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This is the pilot study for the Peace Education Curricular Analysis Project – a project that seeks to become a longitudinal and global analysis of national curriculum statements for pro-peace values. National education as a system of organized learning can act as a transmission belt – a cultural institution that assigns communal ideals and values and uses pedagogy to echo social standards. As this analysis considers that it is possible to assess non-peace education for peace education qualities, this study analyzed New Zealand’s early childhood, primary, and secondary education curricular statements to ascertain the presence or absence of three elements common in peace education programs: recognition of violence; addressing conflict nonviolently; and creating the conditions of positive peace. The methodologies used in this mixed methods study include directive and summative content analysis. This analysis finds that the curricular statements (2) of New Zealand have made progress to educate students toward peace and non-violence and that in general, the early childhood curricular statement incorporates a greater amount of pro-peace content than the primary and secondary curriculum statement. Opportunities exist to strengthen peace education content in future New Zealand curricular statements.
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One cannot hope to understand cultural evolution without also understanding education. (Varenne 2008, 363)

Introduction

Some cultures resist violent conflict and others do not. What explains this? People normally learn how to interpret and behave within society through processes of learning that happen in the home, the community, and in school. Peace education like all education is a form of learning that connects schools to the social environment of the greater society. Education is a pillar of social power and influence. If peace education can teach us how to recognize violence, act non-violently, and work toward positive cultural values then it is important to explore the extent to which these principles are embedded in existing national curricula.
The Peace Education Curricular Analysis Project

The Peace Education Curricular Analysis (PECA) Project is the first systematic analysis of existing national curricula for peace education qualities. The project is concerned with the following research question: What values do nations communicate in their national curricula related to peace education? To answer this question, this research aims to create the tools to assess national curricula for peace educative capacities. It will undertake a systematic content analysis of national curricula (text) using qualitative and quantitative data inquiry. A variety of coding devices will be implemented to identify the presence (or absence) of pro-peace educative qualities and on going; the PECA Project seeks to be a longitudinal study of national curriculum and pro-peace values. The long-term goal is to create a database (pecaproject.org) of global curricula at early childhood, primary, and secondary levels for every year that a new curriculum is introduced and to create an analysis framework that establishes the presence or absence of three elements of peace education.

Rationale

Why study curriculum for peace education values? In peace education, organized learning is used to impart ideals and techniques to participants and educands (Noddings 2012) and uses either formal or informal learning to examine and transform negative behavior and/or perceptions about others (Bajaj 2008). Practitioners of peace education use organized learning to share techniques of non-violent conflict resolution and other peaceful abilities such as ecological consciousness, respect for diversity, gender awareness and non-violent political, cultural, and societal transformation (Boulding 2000). But can non-peace educations also contribute to building peace? The majority of the world’s children attend mandatory education at the primary and (increasingly) the secondary level (non-peace educations). If mainstream education is the customary form of education most children in most countries encounter, how do we know which values are communicated if we do not investigate the values non-peace educative curricula communicate.

Peace Education

In Uri Bronfenbrenner’s treatise entitled The Ecology of Human Development (1979), a child is considered to be at the center of a layered and impactful ecosystem of information. Layer one is the individual and layer two includes the home and the child’s immediate surroundings. The third level expands out to include the neighborhood, external social networks, and activities that relate to work and media. The last level is the national level and speaks to influences and attitudes that are communicated to a child about the values and beliefs held that relate to both the rights of children and their relationship to education.

The PECA Project explores a form of evidence found in the fourth layer of human development – national curricula – as artifacts of national culture that contribute to our understandings of others and, importantly, ourselves. Sociologists identify that the process of acquiring human values, attitudes, abilities, and behaviors is a result of primary (early) socialization (often but not always in the family home) but also what is termed secondary (continuing) socialization – located in a variety of learning sites by myriad social agents, including schools (Durkheim 2002; Simmel 1971; Weber 1978). Socialization is the process by which we become competent
humans, able to act, interact, and communicate in social settings (Plummer 2010). Curriculum is one cultural product that is both a result of and a root of the process of becoming human. If culture is an ‘ongoing human production,’ then, that ‘places education at the core of what makes human beings human’ (Varenne 2008, 357). We cannot know how every individual self acquires values and understandings throughout the life cycle but we can identify which social values are present in national curricula and perhaps, by their absence, additionally perceive what is missing.

**Peacebuilding and peace education**

Peacebuilding is an intervention—an act by an external agent that introduces elements that present principles or structures that will affect change (Fabiano et al. 2003). An important form of peacebuilding, peace education is oriented to three main goals—recognizing violence, resolving conflict non-violently, and working toward outcomes congruent with positive peace (Galtung 1996). Peace education comprises a variety of diverse practices and activities that nurture peaceful behavior, outlooks, and beliefs and it can occur anywhere along the conflict and peace continuum—before conflict, during conflict, after conflict, and in tranquil nations (Salomon and Cairns 2010).

**Building peace with education**

Education is not merely a one-sided endeavor that ‘banks’ material into humans—depositing supposedly neutral information—it also inhabits a social space that exhibits ways of thinking, being, and living (Freire 2001). Education that only replicates the values and beliefs of social hegemons convey cultural capital to pupils that can result in the duplication of existing cultural inequalities. This directly leads to structural forms of marginalization, discrimination, and uneven life chances (Bourdieu 1977; Galtung 1996). The difference between ‘standard’ or ‘everyday’ education and peace education lie in the intended outcomes of its curriculum and the pedagogical approaches used. Normal teaching tends to replicate the existing requirements of society conditioning students to be the next generation of citizens, employees, and social participants. Peace education is hopeful, transformative, and oriented to the preservation of human rights, environmental sustainability, social justice, and positive peace (harmonious relations) (Harber and Sakade 2009).

Peace education, simply put, is a transformational pedagogy—concerned with affecting positive change regarding social mores and attitudes. Since schools are cultural institutions, they are often places where cultural disparities lead to social disadvantages; peace education acknowledges that schools can be locations of structural violence and peace education uses imagination, commitment, and the resolution to change patterns of cultural supremacy (Carter and Vandeyar 2009).

**Education, pedagogy and curriculum**

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights—written in 1948—considers education a human right (Article 26). But what is education? Simply put, education is an organized form of learning that often takes place in schools. And, a customary appendage to all forms of education—irrespective of the educative components involved
is the act of teaching. Teachers fill a role in almost all forms of education facilitating learning using myriad forms of course delivery, materials, and methods. The bulk of the work of teachers is called pedagogy – the art of teaching (Knowles 1973). During the act of pedagogy, a pupil gains information, receives various understandings, and integrates certain forms of knowledge (Spencer 2006). Pedagogical spaces are places where people learn and can apply to the young, the mature and individuals in particular professions. Importantly, pedagogical environments are not only places where we learn things but also a place we learn how to learn and, in addition, in these learning acquisition sites, we learn that schools, classrooms, and education systems are avenues of social, cultural, and intellectual understanding (Dreeben 1968).

Though the overall learning environment may include a variety of subjects, textbooks, learning tools, teacher pedagogies, and the actualization of the educand, this mixed methods study has limited its scope of inquiry to extant statements of curricular intentions – that is, textual statements regarding curricula that refer to intended outcomes, learner experiences, and understandings about the goals and objectives of learning. While the social process of education is a complex and multifaceted cultural project that can include a variety of material that are contested, accepted, disregarded, or rejected the PECA Project aims to identify the existing values of curricular statements. Although this study is concerned with the stated goals and aims of curricular statements future research may investigate outcomes and antagonisms.

Project impact

This innovative research project represents the first time that educative curricula (in early childhood, primary and secondary education) will be systematically evaluated for (1) recognition of violence, (2) non-violent conflict transformation methods, and (3) positive peace. As such, it could have major policy ramifications regarding national curricula. In addition, the multifaceted nature of this study hopes to provide international and intercultural comparisons of global significance by using the results of this project against other established social science metrics for example: the Global Peace Index, the World Report on Violence and Health, the Human Development Index and the Environmental Performance Index. Further, the broad scope of this project will encourage and employ researchers from a variety of national/lingual/cultural standpoints in a productive and reciprocal positive relationship.

Transmission belts

School is a forum for transmitting beliefs and attitudes from one generation to the next (Volkan 2006). ‘Schools do not operate in a social vacuum; rather they are institutions of society and will often reflect general societal values’ (Kremer et al. 2003, 132). In this way, schools can be seen as ‘societal marker[s]…or touchstones’ (Simmons, Lewis, and Larson 2011, 121) that are both sources of social values and reflections of the same. Education systems act as transmission belts – cultural institutions that assign communal ideals and values using pedagogical paradigms that mirror societal standards (Schonpflug 2001). ‘Although the transmission of values is a universal phenomenon, there may be culture-specific differences in degree, content and process of transmission. Every culture offers specific developmental niches and
socialization practices for the transmission of values’ (Albert, Trommsdorff, and Wisnubrata 2006; 221). Humans are not natural beings; they are cultural creatures that acquire the majority of their information and understandings though socialization (Alexander and Thompson 2011). Educative institutions are locations where socialization takes place – places where we learn to be human and interact with others in our social world. Because we can link social values to education systems, we should see variation in transmitted social values. If this is so, it is vital that we investigate what values are being transmitted.

Epistemic framework

Although some methodologists insist that content analysis is a purely quantitative pursuit (Neuendorf 2002), this study uses both a quantitative and a qualitative lens to investigate communicative content. Quantitative data tell us frequency, while qualitative data cannot suggest causation or generalizability of results it can contribute to understanding the meaning of data (Krippendorff 2004). This research systematically analyzes texts (national curricula) to discover the ‘ideas in people’s minds’ that produced national curricula (Krippendorff 2004, 23). And, although curricular documents are the end product of multiple minds and are modified to reflect the social and cultural changes in a society, to an extent, they represent a completed process because their creation signals a cessation in the discourse surrounding them. As mentioned by art historian, Professor Christina Smylitopoulos at the 2014 Congress of the Humanities in St. Catherine’s, Canada, ‘curricular statements can be tapped to find the value systems of a community’ (personal communication, May 28, 2014). By using curricular statements as a form of data, this research project seeks to benchmark the fluctuating changes overtime to securely ascertain which principles and attitudes are considered in the text.

Third paradigm

While an exhaustive exploration of the ‘paradigm wars’ (Howe 1988) is unnecessary, in this study some clarity can be gained by a brief exploration of how thinking about research becomes the research itself. Scholars don’t inhabit a solitary realm of understanding and do not create intellectual inquiries based upon only similar sets of assumptions. For this reason, disciplines tend to address certain materials (while ignoring others) and adhere to certain forms of intellectual inquiry (experimentation or analysis) (Mertens 2010). Disciplines utilize their own specific languages of intellectual inquiry (discourses) and these discourses, in turn, work to construct the discipline. Although disciplines might relate to one another, they define and construct what is significant in unique – and at times – incompatible ways. The social sciences are routinely divided into two ‘knowledge’ groups: objectivist and constructivist (Druckman 2005).

Objectivists say knowledge (truth) can exist (whether rationalist, realist, empiricist or positivist) and constructivists say you cannot observe reality ‘objectively’ but rather, that, preconceptions impact the observation and affect what is measured, how it is measured, and what is found. Constructivists consider that no single knowledge applies to any single reality but that human agents ‘construct’ knowledge(s).

An innovative departure from the mutually exclusive research paradigms of objectivism and constructivism is termed third paradigm research (Mertens 2010).
Third paradigm research (also termed mixed methods research or pragmatism) in the social sciences is a response to the need for a paradigm of research that ‘can be sufficiently flexible, permeable, and multilayered to reflect the reality of social research in the twenty-first century’ (Denscombe 2008, 271). Simply put, the philosophical orientations of objectivism and constructivism (truth vs. perception) benefit in third paradigm research from a pragmatic partnering that permits methodological pluralism (Johnson and Onwugbuzie 2004).

The goal of mixed methods research is to draw on the strengths of both types of research and minimize the weaknesses of each. The PECA Project utilizes mixed methods (a third paradigm standpoint) to investigate both the evidence of values (constructivism) and indicators of ideas (objectivism). Importantly, in this study, the constructivist analyses are precursor to the objectivist analyses; semantic meaning is determined in advance of the act of quantification i.e. values are identified before they are calculated.

**Methodology**

Two methodologies will be utilized in this mixed methods research project: directive (qualitative) and summative (quantitative) content analysis. Data will use illustrative statistics (number of references) to describe data but semantic content will be analyzed qualitatively. When working in the third paradigm, one is occupied with the task of unearthing a formation of reality to discover meaning and context (Leedy and Ormrod 2001) as well as the importance of each meaning by measuring regularity. This study wants to uncover the values contingent in each curriculum but also how often those values are communicated. As this study will eventually result in long-term and comparative case studies of early childhood, primary and secondary curricular statements the study requires both methodologies (directive and summative content analysis) to achieve a meaningful baseline of analysis. The use of two forms of content analysis should warrant a coherent and logical understanding of each curricular document, which will permit future comparable analyses.

**Content analysis**

Content analysis is a method of analysis designed to uncover and categorize textual properties from multiple documents – systematically evaluating text to capture contingent logic (Druckman 2005). Contingent logic is neither true nor not true but dependent upon surrounding factors. In this instance, capturing contingent logic requires identifying (in the empirical analyses) words or expressions that reflect the content coded for in the directive list. Capture means locating (identifying, finding) references that arise from the conceptual framework and content analysis. Through a word-by-word examination of text, content derived from the directive methodology is captured: an example is looking for ‘understands the feelings of others’ to indicate (capture) a reference coded as Peace Bond.

Further, content analysis is a scientific methodology that looks at the meaning derived from texts as indicators of the social values present when the text is created (Krippendorff 2004). Curricula are ‘social constructions’ and as such, they can be investigated for cultural elements (Goodson 1992, 66). To investigate cultural elements present in national curriculum, this research study will engage with two complementary and insightful forms of the content analysis method – directive and
summative content analysis (Hsieh and Shannon 2005). In a directive content analysis method, ‘the goal … is to validate or extend conceptually a theoretical framework’ (Hsieh and Shannon 2005, 1281); in this instance, the conceptual framework described momentarily as coding themes: (1) recognition of violence; (2) addressing conflict non-violently; and (3) creating the conditions of positive peace. Additionally, this study will use summative content analysis to uncover explicit references in curriculum. Summative (manifest) content analysis catalogs (quantifies) the usage of terminology (references) within a document and involves identifying frequencies of use rather than inferences of meaning to assist in the investigation of peace education elements.

**Context, reliability, validity, and credibility**

Content analysis methodology has been criticized for negligible contextual considerations, weak reliability, and inadequate validity. Context provides meaning to observable phenomena, reliability speaks to the consistency of a research methodology, and validity refers to the assurance that desired measurements are actually being measured (Manning 1997). Content analysis addresses these issues as credibility (context, reliability and validity) and increases credibility with a persistent scientific engagement involving prolonged observation (Guba and Lincoln 1985).

[As] one challenge of this type of analysis is failing to develop a complete understanding of the context … credibility can be established through activities such as peer debriefing, prolonged engagement, persistent observation, triangulation, negative case analysis, referential adequacy, and member checks. (Hsieh and Shannon 2005, 1280)

To remedy the credibility concern, multiple coding sessions have been utilized by this sole authored study and future research involving multiple coders will include additional methods of ensuring credibility including peer debriefing and referential adequacy.

**Data collection**

Global data collection has already begun and included a variety of techniques to access and capture existing curriculum. Ministries of Education often house curricular documents on websites (often categorized by grade or subject) and in cases without a federal educative structure (such as in Canada) each province or state is researched independently to gain access to primary, secondary, and early childhood curricula. In this research article, the early childhood and year 1–13 curricula from New Zealand were located from New Zealand Curriculum Online, located at: [http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/The-New-Zealand-Curriculum](http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/The-New-Zealand-Curriculum).

**Conceptual framework**

The United Nations Childrens Fund (UNICEF) defines peace education as follows:

Peace education in UNICEF refers to the process of promoting the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values needed to bring about behaviour changes that will enable children, youth and adults to prevent conflict and violence, both overt and structural; to resolve conflict peacefully; and to create the conditions conducive to peace. (Fountain 1999, 1)
This definition clearly locates the work of peace education in three distinct areas – prevention, peaceful resolution, and peaceful conditions. The PECA project will diverge from this demarcation: the prevention of violence is replaced by the recognition of violence (recognition is an antecedent of prevention), resolving conflict peacefully is read to mean resolve conflict nonviolently and creating the conditions conducive to peace is understood to refer to positive peace as opposed to negative peace.

This research uses content analysis methods to examine text (curriculum documents) in order to locate (by presence or absence) a variety of items, narrative themes, implications, and examples of (3) peace education elements (Figure 1).

**Element one: recognizing violence**

Violence is understood in this study as an intentional human act causing harm. Acts of violence are avoidable, distinct from danger or hazards that emerge from the environment and they are detrimental to creating positive peace. There are three forms of violence (Galtung 1990) considered in this element including violence that is part of a worldview (cultural), violence that is part of a social process (structural), and violence that is an event (direct).

**Element two: non-violent conflict transformation**

Paradigms of war consider it both legitimate, appropriate, necessary and, at times, obligatory to use violence. Paradigms of peace consider that violence is unacceptable to both manage conflicts – within and between groups – and for the purpose of bringing about change. Peace education, working within the paradigm of peace holds that conflict transformation should be non-violent (Harris 2004). This

![Figure 1. Conceptual framework of peace education.](image-url)
means, for example, conflict resolved with weapons does not result in non-violent transformation if violence was used to obtain the desired outcomes.6

**Element three: positive peace**

Negative peace is characterized by cessations in overt violence (such as during the cold war), whereas positive peace contains nine vital components of positive human perception, attitudes, and actions.

1. Peace Zone (safe spaces where violence is absent)
2. Peace Bond (positive relationships characterized by kindness and empathy)
3. Social Justice (presence of fairness or equality)
4. Eco Mind (harmonious living between humanity and nature)
5. Link Mind (perception of interconnectivity and/or interdependency)
6. Gender Mind (awareness of gender as an important facet of understanding)
7. Resilience (ability to absorb calamity: personal, social, or environmental)
8. Well-being (health, wellness, and taking responsibility for self or others)
9. Prevention (knowing ways to stop violence before it starts)

**Theoretical roots of element three**

Positive Peace is not the absence of conflict but the absence of violence. As one theory (one conceptualization or perception) of positive peace is an invitation to cultural violence – neglecting all other truths (Galtung 1996, 21) this study includes nine. There are other facets of positive peace but the aforementioned nine components emerge from the following nine pro-peace constructs.

**Peace Zone:** Maria Montessori’s *Casa di Bambini* (children’s house) envisioned school as a safe space. We cannot achieve positive peace if we are at risk (Polk Lillard 1988).

**Peace Bond:** the act of caring for one another is a foundational moral principle of education and an integral part of fostering positive peace. Although the first place of learning lies in the home, after the home, the school is a primary location of social transfer (Noddings 2012).

**Well-being:** practicing caretaking leads to positive peace because when we practice acts that contribute to well-being we are practicing non-violence. Taking responsibility for self and others is also a way of fostering democratic values and stimulating the care/harm foundation that inhibits cruelty (Haidt 2012).

**Social Justice:** education should contribute to equality and emancipation. Positive peace is often considered the absence of structural violence, which means discrimination, cannot be tolerated (Snauwaert 2011).

**Gender Mind:** as gender is an integral human feature, recognition of gender is a necessary step toward fostering gender equality. Positive peace cannot exist without gender equality (Reardon and Snauwaert 2015).

**Eco Mind:** peace ecology adopts the *Arcadian Ecology* perspective that espouses harmony between humanity and nature as distinct from *Imperial Ecology* which sees nature as a resource for humans. Positive peace requires the inhibition of cruelty (violence) to others whether human or ecological (Van Koppen 2000).
Link Mind: Interconnectivity and/or interdependency perceive reality as linked and having multiple relationships. Philosophically, this relates to the unity (a oneness) of all things and a rejection of perceptions of isolation (non-dualism sees no separation between matter and energy.) Positive peace is a holistic concept that requires complex understandings (Jack 1994).

Resilience: education that builds resilience contributes to mitigating and preventing violent conflict. Resilience is a part of building positive peace (Bird 2011; UNICEF 2015).

Prevention: violence is destructive and techniques that prevent violence are desirable. Conflict can be creative and valuable but peace (whether negative or positive) is not compatible with violence. To promote positive peace you need to prevent violence (Harris 2013).

There are a number of factors that impact human experiences and are tied to identity including gender, social class, sexuality, ethnicity, kinship, education, critical issues of the long-term and contemporary effects of direct, structural, and cultural violence against indigenous populations, individuals living with (visible or invisible) disabilities and persons who experience the many negative outcomes of ethnic, racial, or religious profiling. While gender is included (as all persons perform or are expected to perform gender) other identity categories (class, ethnicity, religion, race, ability, etc.) are not directly investigated in the PECA Project to include as many nations as possible. While some facets of identity are important fault lines in some nations, they are not unanimously applicable the world over.

New Zealand

The first curricula (ECE, primary and secondary) to be analyzed in the PECA project is from the Nation of New Zealand – called Aotearoa in the native language of the Māori peoples. New Zealand is composed of over 30 islands but the largest landmasses are commonly called the north and south island and are located in the southwest Pacific Ocean – east of Australia and south of the Pacific Islands of Tonga and Fiji. The Island nation of New Zealand has been home to indigenous Māori peoples since roughly 1250 CE. The remote territory had its first European contact by the Dutch in the seventeenth century and later became a colony of the British Empire in 1840. The country was self-governing by the start of the twentieth century (King 2003).

New Zealand curricula

The New Zealand English medium curriculum is separated into two documents that are analyzed herein: the 1996 Te Whāriki Early Childhood Education (hereafter referred to as NZ ECE) and the 2007 New Zealand 1–13 Curriculum that comprises the primary and secondary levels of education (hereafter referred to as NZ 1–13).

Coding rationale

Directive content analysis permits a concentrated and focused adherence to a preexisting theoretical framework. In order to select content that relates to the three elements of peace education (recognition of violence, non-violent conflict transformation tools, and nine elements of positive peace) this study used the following rubric:
• To be included in the category recognition of violence – cultural, structural, or direct – it was crucial that the passage not be simply an example of violence (for example: slavery, infanticide, bullying) but that the passage explicitly recognized the content as a form of violence – a deliberate and avoidable act of harm;
• in order to be included in the category ‘Non-violent Conflict Transformation,’ it was necessary to conclude that the method, tool, or technique utilized could not possibly be used violently;
• in order to be coded Peace Zone, the passage must relate the importance of safe space;
• in order to be coded Peace Bond, the content must relate to building positive relationships that involve kindness and empathy (relationships described as respectful or appropriate are not coded);
• in order to be coded Social Justice, the content must relate the importance of fairness and/or egalitarianism;
• in order to be coded Eco Mind, the content must communicate the importance of harmony between humanity and nature and not merely notions of sustainability which often define eco consciousness as a benefit for humans;
• in order to be coded Link Mind, the content needs to recognize that interconnectivity and interdependency convey that an existence is linked to a matrix of other factors; connections or relationships can have only two poles, whereas interconnections and interrelationships are multi-poles;
• in order to be coded Gender Mind, the text must communicate that gender is an important facet of identity and includes the social expectations/experiences of the sexes; biological content is not coded Gender Mind;
• to be coded Resilience, the question is asked does this content teach a student to cope with a disaster;
• in order to be coded Well-being, content must refer to health, wellness (physical, spiritual or emotional) and taking responsibility for the self and/or others; and
• in order to be coded Prevention, the content must communicate that violence can be avoided by providing techniques to prevent violence; managing risk, hazards or danger is not coded Prevention.

Findings
The following section will exhibit semantic evidence for three elements considered common in peace education. Element one will separate out specific statements that recognize cultural, structural, or direct violence. Element two will ascertain the presence of non-violent tools for conflict transformation and element three will investigate which actions/attitudes toward positive peace are present in curricula. In the following section, short illustrative portions of curricular content are presented within the text in italicized font and longer exemplary sections are offered as quotations.

NZ ECE: 1996 Te Whāriki early childhood education
In NZ ECE a child’s cultural, physical, social, emotional, spiritual, and cognitive worlds are reported as integral to positive development because:
The early childhood curriculum takes up a model of learning that weaves together intricate patterns of linked experiences and meaning rather than emphasizing the acquisition of discreet skills. The child’s whole context, the physical surroundings, the emotional context, relationships with others, and the child’s immediate needs at any moment will affect and modify how a particular experience contributes to the child’s development. (41)

**Element one: recognizing violence**

In the NZ ECE, violence is described as injury (52), physical and emotional abuse (62), harm (46), being demeaned (62), discriminatory practices (66), stereotyped language (66), prejudice (65), and negative attitudes (67) (Figure 2).

In recognition of structural and cultural violence, the curriculum avers that:

To learn to develop their potential, children must be respected and valued as individuals. Their rights to personal dignity, to equitable opportunities for participation, to protection from physical, mental, or emotional abuse and injury, and to opportunities for rest and leisure must be safeguarded. (40)

When considering the role of direct forms of violence NZ ECE speaks of protection: from rough handling (53), from each other (53), from biting or hitting (53) and contemplates rules about (not) harming others (53).

**Element two: nonviolent conflict transformation**

NZ ECE refers to a range of strategies for solving conflicts in peaceful ways, and a perception that peaceful ways are best (70). Three tools of non-violent conflict resolution are expressed in the curriculum (Figure 3).

![Figure 2. Recognition of violence in NZ ECE.](image)
Referring to collaboration the curriculum asserts that: children learn through collaboration with adults and peers, through guided participation and observation of others, as well as through individual exploration and reflection (9). Regarding dialog and negotiation the curriculum values: the capacity to discuss and negotiate rules, rights, and fairness (62) [and the] ability to disagree and state a conflicting opinion assertively and appropriately (62). Furthermore, the curriculum perceives of the importance of acquiring strategies and skills for initiating, maintaining, and enjoying a relationship with other children – including taking turns, problem solving, negotiating, taking another’s point of view, supporting others, and understanding other people’s attitudes and feelings – in a variety of contexts (70).

Element three: positive peace

Evidence exists for all but three of the nine characteristics of positive peace in NZ ECE. The most numerous references that support positive peace related to the category of Well-being. NZ ECE encouraged students to take increasing responsibility for their own learning and care (40), for their own health and safety (94), to protect others from physical and emotional abuse (52), increase their knowledge about keeping physically healthy (86), promoting emotional well-being (46), and develop a sense of responsibility for the well-being of others and the environment (98) (Figure 4).

Peace Bond behavior is characterized in NZ ECE as loving (22), contributing to consistent, warm (46) and intimate interactions (47). NZ ECE avers that a childhood setting should be a caring home (54) where children learn to empathize with others (64), develop good relationships (96) and establish and maintain warm (47), good friendships (25).

NZ ECE curriculum addresses the positive peace qualities of Peace Bond and Well-being through passages such as:
The early childhood education setting should be like a caring home: a secure and safe place where each member is entitled to respect and to the best of care. The feeling of belonging, in the widest sense, contributes to inner well-being, security, and identity. Children need to know that they are accepted for who they are. They should know that what they do can make a difference and that they can explore and try out new activities. (54)

Regarding gender, NZ ECE makes repeated reference to the importance of creating learning environments inclusive of gender in ways that show girls, boys, men, and women in a range of roles (67) and permit positive judgments on their own gender and the opposite gender (66).

NZ ECE conceives of Social Justice to refer to fairness (62), rights (55), justice (63), and equity (65). NZ ECE repeatedly communicates that the early childhood environment is concerned with securing, valuing, and appreciating diversity and fairness (66) and that children demonstrate consideration for others through qualities such as caring, fairness, tolerance, and generosity (95).

Resilience passages were limited but did support students to find strategies for coping with change (60), respond to different conditions (42), cope with unpredictability and change (25), and develop ways of coping with conflict, challenge, and change (94).

Peace Zone references are scarce and in NZ ECE but there is content that communicates that children deserve a secure environment (24) and protection from physical, mental or emotional abuse (40). NZ ECE contained no passages regarding the final three categories of positive peace – Eco Mind, Link Mind and Prevention.
NZ 1–13: 2007 New Zealand 1–13 curriculum

**Element one: recognizing violence**

The NZ 1–13 curriculum makes a single statement regarding violence intoning: *the curriculum is non-sexist, non-racist, and non-discriminatory: it ensures that students’ identities, languages, abilities, and talents are recognized and affirmed and that their learning needs are addressed* (9). This passage contains elements that recognize cultural (sexism, racism) and structural (discrimination) violence but not direct violence (Figure 5).

**Element two: nonviolent conflict transformation**

NZ 1–13 contains only three examples of non-violent tools for the transformation of conflict. Dialogue, the purposeful discussion of circumstances is considered a two-way process that involves both talking/speaking and listening. The three references that relate to dialogue convey the importance of learning to *ask questions* (12, 30) and *the ability to listen* (12). Regarding negotiation, discussion that aims to reach agreement, NZ 1–13 uses the term in three instances (10, 12, 38) but nowhere is the term negotiate/negotiation defined.

Content regarding the act of working with others – collaboration – can be assumed from a variety of expressions such working as a team, group work or working in partnership. In NZ 1–13 the sole reference coded as collaboration conveys that students need to know *when it is appropriate to compete and when it is appropriate to co-operate* [and that by] working effectively together, they can come up with *new approaches* (12). While NZ 1–13 does reflect that it is desirable to attain these competencies there is no mention of how the curriculum intends to contribute toward students’ achievement of such outcomes (Figure 6).
Element three: positive peace

NZ 1–13 showcases all but two of the nine characteristics of positive peace. The most numerous references related to positive peace come from the categories of Peace Bond and Well-being. Students are encouraged to develop empathy (10) and positive relationships (34, 41). They are urged to develop skills to enhance relationships (23), relate positively to others (23) and help create a supportive learning environment (34). Regarding Wellbeing, students are counseled to learn about their own wellbeing, and that of others and society (17), to become increasingly able to take...
responsible for themselves and contribute to the well-being of those around them (22), and to develop attitudes that they need in order to maintain and enhance (22) personal, interpersonal and societal well-being (23) (Figure 7).

Link Mind is found in NZ 1–13 through passages that communicate the numerous interactions (28) of Earth’s interdependence (28), the interrelationships that exist between the individual, others, and society (32) and references to the interconnected (globalized) world (9, 39).

NZ 1–13 contains two references to Social Justice reporting that: students will be encouraged to value: excellence, innovation, diversity [and] equity, through fairness and social justice (10) and that students should try to cultivate a sense of social justice (22).

NZ 1–13 contains a solitary usage of the term gender in the curriculum in the foreword.

The New Zealand Curriculum applies to all English-medium state schools (including integrated schools) and to all students in those schools, irrespective of their gender, sexuality, ethnicity, belief, ability or disability, social or cultural background, or geographical location. (6)

Peace Zone is loosely considered in one passage that intones that outdoor education programmes must follow safe practice (22). Despite the possibility that this could refer to the actions of educators instead of the environment within which education occurs this reference was included as the only example in NZ 1–13 of Peace Zone.

Though only limited semantic conclusions can be made from passages such as students build resilience through strengthening their personal identity and sense of self-worth (23), this reference was coded as Resilience as it is the only passage in NZ 1–13 that conceivably alludes to the benefit of fostering coping skills.

There are no references that contain content coded for Eco Mind or Prevention in NZ 1–13.

Discussion

Element one: recognizing violence

Overall, the content regarding the recognition of violence in NZ ECE and NZ 1–13 is meager. NZ 1–13 contains only one reference indicating that the document (the curriculum) itself does not contain content that is sexist, racist, and/or discriminatory and this indicates an understanding and awareness that such concerns are important facets of social communication. Despite this cri de Coeur, there is no content from year 1 to 13 that pertains to students gaining the aptitudes of assessing incarnations of violence and/or that violence is an intentional, undesirable and avoidable act. As the sole statement regarding violence in the curriculum specifically recognizes two forms of violence (cultural and structural) and declares the content free from said forms of violence, it cannot be assumed that NZ 1–13 omits violence because the curriculum does not consider violence. What may be considered is that direct forms of violence (acts of harm or threats of harm), are either omitted because they are difficult to represent discursively or omitted because the curriculum does not consider direct forms of violence as undesirable barriers to inclusivity. A faithful reading of the curriculum discloses that sexism is not tolerated but that acts of direct harm are conceivably acceptable. The curriculum does not include direct acts of violence in its disclaimer. Should the curriculum indeed include direct acts as unacceptable,
there would be no question that the curriculum recognizes direct acts as intolerable acts in the NZ 1–13 curriculum.

NZ ECE contains both examples of violence and procedures for addressing harm urging caregivers to practice acts that protect, infants, toddlers, and others. Protection and safety are semantically incorporated into NZ ECE through tactics that encourage awareness of the early childcare environment and instill the value of creating safe, secure places where children do not feel anxious or at risk of harm. The majority of references in NZ ECE relate to direct incarnations of violence but there were some references that concerned structural violence intoning directives to ensure equity among children. The three references that relate to cultural violence concerned prejudice, bias, and stereotyping as undesirable behaviors and communicated that children, as individuals, deserve to be respected and valued.

**Element two: nonviolent conflict transformation**

There are a variety of techniques that are possible incarnations of nonviolent conflict transformation and although neither NZ ECE nor NZ 1–13 specifically delineate such tools as tools purposively used in the transformation of violence, nonetheless the skills and positive consideration or such methods are indicated in both texts. The most numerous tools in NZ ECE involved children working together – collaboration. This is a social skill that is important as it teaches children to positively encounter others. Although NZ ECE and NZ 1–13 both regard negotiation positively, neither define the practice in a meaningful way. Finally, the art of purposeful discussion – dialog – while present in both curricula, was in evidence in limited passages that supported inquisitiveness (asking), listening (taking turns talking), and the ability to disagree while in discussion.

**Element three: positive peace**

The greatest amount of content contributing to positive peace in both NZ ECE and NZ 1–13 emerges from the categories of Wellbeing and Peace Bond. Students are encouraged to create warm and positive relationships in both documents and there are passages that clearly validate efforts to practice empathy, act supportively, and interact with one another with an end to form friendships. The emphasis on self-care is introduced in NZ ECE and continues on to include others. The aptitude of care is expanded further throughout NZ 1–13 to include self both society and the environment. The ethic of care and responsibility is clearly valued in the NZ curricular documents and there are numerous and repeated content validating positive interactions and caring behavior.

While the concept of gender is an unmistakably tangible facet of identity in NZ ECE where passages clearly consider inclusive perception of gender (women, men, girls, boys) a single reference to gender in NZ 1–13 suggests that the expectations of society and the experiences of individuals – and the performance of gender in school and society – is not profoundly considered. There is room in NZ 1–13 to include gender (both expectations and experiences) as a meaningful feature of inquiry, understanding, and acceptance.

Social Justice was addressed minimally in NZ 1–13 but more clearly valued in NZ ECE where children were encouraged to consider fairness, appreciate diversity, and practice tolerance. The value of Social Justice involves egalitarian considera-
tions – equality in society – and NZ 1–13 could expand upon existing exposition to more clearly define how fairness can be considered both a social value and a cultural practice. Considering the history of New Zealand and the current multicultural population, it is conceivable that issues of fairness, equity, and social justice could be locally interpreted and more comprehensively explored.

Concepts of safe space (Peace Zone) and the ability to cope with disaster (Resilience) had limited examples in both NZ ECE and NZ 1–13 with references in NZ ECE relating to handling disappointment, changing circumstances and change. The obvious comprehension of Peace Zone involves the conceptualization that spaces should be safe and free from violence (in any form). Neither NZ ECE nor NZ 1–13 communicated that schools are or should be violence-free places. While NZ ECE did refer to secure spaces where well-being was safeguarded neither curriculum articulated that school (both the physical and social spaces of school) should be free from violence. It cannot be assumed that this lacuna indicates that violence is accepted in the NZ curricula but the specific assertion that schools are safe spaces where violence is not abided could easily be added.

Link Mind is a perception of interconnectivity and/or interdependence in the universe. This value is completely absent in NZ ECE but does contribute some content to NZ 1–13. While there are passages that encourage students to take holistic and comprehensive views of social, ecological, and planetary factors in NZ 1–13, there is a possibility to more greatly incorporate the manifold linkages of living and non-living systems for future students. Link Mind considers geography, science, and culture as interdependent systems. Where appropriate there is room in the NZ curricula to incorporate content specifically demonstrating this perception.

There was no evidence in either NZ ECE or NZ 1–13 of the final two categories contributing to positive peace – Eco Mind and Prevention. Eco Mind refers to a perception that humanity and nature are equally important and attitudes and actions should strive toward harmonious interactions between nature and humanity. While there was evidence of human-centric ecological consideration (sustainability) in NZ 1–13 and some mention of custodianship of the environment in NZ ECE neither imagined the interrelationship between humanity and nature as equally important. While NZ 1–13 communicated content suggesting that humans are caretakers of resources in the natural world, there were no passages that related that caring for the environment was for non-human benefit.

Additionally, the category of Prevention was totally absent from both NZ ECE and NZ 1–13. This omission relates to creating perceptions and practices that recognize violence and maneuver to counteract violence. As neither of the two curricula show evidence of components that promote the prevention of violence, and because ‘to prevent violence we must be able to measure and monitor it’ (Krug et al. 2002, 1087) – it may be possible to infer here that as the recognition of violence is required before the prevention of violence can manifest that in instances where curricula do not comprehensively consider specific kinds of violence they are then not generally concerned with its prevention.

The analysis shows that NZ ECE can be considered more interpersonal focusing on creating Peace Bonds and personal and interpersonal Well-being, while NZ 1–13 puts greater emphasis on interconnectivity. While NZ ECE contained multiple references to gender NZ 1–13 only mentioned gender once – it may be possible to infer here that gender, similar to other facets of identity left unexplored in NZ 1–13, is not considered relevant. As ‘gender, age and marginality are central structuring fea-
tures of school cultures and education systems’ (Kenway and Fitzclarence 1997, 125) in instances where gender and gender and violence represent unchartered territory in curriculum there is ample opportunity to incorporate gender and gender and violence in a far more meaningful manner.

Conclusions
This article has used mixed methods content analysis to investigate New Zealand curricular statements for three peace education elements. It finds that NZ 1–13 curriculum contains only one reference that amounts to a recognition of cultural and structural violence and no references to direct violence. NZ ECE contains several references to harm, abuse, or injury but of the three forms of violence under review refers mostly to direct violence. The analysis of non-violent conflict transformation tools in both NZ ECE and NZ 1–13 is limited in both quantity and scope and includes three different tools. In each instance, the tool used – collaboration, dialog, negotiation – is left largely undefined.

Overall, the positive peace categories of Well-being and Peace Bond had the most numerous references in both NZ ECE and NZ 1–13 suggesting that positive relationships and caring are significantly valued in the NZ curricula. While Link Mind and Social Justice contribute content in NZ 1–13, three categories are minimally represented – Gender Mind, Resilience, and Peace Zone – and two elements of positive peace – Eco Mind and Prevention – are absent completely. In NZ ECE, both Gender Mind and Social Justice have repeated references, whereas both Resilience and Peace Zone have few. The remaining three categories of positive peace in NZ ECE – Eco Mind, Link Mind, and Prevention – were nonexistent.

This analysis of the national early childhood, primary, and secondary curricula of New Zealand considers that it is possible to assess non-peace education for peace education qualities. If peace education curricula teach us how to recognize violence, act non-violently, and work toward positive peace then the curricula of New Zealand – as a cultural transmission belt – has made some progress to educate students toward peace and non-violence. However, opportunities do exist to strengthen peace education content within its existing curricula in particular the recognition of a more comprehensive understanding of violence, the prevention of violence, and addition of nonviolent tools for conflict transformation.
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Notes
1. There are three kinds of curriculum: explicit curriculum – knowledge students are expected to acquire, implicit curriculum – knowledge of cultural expectations in school and, hidden (null) curriculum – topics that are deliberately not included in the curriculum, ‘the options students are not afforded, the perspectives they may never know’ (Eisner 1985, 107).

2. While conflict is a normal facet of the human world violence is here considered deliberate but avoidable harm done to self and/or others (Harris and Morrison 2013).

3. Cultural violence: hierarchal world views, chosen people status, ethno-nationalism, ethnocentrism, discrimination, racism, ageism, sexism, exclusionary cultures, attitudes or beliefs, obstacles to perceiving universality (often displayed as symbolic forms of violence that are often invisible to insiders).

4. Indirect/Structural violence: inequality, institutional disenfranchisement, social marginalization, poverty, injustice, exploitation, obstacles to experiencing full humanity (systemic forms of violence that are often a part of national institutions).

5. Direct/Physical violence: physical harm, threats of harm, obstacles to experiencing personal safety (agentic forms of violence that can be tied to a perpetrator and victim).

6. Examples of Non-violent Conflict Transformation techniques can include: Team problem-solving, cooperation, nonviolent action/communication, win-win, separate the person from problem, address the problem not the person, responsibility without accusation, opponents become partners, recognition, bad situation not bad person/people, cooperation, joint/participatory decision-making, collaboration, asking, agreeing, negotiation, reconciliation, mediation, diplomacy, peacebuilding, nonviolent resistance, dialogue processes, compassionate listening.
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