Right now, in many Canadian schools, escalated violence presents an evident threat. As I write, another heart-wrenching youth-on-youth assault near a school has hit the front pages. Rates of severe youth violence are considerably lower than sensational media coverage would have us believe, but at the same time, many young people, as well as adults, do not feel as safe, respected, or constructively engaged as they should be. While schools cannot independently resolve the major social problems that are embedded in communities, they can do their part by functioning as safer havens that contribute to resolution, learning, and transformation. Unfortunately, some of the security measures enacted in response to this sense of fear and urgency may actually be impeding the development of reliable, sustainable peace in schools.

While schools are responsible for keeping all students and staff safe from violence and human rights abuse, fortresses of surveillance and control are ineffective educational institutions, in conflict with the basic mission of schools in a democracy. Harsh treatment, especially when based on insufficient understanding of students’ cultures and individual contexts, burns bridges by fracturing relationships. It is through schools’ most fundamental role – the organization of learning experiences – that they can best become havens of safety, mutual respect, and inclusion.

Both individuals and contexts are implicated in the perpetration of violence. Violence is learned individual behaviour that is reinforced (or restricted) by norms, sanctions, and conflict management procedures in social contexts such as schools. Similarly, nonviolence is both learned by individuals and encouraged (or discouraged) by social contexts. Schools are houses of learning, in which every student should have multiple opportunities to develop capacity for nonviolent problem solving. At the same time, individual skills are not enough; people need opportunities and enabling structures to use nonviolence built into their daily patterns of activity. The complex infrastructures of schools must facilitate and sustain the equitable development of nonviolent human relationships and conflict management. Sustainably peaceful schools create continual opportunities to learn problem solving, through both individual learning (explicit lessons) and institutionalized patterns of activity (implicit lessons), in order to prevent the next tragedy long before it starts.

Punishment approaches to school violence, by contrast, confuse the perpetrators with the underlying problems that brought them to the point of violence – instituting blame and exclusion (retribution), but too rarely solving problems or preventing further harm. My research in Canadian urban school boards has shown that safe schools officials often refer student perpetrators to alternative programs and/or counseling support, albeit not until after aggressive incidents. However, that support is often thin, short-lived, disconnected from the social contexts that forged the problems, and completely irrelevant to the victims and witnesses who were harmed by the aggression.

Control-based security and punishment approaches do...
not foster individual learning. Even if they did, these approaches would be inadequate because they do not provide infrastructure for resolving problems at their roots, or for building healthy, inclusive community relationships that would be resilient and actually prevent violence. As John Paul Lederach explains, “Peacebuilding requires us to work at constructing an infrastructure to support a process of desired change.” What would it take for us to construct such infrastructures for nurturing and maintaining peace in our schools?

**THE ICEBERG**

Serious violence is the visible tip of a massive conflict iceberg. Although of course even one violent incident is too many, it is important to note that there are very few people directly involved in such serious violence, as perpetrators or victims, relative to the huge numbers of people in our schools every day. Clearly, the reverberations from this tip of the iceberg touch us all – partly because the media give such disproportionate attention to violent events (they’re newsworthy because they’re rare). However, it’s in understanding and confronting the base of this iceberg, harder to see under water but much larger than its visible tip, where educators can do the most good.

The iceberg’s broad base represents the sources of violence: the countless acts of omission and commission that can make schools alienating, unsafe, and/or ineffective learning environments for many students. These smaller acts of exclusion, disrespect, destructive competition, and ignorance that make up the bulk of the iceberg are harder to see than the violence at the tip, but if left un-checked they can nurture violence.

Problems are easier to resolve before they develop and escalate. Schools need to reallocate some resources from the urgent and painful interventions (analogous to emergency medical care and quarantines) at the tip of this iceberg to on-going prevention (analogous to comprehensive health care, nutrition and sanitation) at its base. As the saying goes, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure: When sources of violence are addressed early and consistently, schools are stronger and safer. The huge resources that are now devoted to coping with harm after the fact can be reallocated to more pro-active support for inclusive, effective staff and student learning. Infrastructure for surveillance and punishment must be replaced and transformed into infrastructure for education and restoration of healthy communities.

**RESTORATIVE PROBLEM-SOLVING PRACTICES**

Discipline practices, and the climates they create in classrooms and schools, ‘teach’ by modeling, guiding students to practice, and reinforcing particular behaviours and norms for interaction. For example, in some schools competition and aggression are normalized. Steep status hierarchies divide in-groups from out-groups. Some students’ positions at the pinnacle (such as athletes or ‘good’ students) and others’ at the margins (such as newcomers, cultural minorities, or people who don’t fit gendered body ideals) are reinforced by school staff – for example by the ways teachers connect easily with certain students and ignore or blame others, or facilitate win/lose competitions. Elliot Aronson’s research shows how such competitive and dehumanizing school environments make severe violence more likely and how, by contrast, educators can build equitable and cooperative environments that discourage violence by encouraging healthy, inclusive relationships in schools and classrooms.

To achieve constructive understanding, dialogue, and justice, schools need mechanisms to encourage both ‘vertical’ relationships (adults-students, up and down the hier-archy) and ‘horizontal’ relationships (student-to-student, across differences among peers). After the emergence of dangerous situations, people are more likely to resort to blame and force when they feel cornered or ill-equipped to handle problems more constructively. And so, peaceful schools plan ahead by setting up a variety of problem-solving structures to handle student-adult and peer conflicts constructively and as learning opportunities.

Canadian public schools already have a wonderful array of strategies and mechanisms (albeit too often marginal and under-funded) for addressing the many less visible causes and manifestations of harm – the tip of the iceberg – before they escalate. These strategies go to the roots of the problems and address skill-building, norms and relationships, helping to both prevent future harm and facilitate immediate problem solving. The following are examples I have seen in Canadian public schools that substitute prevention and transformation for retribution.

- Some programs teach and empower students, for example as peer mediators, to help resolve disputes. Often, teams of trained volunteer peer mediators offer their services on regular duty schedules, for example at recess and before school. Sometimes, although aggressive behaviour is punished, the re-entry process after suspension requires students to try mediated negotiation of the problem that caused the fighting. As one principal who had such a policy explained, “The conflicts will keep coming back until we take time to listen and work out a solution.” Adult administrators, teachers and counselors are sometimes trained to mediate conflicts that are too serious or complex to be handled by peers. At the same time, it is often young people who are best
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Such systematic education is achieved through explicit lessons, as well as through opportunities for each student to be included, and helped to learn and to take constructive action, in order to develop into an autonomous, nonviolent and empowered citizen. That is, peacebuilding requires schools to encourage and enable students and teachers to practice understanding and conflict resolution themselves – not just at times of emergency, but routinely, in daily lessons and school activities. The paradox is that the right time to address conflict is when it is non-disruptive or even invisible – when disagreements and distrusts are small or distant and the situation is, on the surface, peaceful. When people do not feel frightened or angry, they are much more able and open to listen and to learn.

Learning expectations that comprise the ingredients for fair and nonviolent conflict management are already included in Canadian curriculum guidelines. One curriculum leader explained that learning to identify and respond to multiple perspectives is absolutely basic to nearly every curriculum unit: “It’s pretty hard to not deal with conflicts in social studies.” The same could be said for English language arts (the plot of any story involves characters’ perspectives on a problem). Conflict can be found – and conflict resolution practiced – across the curriculum. Some explicit curriculum expectations encouraging nonviolence include:

- Skill development for effective listening and constructive discussion;
- Critical thinking and critical literacy skills, including learning to recognize bias and to appreciate social, cultural, and personal differences and frames of reference in relation to global and local problems;
- Processes for working cooperatively and respectfully with peers on decision-making, tasks, and projects;
- Representing sensitive and controversial issues and histories through writing, directing, performing and discussing drama, informal role-playing, and visual arts;
- Academic tools such as mathematical and scientific reasoning, applied to constructive management of ‘real-life’ conflicts, including questions of violence/peace, social justice, in local, national, and global contexts.
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board staff also require support – regular professional development opportunities embedded in regular work expectations (not just after school or on weekends), time to talk and work together to understand their changing communities and prepare and improve programming, opportunities for consultation with those who have successfully resolved similar problems. Even though pro-active violence prevention is likely to be less costly (as well as more effective) in the long run, it will require at least a temporary, significant infusion of resources to help Canada’s public schools move from the currently typical resource-intensive approach of post-incident reaction and clean-up after the fact, toward proactive peacebuilding for sustainably safe and peaceful school communities. Clearly, to move from violence to peace, school infrastructures require more human resources – personnel with the training, support, dedicated roles and responsibilities to build capacity and to institutionalize processes for relationship rebuilding and problem solving. In many cases, the people who have this expertise already work in the schools; they just need their time reallocated to be able to facilitate peacebuilding efforts. There is no investment more worth making than this one.
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