RESEARCH ARTICLE

WWW.PEGEGOG.NET

The Peace Education Model in Developing a Peaceful Classroom Climate: Lesson-learned from Indonesia

Ilfiandra[1*], Nadia A. Nadhirah[2], Sofwan Adiputra[3]
[1,2]Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia
[3]Universitas Muhammadiyah Pringsewu Lampung, Indonesia

Abstract

The current school climate is no longer peaceful because the prevalence of conflict and violence tends to increase from time to time. In general, students have not been able to resolve conflicts constructively, and the majority of student conflicts are helped to develop by teachers and administrators. Indonesia's education vision is towards global education and peace education, but peace education in Indonesia does not yet have a clear platform. The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of peace education in developing a peaceful classroom climate based on school type and gender. The research approach used is quantitative with quasi-experimental methods and non-equivalent pre-post group design. The research participants were 15 teachers and 72 students who were selected by purposive sampling form vocational high school and senior high school in West Java Province. The instrument used is Peace Class Scale based on Peace Class theory, which is listening when someone is speaking, not excluding anyone, just saying kind of words, speaking softly, showing respect for each other. Data analysis was carried out by testing the difference in the average scores of the two groups using the Independent Sample t test technique. The results is that peace education in total has not been effective in building peaceful classroom. Partially, peace education is more effective in developing respect for female students in vocational secondary schools than male and female students in senior high schools. In the future, recommendations are needed to improve the focus of intervention, strengthen the competence of peace education for teachers, and target interventions that are carried out in stages so that a peaceful climate can be formed in school.

Keywords: pedagogy, peace, culture of peace, classroom climate.

Introduction

School is a social system that requires a conducive climate to support the learning process. It is difficult to deny that education is currently in a crisis, specifically an accountability crisis characterized by strengthening of the "culture of testing" and decrease of "cultural literacy" (Shapiro, 2010). The most serious conflicts between students who occur are student brawls. This situation is not only juvenile delinquency but tends to become criminal because it is often accompanied by violence, persecution, and even murder. "Brawls are not spontaneous events but have become a necessity or even a lifestyle" or become "school culture" (Nugroho, 2012). Brawls between students become the center of attention, "students instead of learning." The perpetrators of these actions have even begun to be carried out by students at the elementary school level.

Data from the Indonesian National Commission for Child Protection in 2011-2016 shows that there were 1381 cases of violence in 2011, as many as 2249 in 2012, as many as 2284 in 2013, as many as 3225 in 2014, as many as 2551 in 2015), and as many as 1452 in 2016. One in three girls and one in four boys in Indonesia experiences violence, according to UNICEF data. In 2015, according to data from the International Center for Research on Women (ICRW) it showed that as many as 84% of students in Indonesia had violence in schools, 22% of student's violence by teachers and school officials, and 75% of students had committed acts of violence in schools (Setiadi & Ilfiandra, 2019).

The problem of violence in education in Indonesia is like an iceberg phenomenon because there are still a lot of data that have not been revealed as well as a form of an educational anomaly that actually brings a message of peace (Kartadinata et al, 2018). Violence is triggered by various things, ranging from small things to criminal behavior. Violent behavior results in a decrease in academic achievement and less focus on learning (Fusco & Fantuzzo, 2009); limitations of students' intrapersonal and interpersonal behavior (Kim, Talbot, & Cicchetti, 2009), decreased academic behavior (Close, 2005); in a long, time can lead to the emergence of deviant behavior and trauma (Cavazos-Rehg et al, 2007); increased problems with self and anti-social (Sternberg et al, 2006).

At the macro level, people are not used to dealing with conflict constructively so it often ends up being tampered with without solving the main problem (Maftuh, 2005). Likewise, in the world of education, disputes between students are fostered by those in authority, such as teachers or parents. Dependence on others occurs because students do not have the skills to resolve conflicts creatively (Ilfandra, 2019). The government has issued a regulation concerning the Prevention and Combating of Violence in Educational Units. The lesson that can be drawn from this step is that the power-structural approach in dealing with violence in education is only an emergency measure and in the long term, this option cannot be maintained (Setiadi & Ilfiandra, 2019).

Peace education is one strategy to promote a culture of peace (Chowdhury, 2008). The social context, culture, needs and aspirations of a country greatly affect the peace education system in that place. Cultural, religious and humanitarian values are very important in peace education (Castro & Galace, 2008). Each country has differences related to ideology, goals, curriculum, content and practice of implementing peace education (Bar-Tal, 2002). Peace education has many different themes and forms. Peace education is a protector in several parts, namely human rights education, global education, conflict resolution educations, education for international understanding, interfaith education, development education, gender-fair/non-sexist and environmental education (Castro & Galace, 2008). Each section has a different system of orientation and set of normative behavior.

In the 21st century, teachers are required to be competent in peace education (Polat, et al, 2016). The strategy of Indonesia's national education system is to realize "peace education" and "global education," but peace education does not yet have a solid platform and foundation (Kartadinata, 2015). Peace education is a critical issue in Indonesia because there is no explicit peace education program from primary to university levels (Kartadinata et al., 2017). The results of Kartadinata et al (2018) research on peace education for prospective teachers shows that there are no specific competencies related to the ability to develop a peaceful classroom climate. In the perspective of students, the majority of them view their climate as less peaceful even though the teacher has a high predisposition to a peaceful culture. This condition is complicated by the fact that creating peace has not been part of the teacher's mission when attending class (Setiadi & Ilfiandra, 2018).

Peace education avoids rigid standards and norms (Bajaj & Brantmeier, 2011). Peace education requires the transformation of content, pedagogy, educational structure, educational practice, teacher-student relations and systems to determine their impact (Bajaj & Hantzoupoulos, 2016). The agenda for peace education in Indonesia is very complex, spanning from philosophical issues, regulations, models and strategies, and impacts. In Indonesia, there are two types of education that have different characteristics of the school climate and the tendency of a culture of peace. The results showed that high-school students' predisposition to a culture of peace was higher than that of Vocational high-school students, and female students perceived the classroom climate to be more peaceful than male students (Ilfiandra, 2012; 2015). Therefore, this study intends to evaluate the effectiveness of peace education in improving the peaceful classroom climate by type of school and gender.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Peace is an issue that continues to grow in the field of education. Peace is essentially a state of individuals who are in a sense of happiness and justice (Webel & Galtung, 2007). Peace means as "freedom from civil commotion and confusion" or "a state of public calm." It can be defined as "a spiritual mental state characterized by freedom from anxiety and oppression." It is defined as "a state of calm free from external disturbances." Peace also means "absence of activity and noise: deep stillness or positive inner peace." It is concluded that peace is "that which creates, gives, or underlines's serenity."

One of the figures that conducted peace research named Johan Galtung (1969), dividing the state of peace includes positive peace and negative peace. Positive Peace is a simultaneous condition in society that describes a sense of justice, equality, harmony. Negative peace is a condition when there is no conflict between humans and war.

It is difficult to define peace education systematically and comprehensively. As a result, different definitions of peace education have emerged. In general, peace education is defined as a process of teaching about peace strategies and non-violence (Harris, 2008).

It is difficult to define peace education systematically and comprehensively. As a result, different definitions of peace education have emerged. In general, peace education is defined as a process of teaching about peace strategies and non-violence (Harris, 2008). Peace Education according to Fountain (1999) is a process of teaching knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values to prevent violence and conflict. Love, compassion, trust, justice, cooperation, and respect are the philosophies taught in this education (Schmidt & Friedman, 1988). This program is a character development program by intervening based on values that make students feel at peace (UNESCO, 2001).

Loving education is the essence of this education. Knowledge, skills, attitudes and values are honed to avoid conflict. Individuals are encouraged to be able to believe, care and be peaceful, create non-violent situations, based on moral values. This education embodies a sense of affection, a desire for prosperity and mutual love (Devici, 2008).

Method

Research design

This study uses a quantitative approach, a quasi-experimental method with a nonequivalent pre-post group design. This design is used because it is most commonly used in educational research, and the high school and vocational schools have determined two intact class-room.

Research Participants

The research participants were 15 teachers (seven high school teachers and eight vocational high school teachers in Bandung) which are determined purposively and represent groups of adaptive-normative or general subjects, expertise, and guidance and counseling. During the model implementation process, the research involved two people who acted as collaborators and supervisors to provide assistance in developing lesson plans and shooting the entire intervention session. The main participants were students of Accounting class as experimental group from vocational high school and Science class as Control Group from senior high school, which were selected through non-probability random technique with 76 subjects eleventh grade.

Data collection

The instrument used is the Peaceful Classrom Scale based on the Peaceable Classroom theory from Castro et al, (2005), totaling 25 items using a model. This instrument reveals five indicators of class as a zone of peace, namely listening when someone is talking, do not exclude anyone, say only kind words, speaking gently, show respect for each other. The results of the item validity test using the Spearman's Rho technique, showed that all items had significant validity at $p = 0.05$ with a validity coefficient range from 0.211 to 0.657. The reliability coefficient calculation using the split-half method using the Spearman's Rho technique produces a reliability coefficient of 0.564 and the full test reliability coefficient calculated by the Spearman-Brown Coefficient technique produces a reliability coefficient of 0.72 (including the acceptable category).

Research procedure

Implementation of peace education to build a classroom climate using integrated strategies in subjects and guidance and counseling services. Prior to implementation, the Training of Trainee (ToT) activity was carried out as an effort to develop teacher capacity in the implementation of peace education. ToT are packaged in the form of a workshop that lasts for two days. The substance of this ToT activity includes the concept of peace education, peace education competence, peace education strategies and techniques, peaceful classroom concept, lesson plan development to build peaceful classrooms through guidance and counseling subjects and services, and simulation and reflection for the benefit of lesson plan revision. Furthermore, 15 teachers developed an intervention design (two sessions each) which was integrated into subjects and guidance and counseling. The lesson plan prepared by the teacher is consulted with the supervisor to get input, which is then revised again. There are 31 intervention sessions (14 sessions in senior high schools and 17 sessions in vocational high schools). The intervention was initiated by a pre-test in 2 experimental and control group. The intervention was carried out two times in one week with an interval of two days to provide opportunities for internalizing students' experiences. During the intervention session, direct monitoring was carried out by the supervisor to document the intervention process and the dynamics of teacher-student behavior. The post-test activity was carried out one week after the last session using the same instrument.

Analyzing of Data

The filling of the research instrument was done anonymously. One of the consequences, researchers cannot do data tracking in pairs. On that basis, the data processing process first tested the difference in the average pretest score of the experimental group with the average score of the control group. Member participants for each group were selected and determined so as to produce an average score in the two groups that was not significantly different. Because the groups in the pretest conditions produced an average score that was not significantly different, then the effectiveness of the model was tested by testing the difference in the average posttest scores for the two groups using the Independent Sample t test technique with a price of $\alpha = 0.10$.

Implementation of peace education to build a classroom climate using integrated strategies in subjects and guidance and counseling services. Prior to implementation, the Training of Trainee (ToT) activity was carried out as an effort to develop teacher capacity in the implementation of peace education. ToT activities are packaged in the form of a workshop that lasts for two days. The substance of this ToT activity includes the concept of peace education, peace education competence, peace education strategies and techniques, peaceful classroom concept, lesson plan development to build peaceful classrooms through guidance and counseling subjects and services, and simulation and reflection for the benefit of lesson plan revision. Furthermore, 15 teachers developed an intervention design (two sessions each) which was integrated into subjects and guidance and counseling. The lesson plan prepared by the teacher is consulted with the supervisor to get input, which is then revised again. There are 31 intervention sessions (14 sessions in senior high schools and 17 sessions in vocational high schools). The intervention was initiated by a pre-test in 2 experimental and control group. The intervention was carried

out two times in one week with an interval of two days to provide opportunities for internalizing students' experiences. During the intervention session, direct monitoring was carried out by the supervisor to document the intervention process and the dynamics of teacher-student behavior. The post-test activity was carried out one week after the last session using the same instrument.

FINDINGS

The Effectiveness of the Peace Education for Developing a Peaceful Classroom Climate

The procedure used to answer the question is statistical inferential through the mean difference test through the Independent Sample t test. The results of total and partial data processing are presented in tables 1 to 5.

Table 1 shows that the average posttest score for the peaceful class atmosphere in total and its five aspects in the experimental group with the control group have a probability value (p-value) greater than 0.05. Thus, the average posttest score for the peaceful class atmosphere in the experimental and control groups was not significantly different at α = 0.10. This means that the peace education has not been effective in developing a peaceful classroom atmosphere. Analysis with the same statistical procedure was carried out to evaluate the

effectiveness of the peace education for developing a peaceful classroom climate in vocational high schools. The results of data processing are presented in table 2.

The test results show that the average posttest score for the peaceful class atmosphere in total and its aspects in the experimental group with the control group in Vocational High Schools have a probability value (p-value) greater than 0.10 except for the Respect (E aspect). The average posttest score for the peaceful class atmosphere in the experimental and control groups was not significantly different at α = 0.10 except for the respect . That is, the intervention used was effective in developing a peaceful classroom climate in Vocational High Schools for the respect. The results of testing the effectiveness of the peace education in high school are presented in table 3.

Table 3 shows that the average posttest score for the peaceful class atmosphere in total and its aspects in the experimental group with the control group in high school have a probability value (p-value) greater than 0.10. Thus, the average posttest score for the peaceful class atmosphere in the experimental and control groups was not significantly different at α = 0.10. This means that the peace education has not been effective in developing a peaceful classroom climate in high school.

Table 1: Test the Effectiveness of the Peace Education for Developing a Peaceful Classroom Climate

Variable	t-test for Equality of Means				
	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
POSTTEST_A	.461	127	.646	.1321022	.2868639
POSTTEST_B	.185	127	.854	.1159884	.6270827
POSTTEST_C	.493	127	.623	.2228478	.4521748
POSTTSET_D	-.242	127	.810	-.1301203	.5386453
POSTTEST_E	.901	127	.369	.4991819	.5540650
POSTTEST_TOTAL	.455	127	.650	.8399029	1.8471594

Description:
A: Listening when someone is talking,
B: Do not exclude anyone,
C: Say only kind words,
D: Speaking gently,
E: Show respect for each other,

Table 2: Test the Effectiveness of the Peace Education Model for Building a Peaceful Classroom Climate in Vocational High Schools

Variable	t-test for Equality of Means				
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
POSTTEST_A	.558	59	.579	.579	.2404580
POSTTEST_B	-.026	59	.980	.980	-.0228017
POSTTEST_C	.688	59	.494	.494	.4483265
POSTTSET_D	-.406	59	.686	.686	-.2881886
POSTTEST_E	1.863	59	.067	.067	1.3909138
POSTTEST_TOTAL	.730	59	.468	.468	1.7685108

Test the effectiveness of peace education based on the posttest scores of the experimental and control groups of female student

The results of statistical calculations for posttest scores in the experimental and control groups of female students are presented in table 4.

Table 4 shows that the average posttest score for the peaceful class atmosphere in total and its aspects in the experimental group with a control group of female students has a probability value (p-value) greater than 0.10 except for the E aspect. The average posttest score for the peaceful class atmosphere in the experimental and control groups did not differ significantly at α = 0.10 except for the E aspect. That is, the peace education used was effective in developing a peaceful classroom climate for female students in Respect aspect.

Test the effectiveness of the model based on the posttest scores of the experimental and control groups in men

The results of statistical calculations for posttest scores in the experimental and control groups of male vocational high school students are presented in table 5.

The test results show that the average posttest score of the peaceful class atmosphere in total and its aspects in the experimental group with the control group on male in Vocational High Schools students have a probability value (p-value) greater than 0.10. Thus, the mean posttest scores for the peaceful class atmosphere in the experimental and control groups of male students in vocational high schools were not significantly different at α = 0.10. This means that the peace education model used has not been effective in developing a peaceful classroom climate for male students in vocational high schools.

Table 3: Test the Effectiveness of the Peace Education Model to Develop Peaceful Classroom Climate in High School

	t-test for Equality of Means				
Variable	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
POSTTEST_A	.461	127	.646	.1321022	.2868639
POSTTEST_B	.185	127	.854	.1159884	.6270827
POSTTEST_C	.493	127	.623	.2228478	.4521748
POSTTSET_D	-.242	127	.810	-.1301203	.5386453
POSTTEST_E	.901	127	.369	.4991819	.5540650
POSTTEST_TOTAL	.455	127	.650	.8399029	1.8471594

Table 4. Test the Effectiveness of the Peace Education to Develop Peaceful Class Climate in Women

	t-test for Equality of Means				
Variabel	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
POSTTEST_A	.938	84	.351	.3311787	.3530420
POSTTEST_B	.970	84	.335	.7433048	.7666860
POSTTEST_C	.682	84	.497	.3912543	.5735115
POSTTSET_D	-.109	84	.913	-.0739888	.6789851
POSTTEST_E	1.744	84	.085	1.1587513	.6645652
POSTTEST_TOTAL	1.109	84	.271	2.550361	2.3000287

Table 5: Test the Effectiveness of the Peace Education Model to Develop a Peaceful Classroom Climate in Boys

	t-test for Equality of Means				
Variabel	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
POSTTEST_A	-1.208	11	.252	-1.7104333	1.4159889
POSTTEST_B	.136	11	.894	.3128667	2.2985036
POSTTEST_C	-.401	11	.696	-.8701000	2.1724100
POSTTSET_D	-.922	11	.376	-1.8726667	2.0316412
POSTTEST_E	.647	11	.531	1.4460333	2.2353529
POSTTEST_TOTAL	-.348	11	.734	-2.6940667	7.7411044

Discussion

In general, the results of research on the implementation of the peace education have not been able to develop showing peaceful classroom climate as a point of arrival. There are many perspectives to explain this finding, including the strengths and weaknesses of the peace education, teacher readiness factors, student participation, and system support in the form of policies. In terms of research methodology, sampling, instrument and testing, factors are alternative explanations regarding the ineffectiveness of peace education to develop a peaceful classroom climate.

The ineffectiveness of education in building a peaceful classroom climate is not yet conclusive and there are many alternative explanations, one of which is an understanding of the urgency of peace education on a macro basis. The role of education has been understood and contested since Plato's era ((Harber & Mncube 2012), and education is the most effective strategic step to build a culture of peace (Chowdhury, 2008). Education is theoretically a tool for building peace (Shepler & Williams, 2017).

School is the first place in instilling the value of tolerance, mutual prescription and skills to live peacefully with others (UNESCO, 2011). Although it is believed to be a potential force for building peace, it requires a fundamental change in the moral context (Christie, 2016). Formal schools do not view peace education as a bridge to build peace because school culture and values are not as long as they are in line with the need to build peace (Gill & Niens 2014). In addition, the development of peace education is more in the context of the needs of the global community than the specific school context (Smith Ellison, 2014). At the country level, especially in post-conflict countries, peace education is placed more exclusively as a subject and discourse on peace in schools is often perceived as less positive, even not needed at all (Cunningham 2015; Novelli et al, 2014).

It is difficult to assess changes in skills, attitudes and behavior as an outcome or impact of peace education, especially in a long-term context (Harber & Sakade, 2009). In addition, peace education tends to emphasize the individual rather than the social structure (Higgins and Novelli 2018). The intervention model of peace education developed is still partial and only relies on integrated strategies in learning plus guidance and counseling. In addition, there is a kind of jump in the focus of research that is directly at the class level, while the personal level of students has not been intervened at all because the peaceful climate does not necessarily occur because of the group of students who have been at peace (Scarritt,& Nkiwane, 1996). Thus students' inner peace becomes the entrance before increasing with the class level. The pedagogical challenge is that the curriculum is actually developed to bring students to a peaceful and happy state, but the learning process cannot be seen (Ilfiandra & Kartadinata, 2015).

Research on peace education programs has been developed and studied in several countries (Bretherton, 2014). The results of this study are different from several studies on peace education that have been carried out. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, since 2000 a study has been conducted on 112 secondary schools with 80,000 participants involving students, teachers and parents (Danesh, 2006). This study applies elements of the Integrative Theory of Peace (ITP) concept which introduces the education curriculum for peace in the school. Likewise, the results of Eslami-Somea & Movassagh (2014) research in primary and secondary schools in Iran which recommends that students have great potential and can be educated in peace and the existence of a formal curriculum on peace in schools will make students stronger.

The results showed that more peaceful behavior was shown by teachers than students and among students, although the changes perceived by students were not very authentic. In this context, the teacher has carried out the function as a role model in the implementation of peace education. This is in line with the view that schools are places where a culture of peace develops, and teachers have an important role in this effort (McLeod, & Reynolds, 2010). The success of peace education requires a transformation in content, pedagogy, organizational structure, practitioners, the relationship between teachers and students and the school system as a whole (Bajaj & Hantzopoulos, 2016). It is the teacher who is at peace within himself who can teach the education of peace (UNESCO, 2001). The teacher is a role model for students to understand the essence of peace education.

It can be understood that peace education is a process and a philosophy, because as a philosophy, education emphasizes social justice, anti-violence, justice and as a process emphasizes empowering students' skills to create a society that embodies the values of peace (Lauritzen, 2016). From the side of the research participants, the selection of high-school students (adolescents) is considered a strategy because they are the main capital in the development of a culture of peace by considering the value of the locality and the cultural context in which they grow and develop. Therefore, adolescents are more likely to avoid violence by instilling the values of peace in them (McEvoy-Levy, 2001). The development of emotional, social, moral and humanistic aspects in children will be disturbed if they only focus on cognitive (Castro & Galace, 2008). Education must be able to equip students to live in peace.

The results of the study which show that students' perceptions of the classroom climate has not changed can be examined from their conception of the peace construct. Students who become research participants certainly have their own perspective on the construct of peace. In the context of the development of the conception of the construct of peace, research by Hakvoort & Oppenheimer (1998) noted that children aged 7-8 already have views about peace and war.

Over time, children will develop different concepts of peace. At the age of eight years, they tend to develop the concept of negative peace thinking, namely the absence of war and the realization of calm. However, when children are 10 years old, the concept of positive peace begins to develop, including respect for and respect for others, integration, cooperation, equality, and the process of democracy and reconciliation. This can be interpreted when childhood the basic concept of peace tends to be passive and negative, but at the age of 10, the construct of the concept of peace tends to be positive and active (Galtung, 1969). Thus, the joking behavior of students during learning is perceived by the supervisor as an indication that it is not peaceful, in the child's perspective, it can be the other way around.

The intervention focus on classroom climate includes five class indicators as a zone of peace as proposed by Castro et al, (2005) can be an alternative explanation for the ineffectiveness of the peace pedagogical model intervention. Peace pedagogy focuses on developing systems thinking (Ilfiandra & Kartadinata, 2015). This is also the main premise of UNESCO (2006) regarding the focus of peace education interventions through the statement "since war begins in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men who defenses of peace must." In addition, how to position a safe and peaceful climate can be a mode of intervention failure, in this study a safe and peaceful class climate is positioned at a point of arrival. Another perspective is that peace education is very basic, not only a matter of results but very much respecting the process (Wells, 2003). This education also teaches the pattern of life as individuals who have a pattern of democratic society (Gillis & Miller, 2004).

The strategy of implementing the pedagogical model used is still limited to being integrated with plus subjects through guidance and counseling services. This choice certainly carries the risk of teacher conflict between focusing on mastering content knowledge, on the one hand, and developing a classroom climate on the other. In many classrooms, the majority of teacher teaching still uses a "learn about" or "learn for" approach. Peace pedagogy approach through "learning in or through" is the expected state of learning (Gray-Donald & Selby, 2004). There needs to be a reflective process in peace education learning (McLeod, & Reynolds, 2010). This relatively new strategy is a source of difficulty in implementing peace pedagogy.

Theoretically, the approach to peace education is experiential through presenting experiences that are contextual to the student's world and used in life. However, in the intervention carried out, this has not yet fully occurred because the choice of the embedded approach has less room for movement due to the difficulty of finding cases or examples that are close to the students' daily world. This has actually been outlined by UNICEF that peace education should "…

constitutes a very real part of the day to day 'incidental' learning that takes place in the classroom." Peace education is more of a practice than a theory because education is actually a project of awareness about what it means to be human and how to interact with nature and other creatures. This includes learning to care for and care for the environment. In the context of the application of educational science, peace education is not in the form of special subjects. Peace must be present as a climate that surrounds teaching and learning interactions (Ilfiandra & Kartadinata, 2015).

As the point of arrival of the peace, pedagogical intervention is to build a safe and peaceful class climate already using a positive peace perspective and not focusing on conflict resolution. This decision is in line with the view that peace education in schools does not only carry out the mission to eliminate conflict and violence, but there is a transformation of thought, attitude and behavior to create awareness and understanding that allows people to live, relate, and create conditions and environmental systems that are non-violent. justice, care for the environment and values of peace (Castro & Galace, 2008). A culture of peace in schools needs to be built to develop attitudes, knowledge, skills in order to be able to control desires, balance desires and appropriateness, tolerance and respect for differences, attention and love for others, and shifting from competition to cooperation (UNESCO, 2006). Peace education is not like 'business usual' but needs to develop cognitive and affective skills (Baxter 2013). Peace education emphasizes critical pedagogy, dialogue pedagogy and awareness education. Classes that want to build peace need to involve analysis and discussion of controversial issues assuming mutual respect and a slight shift of power from teachers to students (Harber and Mncube 2012).

The orientation of the peace pedagogy model is how students are able to live in peace and harmony with teachers and fellow students. This perspective is in line with the opinion of Das & Das (2014) that peace does not mean the absence of conflict or war. A peaceful personality also shows that a person responds to negative actions in a positive way. For example, when we choose to forgive over revenge and continue to do well to others even though it hurts because that person has brought us down, we can feel an extraordinary sense of wellness (Castro & Galace, 2008).

Another problem in peace education is that many teachers, parents, and teachers reject critical pedagogy for peace education (Zembylas, 2016) and teachers also do not have sufficient skills to raise controversial issues in the classroom (Harber & Mncube 2012) and teachers do not have experience to teach about democracy and orientation to peace in the classroom (Harber 2017). Qualitative analysis of the impact of the implementation model shows that there is a change in the dynamics of teacher and student behavior. In the view of students, during implementation the teacher became more

open, less angry, and more patient with student behavior. This condition is in line with the findings of Syrjäläinen, et,al (2015) who found that school safety and peace will affect students' ability to form close bonds with teachers and peers. Feeling insecure can negatively affect students' grades, attendance, and engagement with everyday lessons (Bowen & Bowen, 1999). In addition, schools have a strong influence on children's emotional development, as an ideal environment to build the soul to have a strong character and obtain emotional well-being. The success of peace education requires the development of emotional intelligence that involves awareness and self-control supported by interpersonal factors such as sympathy, sensitivity and the ability to cooperate (Cunningham, 2015).

The results showed that the peace education was effective for developing respect behavior aspects, especially for female students in vocational high schools. One of the contributing factors is the cultural differences between high school and vocational school. In vocational schools where the majority of students are female, respectful behavior changes more quickly because the learning atmosphere is different because the majority of teachers are also female. Research Gottfredson & Hirschi (1990) found differences in the level of self-control between men and women. Men have a lower level of self-control than women, so they take more negative and deviant actions. In addition, peace education will develop in a democratic classroom (Shapiro, 2010). A peaceful school cannot be separated from upholding justice for all school members and providing wide space to develop potential. Peace is not something that is easy, namely the absence of war or conditions of nonviolence; Peace is eradication (eradication) of all problems of injustice. It is necessary to take advantage of a critical approach to peace education that emphasizes the empowerment of students as agents of social transformation. Therefore, optimal peace will occur when it is supported by the school's mission and involves students as agents of peace (Johnson & Johnson, 2010).

During the implementation of the peace pedagogy, a dilemma appears on the students. On the one hand, the teacher's peace pedagogy teaches the values of openness, respect and honesty but on the other hand, the student section uses the instrument of punishment and warning to manage student behavior. The general regulation used by schools to ensure safe school condition is through order or discipline. This strategy is like a double-edged sword because it is not a guarantee for the birth of a peaceful atmosphere. The results of Lacoe's (2015) research show that there is evidence that school regulations are associated with increasing a sense of security and peace and perceptions of discipline is correlated with a sense of security, and inconsistent punishment is counterproductive to efforts to increase a sense of security and peace. Excessive application of punishment will lead to deviant behavior. Peace will occur if the application of discipline is

carried out fairly. The main problem facing schools is how peace education is meaningful, integrated, and valued as part of learning in society. The results of research by Honkasilta et al, (2016) in Finland show that teachers who apply reactive classroom management strategies make students cry. Though ideally teachers take a leading role in ensuring social justice and peace for students in schools.

The peace pedagogy model intervention can be categorized as a brief intervention because it only lasts for 14 and 17 sessions. In simple logic, it is unrealistic to expect major changes to the classroom and school climate because the development of a culture of peace reflects an active, positive and participatory effort through respect for diversity, tolerance for differences, encouraging dialogue, and conflicts being resolved in a spirit of understanding and cooperation. It is a process of cultivating beliefs and actions based on tradition, culture, and religion. Therefore, a culture of peace requires a long-term, multi-dimensional process, a process of transforming values, attitudes, behavior, ways of life through living together and increasing interrelationships (Nan-Zhao, 2005). Peace education is a holistic concept and a condition that cannot be developed through a lecture-note taking-testing framework, but must include elements of critical thinking, reflection, and active participation of all school components and can be integrated in many disciplines (Weiss, 2015).

The intervention strategy used in the intervention of the peace pedagogy model is embedded in learning so as not to add to the teacher's burden. The reference is that peace concepts, attitudes, values, and social skills have been integrated into school curricula in many countries. Some countries place values as part of moral education, related to religious values, some place values in a cultural and economic perspective (Nan-Zhao & Teasdale, 2004). However, all of them assume that these values will improve the quality of life of individuals and society.

Based on the results of research, theoretical studies, and previous research on peace education, it can be drawn a main principle in developing a culture of peace in the classroom, in particular, and schools in general. That piece is a complex psychological construct, peace will have different meanings and expressions based on cultural predispositions, sociology, religion, and political orientation, even at the economic level. Building a culture of peace in schools requires a comprehensive approach, covering various levels of life, with a whole spectrum of abilities that are tested in the real life of students, through lifelong learning. Peace pedagogy as a real contribution of education to build a culture of peace, still needs improvement, both in terms of assumptions, substance and steps.

CONCLUSION
In general, the peace education model is not effective for building a peaceful classroom climate, but is partially

effective for developing the respect aspect of female students in vocational high schools rather than senior high schools. This conclusion is strengthened by qualitative data based on the results of observations and interviews of students who perceive that their classroom climate is not different from conditions before the intervention of the peace education. The ineffectiveness of the peace education can be caused because peace is a complex construct and difficult to change through short-term interventions.

In addition, the intervention strategy that is partial only through an integrated approach in learning and counseling guidance is also an alternative explanation of the ineffectiveness of peace education interventions when, in fact building a peaceful classroom climate requires a holistic and collaborative strategy. The process of developing teacher capacity for the implementation of peace education relatively short is the reason why the intervention has not been successful because the weaknesses in the basic aspects of the peace education pedagogy are still found during the intervention process.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Bajaj, M., & Brantmeier, E. J. (2011). The politics, praxis, and possibilities of critical peace education. *Journal of Peace Education*, *8*(3), 221-224. https://doi.org/10.1080/17400201.2011.621356

Bajaj, M., & Hantzopoulos, M. (Eds.). (2016). *Peace education: International perspectives*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Bar-Tal, D. (2002). The elusive nature of peace education. *Peace education: The concept, principles, and practices around the world*, 27-36. https://www.tau.ac.il/~daniel/pdf/39.pdf

Baxter, P. (2013). Education for Citizenship and Peace: Approaches to Behaviour Change and Values Development. In M. Sinclair (Ed.), *Learning to Live Together: Education for Conflict Resolution, Responsible Citizenship, Human Rights and Humanitarian Norms*. Protect Education in Insecurity and Conflict PEIC.

Bowen, N. K., & Bowen, G. L. (1999). Effects of crime and violence in neighborhoods and schools on the school behavior and performance of adolescents. *Journal of adolescent research*, *14*(3), 319-342. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0743558499143003

Bretherton, I. (Ed.). (2014). *Symbolic play: The development of social understanding*. Academic Press.

Castro, L. N. C., & Galace, J.N (2008). *Peace education: A pathway to a culture of peace*. Center for Peace Education, Miriam College.

Castro, L., Nario-Galace, J., & Lesaca, K. (2005). *Peace Education Initiatives in Metro Manila*. UP CIDS.

Cavazos-Rehg, P. A., Zayas, L. H., & Spitznagel, E. L. (2007). Legal status, emotional well-being and subjective health status of Latino immigrants. *Journal of the National Medical Association*, *99*(10), 1126. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2574408/pdf/jnma00209-0050.pdf

Chowdhury, K Anwarul. (2008). *Toward a holistic understanding of peace and peace education*. In Castro, Loreta Navarro. Galace, Jasmin Nario. Peace education: A pathway to a culture of peace. Center for Peace Education, Mirriam College.

Christie, P. (2016). Educational Change in Post-Conflict Contexts: Reflections on the South African Experience 20 Years Later. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 14*(3), 434–446. https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2015.1121379

Close, M. Shrron. (2005). Dating violence prevention in the middle school and high school youth. Journal of Child and Adolescent. *Psychiatrist Nursing*, Vol 18 (1). https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6171.2005.00003.x

Cunningham, J. (2015). *Conflict Transformation Through School: A Curriculum for Sustainable Peace*. IOE Press.

Danesh, H. B. (2006). Towards an integrative theory of peace education. *Journal of peace education*, *3*(1), 55-78. https://doi.org/10.1080/17400200500532151

Das, S., & Das, K. K. (2014). *Imparting peace education through coscholastic activities at the school level*. European Scientific Institute. https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.679.6630&rep=rep1&type=pdf#page=31

Deveci, H (2008). Pre-service teachers' perceptions of peace education. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 8* (30): 63–80. https://ejer.com.tr/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/ejer2008_issue_30.pdf

Eslami-Somea, R., & Movassagh, H. (2014). Peace education in Iran: Challenges and prospects. *Journal of Peacebuilding & Development*, *9*(2), 33-48. https://doi.org/10.1080/15423166.2014.948781

Fountain, S. (1999). *Peace education in UNICEF*. Unicef, Programme Division.

Fusco, R. A., & Fantuzzo, J. W. (2009). Domestic violence crimes and children: A population-based investigation of direct sensory exposure and the nature of involvement. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *31*(2), 249-256. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2008.07.017

Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of peace research*, *6*(3), 167-191. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F002234336900600301

Gill, S., & Niens, U. (2014). Education as Humanisation: A Theoretical Review on the Role of Dialogic Pedagogy in Peacebuilding Education. *Compare, 44*(1), 10–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2013.859879

Gillis & Miller. (2004). *Creating a Culture of Peace*. Project Peacemakers.

Gottfredson, M. R., & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime*. Stanford University Press.

Gray-Donald, J., & Selby, D. (2004). Through the (not so) Green Door: University campus greening and curriculum change. *Ekistics*, 203-212. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43623431

Hakvoort, I., & Oppenheimer, L. (1998). Understanding peace and war: A review of developmental psychology research. *Developmental*

Review, *18*(3), 353-389. https://doi.org/10.1006/drev.1998.0471

Harber, C. (2017). *Schooling in Sub-Saharan Africa: Policy, Practice and Patterns*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Harber, C., & Mncube, V. (2012). *Education, Democracy and Development: Does Education Contribute to Democratisation in Developing Countries?* Symposium.

Harber, C., & Sakade, N. (2009). Schooling for Violence and Peace: How Does Peace Education Differ from 'Normal' Schooling? *Journal of Peace Education, 6*(2), 171–187. https://doi.org/10.1080/17400200903086599

Harris, A. (2008). Distributed leadership: According to the evidence. *Journal of educational administration. 46*(2), 172-188. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578230810863253

Higgins, S., & Novelli, M. (2018). The Potential and Pitfalls of Peace Education: A Cultural Political Economy Analysis of the Emerging Issues Teacher Education Curriculum in Sierra Leone. *Asian Journal of Peacebuilding, 6*(1), 29–53. https://doi.org/10.18588/201805.00a056

Honkasilta, J., Vehkakoski, T., & Vehmas, S. (2016). 'The teacher almost made me cry' Narrative analysis of teachers' reactive classroom management strategies as reported by students diagnosed with ADHD. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *55*, 100-109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.12.009

Ilfiandra & Kartadinata, S. (2015). Pengembangan Bimbingan dan Konseling Bermuatan Nilai-Nilai Kedamaian Untuk Membangun Budaya Damai Pada Remaja [Development of Guidance and Counseling Containing Peaceful Values to Build a Culture of Peace in Teenagers]. *Laporan Penelitian* [*Research Report*]. LPPM UPI.

Ilfiandra, I., Setiadi, R., & Sumarto, S. (2019). The comparison of professional identity of prospective teachers between UPI Indonesia and UPSI Malaysia. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Educational Sciences (ICES 2018)*.

Ilfiandra. (2015). Pengembangan bimbingan dan konseling bermuatan nilai-nilai kedamaian untuk membangun budaya damai pada remaja [Development of guidance and counseling with values of peace to build a culture of peace in adolescents]. *Laporan penelitian [Research report]*. LPPM Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.

Ilfiandra. (2012). Model konseling resolusi konflik berlatar belakang bimbingan komprehensif untuk mengembangkan kompetensi hidup damai dan harmoni siswa SMK [Conflict resolution counseling model with a background of comprehensive guidance to develop the competence to live peacefully and harmoniously for SMK students]. *Laporan Penelitian Hibah Bersaing [Competitive Grant Research Report].* LPPM Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.

Ilfiandra. (2019). Model pengembangan kompetensi pedagogik kedamaian calon guru untuk membangun sekolah aman dan damai [Peace pedagogic competency development model for prospective teachers to build safe and peaceful schools]. *Laporan Penelitian [Research report]*. LPPM Universitas Pendididkan Indonesia.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2010). *16 Peace Education in the Classroom*: Creating Effective Peace Education Programs.

Kartadinata, Sunaryo, *et al.* (2017). Pengembangan model pendidikan kedamaian untuk membangun budaya damai pada jalur pendidikan formal [Development of a peace education model to build a culture of peace in the formal education path]. *Laporan Penelitian [Research report]*. LPPM Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.

Kartadinata, Sunaryo. (2015). Meta analisis kandungan nilai lokal dalam pengembangan pedagogik kedamaian: Telaah atas studi etnopedagogik dalam perspektif Indonesia-Finlandia [Meta-analysis of the content of local values in the pedagogic development of peace: A study of ethnopedagogic studies in an Indonesian-Finnish perspective]. *Laporan Penelitian [Research report]*. LPPM Universitas Pendididkan Indonesia.

Kartadinata, S. Setiadi, R, & Ilfiandra. (2018). *Pedagogi pendidikan kedamaian: Rujukan pengembangan sekolah aman dan damai [*Peace education pedagogy: Reference for safe and peaceful school development]. UPI Press.

Kim, J., Talbot, N. L., & Cicchetti, D. (2009). Childhood abuse and current interpersonal conflict: The role of shame. *Child abuse & neglect*, *33*(6), 362-371. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2008.10.003

Lacoe, J. R. (2015). Unequally safe: The race gap in school safety. *Youth violence and juvenile justice*, *13*(2), 143-168. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1541204014532659

Lauritzen, S. M. (2016). Building Peace Through Education in a Post-Conflict Environment: A Case Study Exploring Perceptions of Best Practices. *International Journal of Educational Development, 51,* 77–83. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2016.09.001

Maftuh, Bunyamin. (2005). Implementasi model pengajaran resolusi konflik melalui pendidikan kewarganegaraan di sekolah menengah atas [Implementation of conflict resolution teaching model through civic education in high school]. *[Unpublished doctoral dissertation]*. Program Pascasarjana UPI.

McEvoy-Levy, S. (2011). Children, youth and peacebuilding. *Critical Issues in Peace and Conflict Studies: Theory, Practice and Pedagogy*. Lexington Book.

McLeod, J & Reynolds, R. (2010). *Peaceful pedagogy, teaching human rights through the curriculum*. Newcastle University

Nan-Zhao, Z. (2005). *Four 'pillars of learning' for the reorientation and reorganization of curriculum: Reflections and discussions*. International Bureau of Education-UNESCO.

Nan-Zhao, Z., & Teasdale, B. (Eds.). (2004). *Teaching Asia-Pacific core values of peace and harmony: a sourcebook for teachers*. Unesco Bangkok.

Novelli, M., Higgins, S., Ugur, M., & Valiente, O. (2014). *The Political Economy of Education Systems in Conflict-Affected Contexts*. London: DfID.

Nugroho, H. (2012). Pengelolaan Pendidikan Karakter Berbasis Nilai-nilai Islam di SD Islam al-Azhar 28 Solo Baru Sukoharjo [Management of Islamic Values-Based Character Education at SD Islam al-Azhar 28 Solo Baru Sukoharjo]. (*Doctoral dissertation,* Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta*)*.

Polat, S., Arslan, Y., & Günçavdi, G. (2016). The Qualities of Teachers Who Instruct Peace Education: Views of Prospective Teachers' Who Attended the Peace Education Programme. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *7*(28), 36-45. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1118570

Scarritt, J. R., & Nkiwane, S. M. (1996). Friends, neighbors, and former enemies: the evolution of Zambia-Zimbabwe relations in a changing regional context. *Africa Today*, *43*(1), 7-31. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4187079

Schmidt, F. & Friedman, A. (1988). *Peacemaking skills for little kids*. Peace Education Foundation.

Setiadi, R. & Ilfiandra. (2018). Model pedagogi pendidikan kedamaian untuk pengembangan sekolah aman dan damai [Peace education pedagogy model for safe and peaceful school development]. *Laporan Penelitian [Research report]*. LPPM Universitas Pendididikan Indonesia.

Setiadi, R.& Ilfiandra (2020, February). Peace Education Pedagogy: A Strategy to Build Peaceful Schooling. In *International Conference on Educational Psychology and Pedagogy-" Diversity in Education"(ICEPP 2019)* (pp. 161-166). Atlantis Press. https://dx.doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200130.105

Shapiro, E. S. (2010). *Academic skills problems: Direct assessment and intervention*. Guilford Press.

Shepler, S., & Williams, J. H. (2017). Understanding Sierra Leonean and Liberian teachers' views on discussing past wars in their classrooms. *Comparative education*, *53*(3), 418-441. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2017.1338641

Sternberg, K. J., Lamb, M. E., Guterman, E., & Abbott, C. B. (2006). Effects of early and later family violence on children's behavior problems and depression: A longitudinal, multi-informant perspective. *Child abuse & neglect*, *30*(3), 283-306. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2017.1338641

Syrjäläinen, E., Jukarainen, P., Värri, V. M., & Kaupinmäki, S. (2015). Safe school day according to the young. *Young*, *23*(1), 59-75. https://doi.org/10.1177% 2F1103308814557399

UNESCO. (2001*). Learning the Way of Peace: A Teachers' Guide to Peace Education*. UNESCO. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/../125228eo.pdf

UNESCO. (2006). *Education for All*. Global Monitoring Report. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/ images/0014/001442/144270e.pdf

UNESCO. (2011). *The Hidden Crisis: Armed Conflict and Education*UNESCO EFA Global Monitoring Report.

Webel, C., & Galtung, J., (2007). *Handbook of peace and conflict studies*. Routledge

Weiss, M. (2015). BDSM (bondage, discipline, domination, submission, sadomasochism). *The international encyclopedia of human sexuality*, *1*.

Wells, L. C. (2003). A culture of teaching peace. In *UNESCO Conference on Intercultural Education Finland* (Vol. 16, pp. 1-46). http://205.186.131.100/articles/2003/06/00_wells_unesco.pdf

Zembylas, M. (2016). Emotion, Trauma and Critical Pedagogy: Implications for Critical Peace Education. In M. Bajaj & M. Hantzopoulos (Eds.), *Peace Education: International Perspectives*. Bloomsbury.