-Sieburth, review of Godfrey L. Brandt, *The Realization of Anti-Racist Teaching*, London, New York and Philadelphia: The Falmer Press, 1986, Teachers College Record, www.tcrecord.org

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, “Child and Family Support Programs: Fostering Resiliency and Emotional Intelligence” www.nwrel.org

UNESCO, IBE website: “Learning to live together – the concept”. www.ibe.unesco.org

UNESCO, IBE website: “Learning to live together – what to teach and how?”. www.ibe.unesco.org

Irma Zalazar de Porfirio, Teresita Noemi Codutti and Daniel F. Martinez Zampa, “Experiments in conflict management and school mediation” in UNESCO’s *Best Practices of Non-Violent Conflict Resolution In and Out-of-School. Best Practices* (Paris: UNESCO), no date, pp. 11-14. www.unesco.org

Alexander W. Wiseman, review of *Civic Education Across Countries: Twenty-Four National Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project*, Teachers College Record, 1/7/02. www.tcrecord.org