Teacher Development for Conflict Participation: Facilitating Learning for 'Difficult Citizenship' Education

KATHY BICKMORE, *OISE, University of Toronto*

ABSTRACT A key to citizenship for socially just democracy is the development of capacity to nonviolently and equitably manage conflict. How are teachers educated and supported for this responsibility? This paper is drawn from a larger on-going study that compares implicit and explicit curricula, policies and programming for 'peacekeeping' (security), 'peacemaking' (dialogue and conflict resolution), and 'peacebuilding' (difficult citizenship — redressing social fractures and injustices that underlie destructive conflicts) in three urban Canadian school districts serving racially and culturally diverse populations. In particular, this paper examines the professional development-related opportunities available to teachers to support their facilitation and teaching for peacebuilding citizenship. The few teacher learning opportunities offered seem unlikely to enhance teachers' capacity to foster diverse students' development of agency for difficult citizenship. Much of the explicit professional development available in the schools examined emphasizes teachers' control of students and containment of disruption (peacekeeping), instead of their facilitation of diverse students' participation in constructive conflict management (peacemaking and peacebuilding). Professional learning opportunities are often relegated to short, fragmented occasions, primarily during teachers' volunteer time after school: this severely limits their potential to foster critical dialogic learning on the difficult issues of citizenship education practice.

Introduction

"Democratic education at its best," as Amy Gutmann argues, "is a product of many public deliberations reiterated over time" (2004 p.89). Democratic disagreements — in classrooms as well as about classrooms— can be constructive opportunities to rebuild community, to remedy injustices, and to build citizenship capacity in policies and practices. Democratic processes and social institutions are mechanisms for making decisions in the context of social and political conflict. Even constructive conflict behavior —nonviolent confrontation of basic disagreement, opposition, or injustice— provokes uncertainty and discomfort (Curle, Freire, & Galtung, 1974; Galtung, 1996). To really engage in dialogic decision making, across substantial human differences, is 'difficult citizenship.' Difficult citizenship is critical, engaged citizen participation for social change toward justice, not merely passive membership. How might teacher learning opportunities make it more likely that diverse students would gain experience in constructively handling such conflict, as preparation for difficult citizenship?

Teacher expertise and confidence is crucial, to effectively encourage and guide student participation in conflict education. Significant global and local citizenship subject matter is complex, often ill-defined, and sometimes controversial (Kelly & Brandes, 2001; Parker, 2004). Intersecting identities and justice issues —for example in relation to gender, ethno-cultural/racial diversity, international disparities, heterosexism, and inter-religious biases— influence the interpretation, ramifications, and options for handling each conflict. Much of this social, political, and moral subject matter was not taught to teachers when they were students (Ayers, Hunt, & Quinn, 1998; Boler & Zembylas, 2003; Freire, 1998; Van Galen, 2004). Further, today's populations of students are increasingly diverse, with unequal social status and incommensurate prior knowledge bases (e.g. Banks & Banks, 1995; Bickmore, 1999; Cochran-Smith, 1995; Harris, 1996). Twenty-first century students evidently impact, and are more clearly impacted upon by, a much wider world than students of past generations (e.g. Elkind, 1995; Kirkwood-Tucker, 2004; Thornton, 2005; Torres, 1998). Thus to teach for democratization, in the context of student diversity and globalization, requires more substantive knowledge, more skills, and more comfort with openness and uncertainty than to teach for unquestioned dominant 'common sense.' This can feel overwhelming, especially for novice teachers. Such complexity is not easy to handle, especially in the context of educational systems' social pressures and sanctions (Bigelow et al., 2002; Ladson-Billings, 2004).

Teachers' knowledge and comfort zones are shaped by the formal and informal learning experiences they have had access to, by the discourses shaping thought, and by actual participation (practice) and the feedback it elicits. This paper considers how teachers may develop capacity and confidence to teach complex, conflictual, globally-relevant subject matter —thus to facilitate students' capacity development for difficult citizenship— in equitable, inclusive, and dialogic ways. Later, I juxtapose these insights from the research literature with an in-depth investigation in one large urban school district (supplemented by more cursory study in two other districts), of the actual resources and infrastructure available to support such teacher learning for difficult citizenship education.

Contexts for difficult citizenship learning: culture, politics and conflict in schools

Citizens' (students' and teachers') ways of thinking, being and behaving are not completely autonomous. Rather, individual and collective agency is shaped and constrained by the currents of power surrounding cultural patterns, social locations, and education. Prevailing discourse shapes learning by encoding and reinforcing relations of power through its presumptions, for example in the ways it recognizes, denies, normalizes or constructs as 'other' certain identities and patterns of behavior (e.g. Butler, 1999; Ellsworth, 1997). Identities each person 'performs', language used, and mass public media shape what each of us comes to believe is natural and possible (also Epstein & Johnson, 1998). Young citizens can learn to be relatively critical, self-reflexive participants in cultural rituals and popular media — consciously questioning and influencing, though inevitably also influenced by, the discourses around them (Applebaum, 2004; Cary, 2001).

There seem to be escalating patterns of social fracture, and disengagement from formal democratic governance, in many parts of the world (e.g. Mátrai, 2002; Print, 1998; Salomon & Nevo, 2002; Tawil & Harley, 2004; Torney-Purta, 1999). The word 'politics' often refers, in prevalent discourse, to destructive conflict —

intra-organizational tensions, corrupt leadership, scheming. To try to reverse this incentive toward cynicism and disengagement, citizenship education often idealizes the politics of governance and inter-group interaction, preaching tolerance and the power of the democratic process. Such avoidance or palliative care is insufficient to handle social ills and build social harmony, and even counter-productive, where school knowledge thereby appears naïve and irrelevant to students steeped in public media images of dirty dealing and social tensions. Any teaching (even or especially that which ignores/assumes power relations) is inevitably political — it has ramifications for the distribution of power. Thus clearly some kind of practice with recognizing and handling social/ political conflict in constructive ways is essential to education for difficult citizenship.

A powerful aspect of citizenship education is the modeling and practice embedded in the implicit and informal curriculum of school social relationships, including the climate of competition or equity, the sanctioning of violence, dissent and (dis)obedience, and the opportunities for democratic engagement by students, faculty and staff (Bickmore, 2004a). Schooling is by no means always a benign force for democratic justice. It can promote violence, for example in dehumanizing and inequitable punishment, condoning sexual and homophobic abuse, or indoctrination into militarism, violent masculinities, or hatred of the 'other' (Bush & Saltarelli, 2000; Callender & Wright, 2000; Davies, 2004; Harber, 2004; McCadden, 1998). Through explicit and implicit expectations and reward structures, school and classroom climates can exacerbate (or alleviate) the status competition and prejudice that underlie most harassment and social exclusion (Aronson, 2000; Bickmore, 2002; Gordon, Holland, & Lahelma, 2000). Educators shape and limit (in)equitable opportunities for diverse students to transcend their traditional roles and practice making a difference, for example in student governance, or peer leadership for conflict resolution, anti-bias, or social and environmental change (Bickmore, 2001, 2003; Close & Lechmann, 1997). School social justice education initiatives will not be successful unless they also help to redress inequities in students' opportunities for educational success (Ghosh, 2004; Maynes & Sarbit, 2000). In an international study, Akiba and colleagues (2003) found that (independent of violence rates outside schools) school systems that reduced the variance between most-successful and least-successful students (for example, because they de-emphasized tracking and/or offered remedial help) also had lower rates of overt physical violence than more competitive systems. Thus citizenship education for social justice includes educators' roles in shaping the school and school system's human rights climate, as well as classroom curriculum (Opffer, 1997; Osler & Starkey, 1998; Smith, 2004).

The remainder of this paper investigates how public school teachers might be prepared and supported to build such citizenship capacities. In light of this framework, I then examine the context for teacher professional learning in one large Canadian school district.

A core component of critical citizenship teacher education is to develop teachers' capacity to facilitate students' practice with democratic processes and skills. These include dialogue, conflict analysis and resolution, constructive discussion of controversial issues, deliberation and decision-making. Social justice citizenship education applies such processes to various shapes and sizes of interpersonal, political, global, historical and current social questions and problems. Democratic processes are not generic, simple, or technical: questions of unequal power, cultural norms and values, identity and difference, equitable access and voice are inseparable from the processes people use to communicate and make decisions together (e.g. Bickford, 1996; Freire, 1970; Ross, 1993; Young, 1998). Such

individual and procedural capacities are (by themselves) not sufficient to equip students/ citizens for social justice building, but they are certainly a necessary condition. Democracy and social change require conflict management. It seems obvious that students/citizens are likely to gain capacity in democratic processes when they have opportunities to practice these processes, with guidance and feedback, in the classroom. Matters of conflict and fairness are intrinsically interesting (as well as all around us in society), so school knowledge is also more engaging and credible when students have opportunities to practice handling conflicting perspectives. In this postmodern era, alternative (including critical and subaltern) perspectives and knowledges are technically more accessible than ever before. Yet it requires not only pedagogical skill, but also sophisticated subject-matter understanding, for teachers (and teacher educators) to be able handle such complex information in an open (constructively-conflictual) and accessible manner (Kymlicka, 1998, 2003; Parker, 2004; Thornton, 2005).

Any transformation in curriculum depends heavily on teachers' academic and professional preparation. Especially in resource-poor communities, textbooks (although these typically rely on uncritical master narratives and fragmented/overloaded information) often form the main basis for the implemented curriculum (e.g. Milligan, 2003; Tupper, 2005). Official curriculum materials and textbooks (that very often guide teachers' as well as students' knowledge development) too often gloss over or censor critical or troubling information — for example, Laura Finley (2003) asks, "how can I teach peace when the book only covers war?" Other such sources are downright inaccurate. For example, Karen Riley and Samuel Totten (2002) critique several U.S. state-endorsed human rights and Holocaust curricula, pointing to shallow analysis, inattention to multiple factors shaping contexts and events, and historical inaccuracy. Paulette Patterson Dilworth (2004) finds similar kinds of problems, along with a few shining alternatives, in the multicultural content of social studies curricula implemented in selected U.S. classrooms. Robert Nash (2005) cites U.S. Supreme Court decisions ensuring schools' right and responsibility to teach about multiple world religions in a balanced fashion, yet laments that such topics are typically avoided or presented in woefully misleading ways. Even relatively-available resources that could supplement or replace textbooks (such as material found on the internet, in newspapers, and distributed by business-oriented development initiatives) themselves can be shallow, decontextualized, and uncritical of social injustices.

What makes dominant discourse hegemonic is the way it builds an understanding of the status quo as 'natural' or common sense, masking or closing down openings for re-thinking, so that teachers (and students/ citizens) don't even realize what they don't know. Teachers' capacity to discern that some information, topics, or questions are missing or misleading, their knowing where (and why) to find alternatives, are a necessary precondition for students' critical citizenship learning. This is not merely a matter of adding information to the basic master narrative: knowledge transformation that would open the way for social justice would significantly change both which knowledge is developed and how it is interpreted and juxtaposed with other information (Bickmore, 2004b; Pang & Valle, 2004; Woyshner, 2002). Education for difficult citizenship challenges the partial nature of curriculum resources as well as students' prior knowledge. This requires raising questions about the stories underlying geographic, political, and historical phenomena, and thereby "disrupting the repetition of comforting knowledges" (Kumashiro, 2004 p.47). This disruption, in turn, provokes the desire and the need for further knowledge building. Such discomforting moral and political questioning

is at least as important in teacher education as it is in elementary and secondary classrooms.

Teachers' capacity development for critical citizenship education

The initiatives that show the most promise in meeting teachers' need for deeper, experientially grounded professional development for social justice citizenship education do not involve simple knowledge dissemination. Quantity of knowledge cannot substitute for quality of knowledge, nor for a sense of efficacy (agency) in interpreting and applying that knowledge. The teacher development opportunities that seem to offer this quality tend to be relatively horizontal —built around extended experiences of dialogue, critical reflection on practice, and dissent among peers— rather than the typical vertical, short, administratively convenient dissemination materials or workshops (Little, 1993; McLaughlin, Pfeifer, Swanson-Owens, & Yee, 1986; Solomon, 1995; Wallace & Louden, 1994). This kind of dialogic teacher learning opportunity is by no means the norm in North American public schools.

> *Despite recognition of its importance, the professional development currently available to teachers is woefully inadequate … inservice seminars and other forms of professional development are fragmented, intellectually superficial, and do not take into account what we know about how teachers learn. … Teachers generally welcome the opportunity to discuss ideas and materials related to their work … yet, discussions that support critical examination of teaching are relatively rare (Borko, 2004 p.3 & 7).*

Research shows that teachers need opportunities to bring artefacts of classroom practice (e.g. lesson plans, videotapes of teaching, student work samples) into discussion-based professional development settings (Borko, 2004; Darling-Hammond, Hammerness, Grossman, Rust, & Shulman, 2005).

A culture of joint educative dialogue among school staff members could be created through schoolwide inquiry and acknowledgement that the curriculum inevitably has moral ramifications that are not (and should not be) neutral: "controversy is inevitable when people talk about things that matter to them" (Simon, 2001 p.219). Facilitation and supportive contexts for such dialogue can arise from inside or outside the school. For example, interactive teacher education pedagogies grounded in carefully-chosen internet-based and United Nations information seem to help build critical, gender-equitable international perspectives and capacities (Crocco & Cramer, 2005; Kirkwood-Tucker, 2004). A series of collaborative dialogues among social studies and English educators from a university and local secondary schools yielded insights about alternate ways to implement a concern for social justice in the classroom (Brandes & Kelly, 2000). In another interesting case, teachers from schools with underachieving African-American students observed master teachers teaching their 'own' students in an after-school program (Foster, Lewis, & Onafowora, 2005). Each of these initiatives provoked both dissonance (in the latter case, watching their students doing things the teachers hadn't known they could do) and dialogue (questioning and problem-solving debriefing among the teachers) to build teachers' understanding.

Culturally relevant teacher development for difficult citizenship education requires both a critical knowledge base about power and domination (based on

histories of marginalization and oppression) and collective participation in culturally meaningful learning activities (Hesch, 1999 p.380). Many teachers already feel a "deep-seated sense of ambiguity" toward prevailing curricula that reflect fragmented information and a "mythic structure of modernism" amid "postmodern realities" (Richardson, 2002 p.135). Richardson facilitated a collaborative teacher action research effort to find legitimate spaces for teaching pluralist and dynamic citizenship within the existing Alberta curriculum, facilitating learning by surfacing the participants' deeply conflicting interpretations of national identity. Instead of shying away from such controversy, it is worth seeking out as the motivation and frame for teacher development.

Unfortunately, even the best professional development initiatives that currently exist primarily involve only the unusually motivated individuals who choose to seek out learning opportunities, often donating their own time (Borko, 2004 p.5). The scarcest resource to support such learning, for the broad majority of North American public school teachers, is time during the school day.

> *Collaborative time for teachers to undertake and then sustain school improvement may be more important than equipment or facilitities or even [explicit] staff development. ... Unless the 'extra energy requirements' [for school change] are met by the provision of the time, the change is not likely to succeed (Raywid, 1993, p.30, citing research by Fullan and Miles, Louis, and Rosenholtz).*

Furthermore, Raywid adds, it is unrealistic to expect teachers to add on thoughtful critical and creative work meetings at the exhausted end of a regular school day. 'Creating' that extended, quality professional development time (under conditions of scarcity that prevent adding much staff) requires political will and creativity to redesign existing timetables, add time to school days or school years, and/or change staffing patterns by creating some larger or combined classes to free up other time.

Open, equitable, well-facilitated classroom discussion of important political and moral issues is a necessary, although by itself insufficient, condition for students' development of social justice citizenship capabilities and motivations. To give such pedagogies life and meaning for democratization requires broadening educators' international, pluralistic, critical knowledge bases, as these apply to their classroom practice. To facilitate such teacher learning, there is no substitute for ensuring that new and continuing teachers have ample opportunity and support to engage in challenging, dialogic, time-intensive problem-solving learning about specific instances of practice with professional colleagues. Teachers' participation in discussion-rich learning about crucial issues, incidents, viewpoints and options can facilitate their capacity to engage diverse students, equitably and effectively, in dialogic learning for social justice citizenship.

Professional development for peacebuilding citizenship education in Canada today

I investigated the realities of implementing the above principles, as part of a larger, multi-year study of 'safe and inclusive schools' programming and policy infrastructure in a few urban Canadian school districts (for more information about the study, please see Bickmore, 2004a, 2005 forthcoming). By virtue of economies of scale (because they are large school districts with hundreds of schools), such large

urban boards would be more likely than others in their regions to have diversified staff allocated to a variety of programme initiatives and professional development-related activities. Prevailing discourse about teachers' knowledge (which influences the spaces available for learning in these school districts) is reflected in what professional development opportunities are offered and how professional learning is discussed.

For this part of the study, my student team and I examined the teacher resource materials and staff/ services available during 2004-05 in three city school districts in different provinces (including resources from ministry of education, teachers' federation, and other organizations). Further, we interviewed over 40 educators (in eight schools, focusing primarily on two high schools and three elementary schools serving low-income populations, plus centrally-assigned staff) in one of those districts. The focus schools were identified by centrally-assigned safe schools staff on the basis that they all had low-income, high-needs student populations, but had different patterns of student conflict and conflict management (as reflected primarily in suspension rates). The other schools and centrally-assigned staff were identified through 'snowball' sampling, focusing on key informants about programming and services especially relevant to peacekeeping (safety and security intervention and discipline), peacemaking (conflict resolution intervention and practice of dialogue), and/or peacebuilding (long range prevention of harm through inclusivity, overcoming inequities, and social justice education).

Each school board (directly and through allied organizations or government programs) did offer a range of teacher development workshops, the vast majority of these in short one-time meetings after school at central locations (see Table 1). What is striking in the lists of workshops and related resources for school staffs (reinforced by interview data) is the emphasis on short-term control for security purposes, such as crisis intervention, threat assessment, discipline, anti-bullying, internet safety. Even many of the workshops potentially related to peacemaking (such as problem-solving, gentle teaching, managing conflict, fixing broken teams) and peacebuilding (such as cross-cultural competency, youth homelessness, teaching in cultural mosaic classrooms), especially given their short duration, seemed more oriented toward quick-fix management of disruption than toward development of diverse students' citizenship capacities.

With varying degrees of severity in different school boards, staffing and funding for formal professional development, as well as for any joint teacher thinking/ planning time, is extremely scarce. Teachers and school principals report that curriculum changes, coupled with staff cuts, have intensified staff workloads such that there is less time than ever (during their career memories), and fewer resource people to facilitate, opportunities for teachers to talk, work and learn together.

> *In theory, the board through our division has great programs to offer, and can come out and work with kids, but they're not that accessible. We really haven't had much contact. For example in safe schools, there seem to be only a couple of people for this whole family of schools, and they seem to be run off their feet. Basically I find resources on my own (HS2 T, May 4).*

Relatively experienced staff, when asked about the sources of their initiatives, often mentioned an experience they had had at a previous school workplace, rather than any recent formal or informal professional development. Some print resource materials (such as sample lesson plans and teaching kits) relevant to social justice

citizenship are available in board resource centres and on-line. The increasingly-accessible internet does allow some teachers to find resources produced by educators elsewhere (although in some schools there was little paper to print them on). It also facilitates school board leadership staffs' capacity to disseminate materials and information. Yet most teachers reported that they were unable to find the time (above and beyond their existing workloads) to even find and read these materials, never mind to meet with colleagues for even a few minutes to discuss, assess, implement or adapt them for use in their own classrooms.

> *No, the [printed teaching resource materials] aren't useful: it's time. ...*
> *Just trying to manage the needs that the students present on a day-to-*
> *day basis ... there just isn't time to make use of those kinds of*
> *resources (Elem5 P June 29).*

Some staff (especially novice teachers with high needs and motivation) made clear that they didn't know how to access even these basic, generic, non-dialogic resources at all. The sparse curriculum leadership staff surely did reach some individuals, and the people in those leadership positions believed that

> *if teachers wish to be connected, they can be" (bd. curric. leader, July*
> *6; bd. equity leader, June 15)*

However, some teachers, especially those with the fewest years of experience, told a different story:

> *I realized, students need a forum. They need a place to talk about [bias,*
> *equity and peacebuilding issues], without somebody shaking their*
> *finger at them and saying 'that's wrong.' So I talked to the principal*
> *... There was a [teacher] equity committee, but it wasn't doing*
> *anything. ... So, in January, four of us [restarted the school equity*
> *committee] ... Black history month was fast approaching; that seemed*
> *like the first opportunity to do something. ... We had kept thinking*
> *there must be some kind of information, some kind of Bible for Black*
> *history month. There must be teachers doing this all over the city! ...*
> *It didn't seem like we should have to be creating all these things from*
> *scratch. ... At the same time I was doing my ESL [Additional*
> *Qualifications course at the university], and by chance [one of the*
> *school board's few remaining equity studies staff] came in as a guest*
> *speaker. She had some good ideas and resources. ... If it hadn't been*
> *for the ESL AQ course I happened to be enrolled in, and that guest*
> *speaker, I wouldn't have known [those resources] existed (HS1 T5,*
> *June 3).*

Existing formal professional development workshop and curriculum planning opportunities were few, short, fragmented, and nearly always offered only after school hours to teachers who volunteered their time. Labour conflicts that had motivated various bargaining units to work-to-rule during most of the school year caused other staff meetings and seminars to be cancelled or postponed. Some administrative or centrally-assigned staff were able to go off site for an occasional short conference or workshop, but those opportunities were rarer for classroom teachers. Teachers at one high school and one elementary/ middle school did report

having been galvanized into action by one late-April after-school video and workshop on bullying among girls (HS2 T1 May 4, Elem1 T1 May 10). Another teacher reported having attended one slightly-meaningful workshop in recent years:

> *I can't think of any professional development. Actually that's not true, we had one session that was for mentors and new teachers, about the degrees of inclusivity, multicultural education. ... But otherwise, I've not seen a lot of that. ... and even some of that is just token, like having books with different pictures in them (HS1 T2 May 5).*

In some schools, some teachers complained that even basic information was not disseminated, even when they made inquiries (e.g. HS1 T2 May 5). This information vacuum could have direct ramifications for teachers' interpretation of school rules (patterns of implicit citizenship socialization):

> *we're not a zero tolerance board any more, we're a progressive discipline school, but I don't think most teachers know about that. We have had no p.d. or information about that at all (Elem1 T2, May 10).*

Redesigned (increasingly centralized and cost-saving) leadership infrastructure, especially pertaining to high schools, exacerbated the challenge. For example, when the board replaced department headships (which had been subject-specific and included some release time) with restructured headships (responsible for multiple subject areas, often without release time), the capacity to offer professional development support plummeted (curric. leader July 6; HS1 T4 May 13). Even finding a common lunch period for teachers to work together on committees (that would contribute to teacher learning as well as peacebuilding citizenship education opportunities in the school) was a challenge, especially in the high schools (e.g. HS1 T5 June 3; HS2 support staff1 May 11). As one of the school board staff put it,

> *we don't have thinking time (safe schls. leader2 July 7).*

The most serious problem, according to educators in all eight schools as well as centrally-assigned board personnel, was teacher time to talk and work together (with or without a formal professional development facilitator). A provincial government hostile to public education, in power for about ten years until voted out recently, had caused teachers' 'work' to be defined very narrowly as classroom teaching time, while also cutting resources for support infrastructure such as curriculum development leaders, conflict resolution advisors, and student services. An elementary principal explained that, as one consequence of this shift, many of her staff had no access to formal learning time with their colleagues.

> *At my previous school, we were able to entice people to [attend training in a popular cooperative learning, social skills, and anti-bias program] during the day. Now ... we've kind of limited what we're offering staff, because we don't have the money in the board any more [to release teachers for professional development by covering their classrooms]. So trainings are after school. We've lost some teachers, who have young children [at home] for example, who can't do it after school. I can't afford to pay for supply [substitute] teachers ... Professional development time makes a big difference to staff. Also*

> *…Years ago we used to have a number of [non-teaching] days. Now we have a number of [non-teaching] days for [parent-teacher] interviews, one for the union so we can't do anything in that one, so there's not much (elem3 P April 19).*

Furthermore, like many such commercially-produced teacher resource packages, professional developers were only allowed to use the particular material this principal refers to if they had been certified in an expensive training for trainers. Resources to hire one of these trainers, or to get an existing staff member trained, were scarce. It was essentially luck that this school's new vice principal had taken initiative earlier to earn that training certificate, so that she could lead her own staff's inservice workshop series.

However, some innovative principals, supported by area administrators, were able to create exactly the kinds of opportunities for teachers to talk and work together that Borko, Raywid and others recommend. Even though they had no more resources per student or staff member, and if anything fewer explicit peacebuilding citizenship-related programs than any of the other schools in the study, these principals had assigned teachers' work differently in order to make time for dialogue and joint work on an on-going basis. One elementary school principal routinely assigned teachers to work collaboratively with combined grades or integrated divisions (elem2 P & others May 2, May 18, June 30). One high school principal had recently initiated a problem-solving process with all staff, in which every staff member identified issues of concern, and then committees were formed to work on each category of concern. Regular staff meeting time was given over so that these small committees could meet, and the principal had tentative approval to change the students' schedule for the coming year so that these teacher committees could meet every Wednesday morning (HS2 P & others April 26, May 4, May 11). Data analysis is on-going, but it seemed that the staff morale and climates for teacher learning were somewhat more positive in those environments.

Thus there are important exceptions that point toward possibilities for improvement, but the overwhelming finding of this research is that teacher learning for critical democratic citizenship education is profoundly under-supported. The interviews with educators in one district suggest that the vast majority of the scarcest resources (the time of educational leaders who could directly or indirectly support teacher learning) seem to be allocated to intervention after violence has erupted and to short-term control. The discourse of teacher learning primarily describes quick-fix packages and coping with disruption. Most of the currently-available professional development resources in this school district do not even pay lip service to the kinds of teacher knowledge-building pedagogy and collective discussion that we know facilitate inclusive democratic citizenship education. It is not clear that many opportunities for dialogic examination of important difficult issues are provided for most students: It is crystal clear that such opportunities are hardly ever provided for most of their teachers.

Conclusion

The discourse and resources for teacher professional learning evident in these school districts bear no resemblance to what the research suggests is needed to support effective teaching for 'difficult' democratic citizenship. Research literature reviewed indicates that the kinds of pedagogy and curriculum content that could prepare diverse students for constructive engagement in conflictual postmodern

contexts are quite rare in North American classrooms. It shows that teachers' content knowledge, especially about social justice concepts and alternative information sources, is important —along with open, inclusive pedagogies emphasizing dialogue about conflictual perspectives— to students' development of interest and capacity for citizen engagement. Further, research in teachers' professional development shows that, to develop such capacity, teachers want and need sustained, dialogic learning opportunities that attend to practical problems and issues (analogous to what their students need for citizenship learning). Teacher education for peacebuilding citizenship, in particular, cannot be reduced to technical recipes that could be learned in the occasional hour after school. The study of one large public school district shows that these kinds of critical dialogic learning opportunities are very rarely provided or supported for teachers in their in-service workplace environment. If teachers are not enabled to discuss, try out, critique, and re-discuss their citizenship education work, then they are unlikely to offer quality education for democracy to their students.

TABLE 1: Safe & Inclusive Schools-Related Teacher Professional Development Resources

Winnipeg School Division 1 (34000 students)	**Halifax Regional School Board (57000 students)**	**Toronto District School Board (300000 students)**
PeaceBUILDING-related	PeaceBUILDING-related	PeaceBUILDING-related
Aboriginal/First Nations education	RCH=Race,X-cultural,HumanRts (admin/ldrsp)	Tchg in cultural mosaic classrm
Worldviews/awareness (8, some for admin)	Diversity management	Equity dept. wksps (array, limited staff to deliver) (e.g. racism, body image, class bias, homophobia, gender equity, Holocaust ed, linking isms, etc)
X-cultural competency	Building inclusive schls (5+, conf. grant& Oct PD)	Equity dept print resources (array)
Body image/weight preoccupation	Racial equity interdiscip. (conf. grant& Oct PD)	Print & video resources include African & Asian heritage activities, anti-racism, challenging homophobia, Aboriginal studies, disability
Diversity (Assn School Superintendents conf)	Queer eye for straight &not T Oct PD day	Fedn print resources include equity school, First Nations activities, community role models
Cross-cultural understanding (Ctr for the Performing Arts workshop)	Youth justice (2) Oct PD day	Online courses include gender equity, Native studies
	Gender diffs in learning Oct PD day	
	Youth homelessness/preventive Oct PD day	
PeaceMAKING-related	Schooling & social justice (conf)	PeaceMAKING-related
Comprehensive Assessment Pgm workshops include Social-Emotional learning (other CAP - health, English Language Arts)	PeaceMAKING-related	Tribes (2+)
Problem solving (N-Gr2, Gr4-5)	Managing conflict (admin/leadership staff)	Cognitive coaching (expensive)
Lions Quest	Tribes (2, conference grants)	Fixing broken teams
Talking tools	Managing conflict/strong schl culture (conf. grant)	Listening, handling tough situations (staff & Ts)
Gentle teaching	Caring education (St FX U conference)	Critical thinking in organizations (staff & Ts)
Child Guidance Ctr wksps including leadership, peer mentoring, teacher advisory	Roots of Empathy Oct PD day	Emotional intelligence (staff & Ts) (Communication & CR for admin staff only)
Education & democracy (U of MB conf)	Student leadership teams Oct PD day	Print resources include environmental ed, dealing w/ controversial issues, media studies, civics, world politics, social studies g.1-3, healthy active living
	World village Oct PD day	Teachers federation print resources include critical media Gr.7-8, environmental studies
	Fair trade/global economy Oct PD day	
	Wars have limits Oct PD day	
PeaceKEEPING-related	Facing fear: terrorism Oct PD day	PeaceKEEPING-related
NV crisis intervention	PeaceKEEPING-related	Creating safe schools (admin, elem & sec Ts)
Talking about touching	NV crisis intervention (5, admin & some Ts)	Internet safety (2)
Restitution (1 & 2)	S behaviour & discipline (admin/ldrsp)	Print resources include Stop Bullying, internet safety for PHE, rules & responsibilities (Gr.1)
Behaviour support	Threat assessment (3, w/safe schls consultant)	Bullying/violence (federation conference)
Positive classroom management & discipline	Bullying/ peaceful schools Oct PD day	Safe/healthy schools (federation conference)
Crisis negotiation (administrators?)	Law, conflict mgt, justice, young offenders (conf.)	Online courses include internet safety
Bullyproofing		Federation wksps include CALM crisis preventn
Harassment/intimidation		
Protecting children/youth on internet		
Safe Schools Forum (provincial Dept of Ed)		
Child Guidance Ctr wksps including gangs info, defiant children		
Violence in multicultural world –U of MB		

Correspondence: KATHY BICKMORE, OISE, University of Toronto, 252 Bloor
St. West - CTL Toronto, Ontario, M5S 1V6, CANADA
kbickmore@oise.utoronto.ca

REFERENCES

AKIBA, M., LETENDRE, G., BAKER, D., & GOESLING, B. (2003). Student victimization: National and school
    system effects on school violence in 37 nations. American Educational Research Journal, 39(4
    (Winter), 829-853.
APPLEBAUM, B. (2004). Social justice education: Moral agency and the subject of resistance. Educational
    Theory, 54(1), 59-72.
ARONSON, E. (2000). Nobody Left to Hate: Teaching Compassion after Columbine. New York: Worth
    Publishers.
AYERS, W., HUNT, J. A., & QUINN, T. (Eds.). (1998). Teaching for Social Justice. New York: New Press
    and Teachers College.
BANKS, C. M., & BANKS, J. (1995). Equity pedagogy: An essential component of multicultural education.
    Theory Into Practice, 34(3), 152-158.
BICKFORD, S. (1996). The Dissonance of Democracy. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
BICKMORE, K. (1999). Elementary curriculum about conflict resolution: Can children handle global
    politics? Theory and Research in Social Education, 27(1), 45-69.
BICKMORE, K. (2001). Student conflict resolution, power 'sharing' in schools, and citizenship education.
    Curriculum Inquiry, 31(2), 137-162.
BICKMORE, K. (2002). How might social education resist (hetero)sexism? Facing the impact of gender
    and sexual ideology on citizenship. Theory and Research in Social Education(Summer), 198-216.
BICKMORE, K. (2003). Conflict resolution education: Multiple options for contributing to just and
    democratic peace. In J. Killian (Ed.), Handbook of Conflict Management (pp. 3-32): Marcel-
    Dekker Publishers.
BICKMORE, K. (2004a). Discipline for democracy? School districts' management of conflict and social
    exclusion. Theory and Research in Social Education, 32(1), 75-97.
BICKMORE, K. (2004b). Education for Peacebuilding Citizenship: Teaching the dimensions of conflict
    resolution in social studies. In I. Wright (Ed.), Challenges and Prospects for Canadian Social
    Studies. Vancouver: Pacific Educational Press.
BICKMORE, K. (2005). Foundations for peacebuilding and discursive peacekeeping: Infusion and
    exclusion of conflict in Canadian public school curricula. Journal of Peace Education, 2(2) 161-
    181.
BIGELOW, B., CHRISTENSEN, L., SWOPE, K., DAWSON, K., KARP, S., LEVINE, D., PETERSON, B., & WEISS, D.
    (2002). Teaching to make a difference: Advice to new Ts from Ts who've been there. Rethinking
    Schools, 13-17.
BOLER, M., & ZEMBYLAS, M. (2003). Discomforting truths: The emotional terrain of understanding
    difference. In P. Trifonas (Ed.), Pedagogies of Difference: Rethinking Education for Social
    Change (pp. 110-136). Halifax: Fernwood.
BORKO, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. Educational
    Researcher, 33(8), 3-15.
BRANDES, G. M., & KELLY, D. (2000). Placing social justice at the heart of teacher education: Reflections
    on a project in process. Exceptionality Education Canada, 10(1-2), 75-94.
BUSH, K., & SALTARELLI, D. (2000). The two faces of education in ethnic conflict: towards a
    peacebuilding education for children. Florence, IT: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre.
BUTLER, J. (1999). Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity (2nd edition). London:
    Routledge.
CALLENDER, C., & WRIGHT, C. (2000). Discipline and democracy: Race, gender, school sanctions and
    control. In J. Dillabough (Ed.), Challenging democracy: International perspectives on gender,
    education and citizenship (pp. 216-237). London: Routledge.
CARY, L. (2001). The refusals of citizenship: Normalizing practices in social educational discourses.
    Theory and Research in Social Education, 29(3), 405-430.

CLOSE, C., & LECHMANN, K. (1997). Fostering youth leadership: Students train students and adults in conflict resolution. Theory Into Practice, 36(1), 11-16.

COCHRAN-SMITH, M. (1995). Uncertain allies: Understanding the boundaries of race and teaching. Harvard Educational Review, 65(4), 541-570.

CROCCO, M. S., & CRAMER, J. (2005). Women, WebQuests, and controversial issues in the social studies. Social Education, 69(4), 143-148.

CURLE, A., FREIRE, P., & GALTUNG, J. (1974). What can education contribute towards peace and social justice? Curle, Freire, Galtung panel. In M. Haavelsrud (Ed.), Education for Peace: Reflection and Action (pp. 64 - 97). Keele, UK: University of Keele.

DARLING-HAMMOND, L., HAMMERNESS, K., GROSSMAN, P., RUST, F., & SHULMAN, L. (2005). The design of teacher education programs. In J. Bransford (Ed.), Preparing Teachers for a Changing World.

DAVIES, L. (2004). Education and Conflict: Complexity and Chaos. London: Routledge/Falmer.

DILWORTH, P. P. (2004). Multicultural citizenship education: Case studies from social studies classrooms. Theory and Research in Social Education, 32(2), 153-186.

ELKIND, D. (1995). School and family in the postmodern world. Phi Delta Kappan, 77(1), 8-14.

ELLSWORTH, E. (1997). Teaching Positions: Difference, Pedagogy, and the Power of Address. New York: Teachers College Press.

EPSTEIN, D., & JOHNSON, R. (1998). Sexualities, nationalities, and schooling, Schooling Sexualities. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

FINLEY, L. (2003). How can I teach peace when the book only covers war? Online Journal of Peace and Conflict Resolution, 5(1), 150-165.

FOSTER, M., LEWIS, J., & ONAFOWORA, L. (2005). Grooming great urban teachers. Educational Leadership, 62(6), 28-32.

FREIRE, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Seabury Press.

FREIRE, P. (1998). Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy, and Civic Courage. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

GALTUNG, J. (1996). Peace By Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development, & Civilization. London: Sage Publications & International Peace Research Assn.

GHOSH, R. (2004). Public education and multicultural policy in Canada: The special case of Quebec. International Review of Education, 50(5-6), 543-566.

GORDON, T., HOLLAND, J., & LAHELMA, E. (2000). Making Spaces: Citizenship and Difference in Schools. London, UK: MacMillan.

GUTMANN, A. (2004). Unity and diversity in democratic multicultural education: Creative and destructive tensions. In J. Banks (Ed.), Diversity and Citizenship Education: Global Perspectives (pp. 71-96). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/ Wiley.

HARBER, C. (2004). Schooling as violence: How schools harm pupils and societies. London: Routledge.

HARRIS, I. (1996). From world peace to peace in the 'hood: Peace education in a postmodern world. Journal for a Just and Caring Education, 2(4), 378-395.

HESCH, R. (1999). Culturally relevant teacher education: a Canadian inner-city case. Canadian Journal of Education, 24(4), 369-382.

KELLY, D., & BRANDES, G. M. (2001). Shifting out of 'neutral:' Beginning teachers' struggles with teaching for social justice. Canadian Journal of Education, 26(4), 437-454.

KIRKWOOD-TUCKER, T. F. (2004). Empowering teachers to create a more peaceful world through global education: simulating the United Nations. Theory and Research in Social Education, 32(1), 56-74.

KUMASHIRO, K. (2004). Against Common Sense: Teaching and Learning toward Social Justice. New York: Routledge.

KYMLICKA, W. (1998). The theory and practice of Canadian multiculturalism [Available on line: www.fedcan.ca/english/policyandadvocacy/breakfastonthehill/breakfast-multiculturalism.cfm]. Government of Canada (Multiculturalism Secretariat). Retrieved, 2004, from the World Wide Web:

KYMLICKA, W. (2003). Two dilemmas of citizenship education in pluralist societies. In J. Annette (Ed.), Education for Democratic Citizenship: Issues of Theory and Practice (pp. 47-63). Aldershot, Hants, UK: Ashgate.

LADSON-BILLINGS, G. (2004). Forward. In K. Kumashiro (Ed.), Against Common Sense: Teaching and Learning toward Social Justice (pp. xiii-xxviii). New York: Routledge.

LITTLE, J. W. (1993). Teachers' Professional Development in a Climate of Educational Reform. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 15(2), 129-151.

MÁTRAI, Z. (2002). National identity conflicts and civic education: a comparison of five countries. In J. Schwille (Ed.), New Paradigms and Recurring Paradoxes in Education for Citizenship: An International Comparison (pp. 85-104). Amsterdam: JAI/ Elsevier Science.

MAYNES, B., & SARBIT, G. (2000). Schooling children living in poverty: Perspectives on social justice. Exceptionality Education Canada, 10(1-2), 37-61.

McCADDEN, B. M. (1998). Why is Michael always getting timed out? Race, class and disciplining other people's children. In B. McEwan (Ed.), Classroom discipline in American schools: Problems and possibilities for democratic education (pp. 109-134). Albany: State University of New York Press.

McLAUGHLIN, M., PFEIFER, R., SWANSON-OWENS, D., & YEE, S. (1986). Why teachers won't teach. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(6), 420-426.

MILLIGAN, J. (2003). Teaching between the cross and the crescent moon: Islamic identity, postcoloniality, and public education in the Southern Philippines. Comparative Education Review, 47(4), 468-492.

NASH, R. (2005). A letter to secondary teachers: Teaching about religious pluralism in the public schools. In N. Noddings (Ed.), Educating Citizens for Global Awareness (pp. 93-107). New York: Teachers College Press.

OPFFER, E. (1997). Toward cultural transformation: Comprehensive approaches to conflict resolution. Theory Into Practice, 36(1), 46-52.

OSLER, A., & STARKEY, H. (1998). Children's rights and citizenship: Some implications for the management of schools. International Journal of Children's Rights, 6, 313-333.

PANG, V. O., & VALLE, R. (2004). A change in paradigm. Theory and Research in Social Education, 32(4), 503-522.

PARKER, W. (2004). Diversity, globalization, and democratic education: Curriculum possibilities. In J. Banks (Ed.), Diversity and Citizenship Education: Global Perspectives (pp. 433-458). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/ Wiley.

PRINT, M. (1998). From Civic Deficit to Critical Mass: The New Civics Education. Australian Curriculum Studies Association. Retrieved, 2005, from the World Wide Web: http://www.abc.net.au/civics/teach/articles/mprint/mprint1.htm

RAYWID, M. (1993). Finding time for collaboration. Educational Leadership, 30-34.

RICHARDSON, G. (2002). The Death of the Good Canadian: Teachers, National Identities, and the Social Studies Curriculum. New York: Peter Lang.

RILEY, K., & TOTTEN, S. (2002). Understanding matters: Holocaust curricula and the social studies classroom. Theory and Research in Social Education, 30(4), 541-562.

ROSS, M. (1993). The Management of Conflict. New Haven: Yale University Press.

SALOMON, G., & NEVO, B. (Eds.). (2002). Peace Education: The Concept, Principles, & Practices around the World. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

SIMON, K. (2001). Moral Questions in the Classroom. New Haven: Yale University Press.

SMITH, G. A. (2004). Cultivating care and connection: Preparing the soil for a just and sustainable society. Educational Studies, 36(1), 73-92.

SOLOMON, P. G. (1995). No Small Feat! Taking Time for Change. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

TAWIL, S., & HARLEY, A. (Eds.). (2004). Education, Conflict & Social Cohesion. Geneva: UNESCO/ International Bureau of Education.

THORNTON, S. (2005). Incorporating internationalism into the social studies curriculum. In N. Noddings (Ed.), Educating Citizens for Global Awareness (pp. 81-92). New York: Teachers College Press.

TORNEY-PURTA, J. (1999). Civic Education across Countries: 24 National Case Studis from the IEA Civic Education Project. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

TORRES, C. A. (1998). Democracy, education, and multiculturalism: Dilemmas of citizenship in a global world. Comparative Educational Review, 42(4), 421-447.

TUPPER, J. (2005, April). Social studies teachers speak up! Uncovering the (im)possibilities of citizenship. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.

VAN GALEN, J. A. (2004). Seeing classes: toward a broadened research agenda for critical qualitative researchers. International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 17(5), 663-684.

WALLACE, J., & LOUDEN, W. (1994). Collaboration and the growth of teachers' knowledge. Qualitative Studies in Education, 7(4), 323-334.

WOYSHNER, C. (2002). Political history as women's history: toward a more inclusive curriculum. Theory and Research in Social Education, 30(3), 354-380.

YOUNG, I. M. (1998). Polity and group difference: a critique of the ideal of universal citizenship. In A. Phillips (Ed.), Feminism and Politics (pp. 410-429). New York: Oxford University Press.