Title: Powerful Knowledge: Learning About and For Peace
Authors: Lee Jerome, Hans Svennevig, Hugh Starkey, Anna Liddle, Isabel Cartwright & Ellis Brooks (photos on file)

Pull Out Quote 1: Our project *Teachers and Citizenship Knowledge* (TACK) is engaging with the issue from a different perspective and exploring what we can learn about subject knowledge through investigating existing practices.

POQ 2: Simply put, what counts as 'valid' in each subject depends on the rules established within each disciplinary community or walk of life.

3: Citizenship knowledge has to be acquired, understood and recalled, but it also has to be embodied, enacted and used to affect change in the external world.

4: Our discussion raised the possibility that these lived experiences of classroom conflict and conflict resolution might be useful for establishing insights into how we should understand peaceful political negotiation

5: This is another example where the teacher's knowledge unlocks the potential for deeper, more critical (and political) understanding, and offers different opportunities for action.

6: In addition to substantive knowledge, we also talked about critical policy / curriculum knowledge and pedagogic knowledge. We now add an additional category of contextual knowledge, that enables teachers to adapt their other forms of knowledge to maximise the chances of success. (Editor Make this bold)

INTRO
In this article we hear the second instalment from the Teachers and Citizenship Knowledge (TACK) project at IOE, UCL's Faculty of Education and Society. The project is exploring the nature of subject knowledge as it is conceptualised by practitioners. In the last edition the project team presented their initial model of professional knowledge and in this edition they focus on the nature of knowledge relevant to teaching about and for peace.

Article Begins:

The TACK Project
There is no shortage of policy and academic books that set out to define what citizenship teachers should teach. But such texts often leave the nature of subject knowledge relatively unexplored, settling instead for listing important areas of skills and knowledge to be covered. Our project *Teachers and Citizenship Knowledge* (TACK) is engaging with the issue from a different perspective and exploring what we can learn about subject knowledge through investigating existing practices. We have been facilitating a series of 'generative conversations' around specific topic areas, with a view to explore the experiences, assumptions, planning and teaching of diverse individuals. The idea is a simple one, that by encouraging practitioners to explore the often unstated assumptions and logics that inform their decisions about what and how to teach, we can start to be more explicit about what is often implicit. And by encouraging dialogue between practitioners, we hope to provoke friendly challenges and complementary perspectives that stimulate practitioners to explore their own experiences in greater depth.

In practical terms, these conversations have been organised in a series of 'masterclasses' for the PGCE students at the IOE during 2021-22. As the year progressed the student teachers were able to engage more actively with the presenters and reflect on their own experiences across dozens of schools. This article therefore draws on the presentations from Anna Liddle (who shared her research into peace education practices in schools) and Isabel Cartwright and Ellis Brooks (who shared their educational insights from Quakers in Britain) and we incorporate insights from the student teachers in their discussions.

Powerful knowledge

Michael Young has argued that powerful knowledge refers to what the knowledge can do or what intellectual power it gives to those who have access to it. Powerful knowledge provides more reliable explanations and new ways of thinking about the world and… can provide learners with a language for engaging in political, moral, and other kinds of debates (Young, 2008: 14). Powerful knowledge is powerful because it provides the best understanding of the natural and social worlds that we have and helps us go beyond our individual experiences (Young, 2013: 196). According to young it has the following characteristics:

- Powerful knowledge is systematic. Its concepts are systematically related to one another and shared in groups, such as subject or disciplinary associations.
- Powerful knowledge is specialised… it has been developed by clearly distinguishable groups with a well-defined focus and relatively fixed boundaries, separating different forms of expertise.
- It is not, like common sense, rooted in the specific contexts of our experience.
- This means that powerful knowledge can be the basis for generalisations and thinking beyond particular contexts or cases (Young, 2015).

Whilst Young's idea of 'powerful knowledge' is relatively new it resonates with a number of established and relatively familiar ways of thinking about knowledge. First, Shulman (1986) suggested that teachers draw on several forms of knowledge, including knowledge of the curriculum and pedagogic traditions. But centrally, he also argued they draw on substantive knowledge about the subject they are teaching, which is to say the core concepts and principles that provide the distinctive knowledge of the area. Examples might include government, power, and human rights and such concepts are likely to be revisited throughout schooling in order to develop greater depth. Bruner (1960) promoted the idea that such concepts should form the basis of a spiral curriculum, and argued these concepts provide a kind of conceptual anchor point, enabling students to 'attach' new facts to underlying core concepts, build increasingly sophisticated schemas about the world, and generate new connections between underlying principles and a range of case studies and examples. Shulman argued that teachers go further and also teach about the particular set of assumptions that inform each subject too, for example, whilst the maths teacher will be interested in establishing the logic of mathematical calculations, and the science teacher might be teaching the rules by which scientists try to prove their hypotheses, the art teacher might be more concerned with developing an understanding of aesthetic judgement and experience, and the RE teacher might be more interested in trying to build a sense of spirituality, or convey what religious faith means to adherents. Simply put, what counts as 'valid' in each subject depends on the rules established within each disciplinary community or walk of life. And because many of these ideas will only be acquired through a deliberate process of teaching, these concepts and ideas can be distinguished from the kind of knowledge we acquire through reflecting on everyday experience. We all experience gravity and momentum through simple actions like falling off a bike, but we are unlikely to spontaneously develop a scientific understanding of the concepts that can be generalised to events in the world or galaxy – for that we require someone to teach us. This distinction between scientific and everyday concepts, introduced by Vygotsky, is an important point of connection to Young's powerful knowledge when we think about the type of knowledge we address in the curriculum (Karpov, 2003).

Whilst Young's idea of powerful knowledge has seized the imagination of many and placed debates about knowledge more centrally in policy and practice circles, there are some reasons to be cautious about adopting all of his ideas. Firstly, citizenship does not have one clear subject disciplinary community on which to draw. Whilst history teachers might draw on the academic community of historians to inform their understanding of core concepts and the rules (or traditions) in the discipline, citizenship teachers do not really have a comparable route to expertise. We need to draw on insights from politics, sociology, psychology, anthropology, philosophy, law, economics and more.

We have to be more inter-disciplinary and yet there is something distinctive about the desire to help young people see the world politically and to think politically about contemporary issues. John Beck (2013) also reminds us that in citizenship, official definitions of what constitutes desirable knowledge are likely to reflect the interests of the powerful, as much as providing any objective account of powerful knowledge. We have to exercise critical judgement then in interpreting the curriculum when, for example, the language of rights shifts to 'precious liberties' or the language of active citizenship slips into volunteering and helping. Beck also highlights another tension in that Young is clear that powerful knowledge is powerful because it transforms our understanding of the world, from a disciplinary perspective. But citizenship teachers want students to be empowered to act in the world, not just see it differently. We have to go further and think about how knowledge is enacted through young people's citizenship behaviour, both in the school and more broadly in society at large. Citizenship knowledge has to be acquired, understood and recalled, but it also has to be embodied, enacted and used to affect change in the external world.

Powerful knowledge about and for peace
The first thing that became evident in our masterclass on peace is that there is a field of knowledge among scholars of peace and conflict that citizenship teachers need to be able to access. Galtung's (1969) distinction between direct violence, structural violence and cultural violence isa particularly powerful starting point. In addition to the types of direct violence we normally think about (from punching someone to dropping a bomb), he argues we also need to address the kinds of violence (psychological and physical) that stem from structural inequalities and processes, for example through poverty, exclusion, poor housing etc. And underpinning both is a bedrock of cultural expectations and norms that legitimises those various forms of violence. This distinction unlocks a further distinction between positive and negative peace, where the latter is simply the absence or cessation of direct violence, but where positive peace refers to a situation where the structures that generate forms of violence and the cultural norms that legitimise them are transformed. Anna's research reveals that a lot of school, curriculum and exam board practice operates with a relatively narrow definition of peace as the end of direct violence, leaving a significant area of thinking unexplored. This misunderstanding, or partial understanding, also means that education about peace often tends to focus on conflicts and their end, rather than on peace.

A second idea that seems particularly significant is that conflict is a natural part of life. Conflict can be productive if we find ways to engage and routes forward. Progress does not require all conflict to be resolved, rather we might simply move on and accommodate ourselves to the existence of conflict. This resonates with Bernard Crick's (1962) influential argument in his classic book 'In Defence of Politics' where he argued conflict was natural and inevitable and provided the root of politics. For a citizenship teacher it is important to acknowledge that if people didn't routinely have conflicting ideas and interests there would be no need for politics or democracy. Politics is the art of engaging with conflict in non-violent ways, to decide what should be done. Sometimes we might resolve a conflict, but more routinely we agree on a pragmatic temporary settlement and then revisit the same underlying conflict at a later point. Findings ways to acknowledge and describe conflicts, analyse them in relation to different experiences and perspectives, and think creatively and inclusively about ways forward is a core citizenship concept. As Isabel and Ellis argued in the masterclass, schools that rush to impose zero-tolerance adult-driven disciplinary codes may achieve a superficial form of 'peaceful' school culture, but they are doing so whilst removing one of the most powerful ways in which students can learn these fundamental ideas. Our discussion raised the possibility that these lived experiences of classroom conflict and conflict resolution might be useful for establishing insights into how we should understand peaceful political negotiation. This is even more evident if we acknowledge the existence of structural and cultural forms of violence in schools, which are much less susceptible to being resolved in zero-tolerance settings, and in fact which may be exacerbated by such systems.

This consideration about the nature of conflict arising in the everyday lives of students links to a further conceptual distinction made by Cremin and Bevington (2017). They distinguish between peace keeping, peace making and peace building. This can be applied in international situations and in the school, for example, many of us will have had experience where we are cast in the role of peace keeper as a teacher – expected to enforce peace on our students in the face of conflict. Peace building, on the other hand, requires a commitment to build the capacity of the students to play an active role in building peace, rather than simply abstaining from violence. Strategies such as conflict resolution, peer mediation, and restorative practices can be important in building a more sustainable culture of positive peace, but they also provide opportunities for students to put their understanding of conflict and peace into operation and to deepen their understanding through experience.

Finally, Anna drew our attention to the meaning of remembrance and commemoration as concepts which can often be picked up in a school setting as though they were straightforward and unproblematic. Anna illustrated what she called a 'red poppy remembrance' discourse, which has a number of characteristics. It is militaristic in that it tends to focus on the deaths of soldiers rather than civilians. It can very easily become nationalistic as 'we' remember 'our' brave soldiers who died for 'us'. It is euphemistic in that the language is about loss, victimhood and sacrifice rather than acknowledging the reality of death and that many we commemorate were also involved in killing others. In Anna's research this discourse became the dominant framework in which students' agency was reduced to a form of performative compliance – buy a poppy, observe the silence, demonstrate reverence. These common assumptions generally go unnoticed, and this may have been the case in the school Anna researched if it were not for one teacher who had served in Afghanistan in the British army and who had a very different perspective. By disrupting these assumptions, he created a space for students to think about the role purpose and symbolism of the poppy. He asked students to consider the different interpretations of the Royal British Legion's red poppy and the Peace Pledge Union's white poppy and engage with the two different narratives they imply. This is another example where the teacher's knowledge unlocks the potential for deeper, more critical (and political) understanding, and offers different opportunities for action.

So far our discussion has focused on the substantive knowledge from the field of peace studies. We have argued that there are a number of important concepts that can operate as powerful knowledge, in the sense that they open up possibilities for a more critical and political understanding. In this sense we have illustrated Young's paradigm of powerful knowledge – these ideas offer to transform the way students think about peace and conflict. But we have also intimated that these concepts can be applied beyond the narrow task of learning 'about' peace and also have implications for learning for and through peace. These concepts, if fully understood and applied across the school, open up new opportunities for citizenship action.

Student teachers' responses
When the student teachers in this masterclass came to reflect on the presentations and discuss how it applied to their own school settings, the conversation shifted to the broader model of teacher knowledge we sketched in our previous article. In addition to substantive knowledge, we also talked about critical policy / curriculum knowledge and pedagogic knowledge. We now add an additional category of contextual knowledge, that enables teachers to adapt their other forms of knowledge to maximise the chances of success. A good example of this latter category was a student teacher working in a school near an armed forces base, with lots of children from families with links to the armed forces. For them, the different forms of remembrance represented through the red and white poppies, but promoted by different groups of veterans, offered a concrete route into complex debates, whilst minimising the risk of inadvertently upsetting students and their families.

In relation to the policy context, some students recalled a recent IOE, UCL's Faculty of Education and Society PGCE Secondary consultation with students about well-being and could see immediately how the whole school processes suggested by the Quakers' report Peace at the Heart could be linked to their school's well-being agenda. Conceptualising well-being within the frame of positive peace helps to shift the focus from a purely individualised and psychologised model, to focus more on the collective nature of working on a shared institutional culture in which individuals can flourish.

In relation to pedagogic knowledge, student teachers talked about the power of case studies for provoking students to engage in different norms and expectations about conflict in different parts of the world. Others had used role play to encourage students to think beyond good and bad, or simplistic responses, and to engage with the dilemmas confronted by individuals in conflict situations. Another student teacher talked about using Gandhi as an example of a complicated moral character, to avoid offering simplistic caricatured versions of pacifists and peace makers. Other examples included the use of songs to focus on the emotional dimension and how people express themselves in relation to peace and conflict. And finally several student teachers talked about the importance of creating space for students to reflect on their own experiences of structural violence, both within and beyond school. Bringing the topic home by connecting to lived experience emerged as an important strategy.

Conclusion

Powerful knowledge has proved to be a useful starting point for our conversations, and we have offered several concepts from the field of peace studies that promise to deepen students' understanding. The student teachers highlighted how these concepts do not speak for themselves though, they are relatively inert until we make decisions about how to enact them in our teaching practices, and they are also limited until students are able to exercise their own judgement and action in relation to peace. By excavating these different dimensions to subject knowledge, we are beginning to facilitate a deeper professional conversation about what citizenship teachers need to know in order to teach effectively so we can move beyond educating young people with knowledge about citizenship and ensure we are building knowledge to empower informed citizens.

References

Beck, J. (2013) Powerful knowledge, esoteric knowledge, curriculum knowledge. Cambridge Journal of Education, 43(2): 177-193.

Bruner, J. (1960) The Process of Education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cremin, H. & Bevington, T. (2017) Positive Peace in Schools: Tackling conflict and creating a culture of peace in the classroom. London: Routledge.

Crick, B. (1962) In Defence of politics. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Galtung, J. (1969) Violence, Peace and Peace Research. Journal of Peace Research, 6(3): 167–191

Gee, D. (2022) Peace at the Heart: A relational Approach to Education in British Schools. Quakers in Britain. Found: https://www.quaker.org.uk/documents/peace-at-the-heart

Karpov, Y. (2003) Vygotsky's doctrine of scientific concepts. In A. Kozulin et al. (Eds) Vygotsky's Educational Theory in Cultural Content. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shulman, L. S. (1986) 'Those Who Understand': Knowledge Growth in Teaching. Educational Researcher, 15(2): 4-14.

Young, M. (2015) Unleashing the power of knowledge for all. Spiked, 1 September.

Young, M. (2008) From constructivism to realism in the sociology of the curriculum. Review of Research in Education, 32(1), 1–32.

Young, M. (2013) Powerful knowledge: an analytically useful concept or just a "sexy sounding term"?
A response to John Beck's "Powerful knowledge, esoteric knowledge, curriculum knowledge".
Cambridge Journal of Education, 43(2): 195–198.