

Collaboration is the Strongest Tool in Impacting Change: Participatory Action Research with Senior Secondary Students in New Delhi, India

Author: Kamiya Kumar

Abstract

Recognising the ethos of conflict shaped by dominant political-societal beliefs, school practices may reflect broader structural inequalities that contribute to macro-level violence, which become normalised and rendered invisible within school systems and cultures. Through this research study, I seek to challenge and disrupt this ethos of conflict by drawing on a case study of a peace education initiative in New Delhi, India, that aspires to resist this socialisation for conflict. Through a year-long youth participatory action research project, 19 senior secondary students (17 females and 2 males) undertook research on '*How do we nurture a culture of peace in our school?*' The research project culminated with the students reviewing and analysing the school policies and proposing an action plan to the school leadership to cultivate three components: (1) Stronger Connectedness with Peers and Teachers, (2) Transparency in School Policies and Processes, and (3) Students becoming Decision-Makers. Moving beyond individual choices and actions, these young people collaborated to reimagine and transform the school's collective culture to nurture a culture of peace.

Keywords: Peace Education, School Policy, Participatory Action Research, Peace Education Programmes in India, Youth Perspectives, Decision Maker, Culture of Peace, Social Media

1. Introduction

Our current world context is defined by an ethos of conflict, evident in the stark shift towards dominant political-societal beliefs that advance policies that create division and conflict among communities. Specifically, in India, the fabric of the country is being redefined by recently introduced laws such as N.R.C (National Register of Citizens) and C.A.A (Citizenship Amendment Act) that are intended to identify and alienate religious minorities. While this may be the most prominent manifestation of conflict in this moment, it is important to recognise that post-independence, the Indian context has witnessed structural and cultural violence, marginalisation, and discrimination based on socio-cultural stratifications such as religion, socio-economic status, gender, sexual identity, caste, and language, among others (Das, 2008; Panda & Gupta, 2004).

Relatedly, a critical analysis of the recent National (Indian) Education Policy 2020 reveals that “it does not adequately address the existing challenges faced by marginalised communities. Ensuring equal access to quality education for all remains a major challenge, especially for economically disadvantaged and marginalised groups” (Mandal, 2023, p. 1977). Moreover, there is no explicit mention of peace education

or a comprehensive peace education framework in either the National Education Policy 2020 or the National Curriculum Framework 2023. Given the dominant political-societal beliefs at the national level, there is an ongoing effort to define and maintain an ethos of conflict through educational systems, policies, and school practices, which often serve as agents of conflict socialisation (Bar-Tal & Rosen, 2009). Through this research study, I seek to challenge and disrupt this ethos of conflict by drawing on a case study of a peace education initiative in New Delhi, India, that aspires to resist this socialisation for conflict.

An ethos and culture of conflict in school tends to manifest as direct violence, the type of violence that is committed by an actor and indirect or structural violence, where the violence exists within the structure, is manifested as unequal power or resources and results in unequal life chances. Galtung (1969) defines negative peace as the absence of personal or direct violence and positive peace as the absence of structural or indirect violence. These types of violence are often maintained and perpetuated amongst young people through power inequalities (Mishra, 2017), failure to engage with difference and diverse social groups (Cunningham & Ladd, 2018; Bickmore, 2006), as well as a culture that glorifies and normalises violence as a way of resolving conflicts (Duckworth et al, 2012). School practices may reflect larger structural inequalities that are the sources of macro-level violence, which become normalised and made invisible as part of school systems and cultures, such as religion-, gender- or caste-based discrimination (Ramakrishnan, 2019), prejudices, stereotypes, and rigid conceptions of ‘self’ and ‘others’ (Brantmeier, 2007).

In response to this culture of conflict, recent scholarship on peace education in India (e.g., Kumar, 2024) underscores the importance of a positive peace framework for nurturing a culture of peace. Kumar draws on a critical peace education framework (Wulf, 1974; Bajaj, 2008), which deems that to disrupt the ethos and culture of conflict that is maintained in schools and communities and create transformative change, young people need to engage with root causes of conflict and structural sources of violence (Bar-Tal & Rosen, 2009; Galtung, 1969). Through an emphasis on “context-specific structural inequities” (Hantzopoulos & Bajaj, 2021, p. 28), a critical peace education framework gives precedence to localised interactions, embodiment, and experiences of peace and conflict, to nurture a sense of agency. According to Bajaj (2009), encouraging young people to cultivate a “belief in their ability to transform their surroundings” (p. 564) can entail “analyses of future action” (Bajaj, 2018, p. 15). Drawing on Freire’s (1970) work, Bajaj (2008) echoes the importance of raising students’ critical consciousness so that they can be further empowered to become transformative change agents “who critically analyze power dynamics and intersectionalities among race, class, gender, ability/disability, sexual orientation, language, religion, geography, and other forms of stratification” (Brantmeier & Bajaj, 2013, p. 145). This idea of peace entails students working actively to transform situations and a culture of conflict by critically engaging with root causes of conflict, reflecting on themselves, engaging in dialogue, and taking social action to build a culture and an ethos of peace (Bajaj & Hantzopoulos, 2016).

Recognising that youth live in a world that simultaneously produces visible displays of conflict and violence and fosters conversations about the possibilities for peace, especially in light of their agency, this study was guided by the research question: “How do we nurture a culture of peace in our school?” Since this case study entailed youth participatory action research with senior secondary students, the research question was posed to research with students as co-researchers, experts of their lived realities and experiences, as well as agents of change.

2. Peace Education Programs in India

Overarchingly, in reviewing the broader literature on peace education in India, the work of eminent peace scholars Bajaj and Kumar emerged as a key resource, providing an overview of the current landscape. Bajaj (2016) highlights two approaches employed across K-12 schools: a focus on values and character education, and conflict resolution that emphasises coexistence. It appears that school practices promote the cultivation of individual and interpersonal experiences rather than engaging in analyses of violence at the collective and structural levels, a facet present in higher educational institutions. Her insight is supported by Kumar (2017)'s assertion that the recognition and engagement with conflict is rarely included in K-12 schools. Acknowledging the omnipresence of conflicts surrounding students, in both immediate and broader senses, he argues that peace education needs to redress the silence and lack of engagement with the root causes of conflict. He contends that institutional education in India avoids engaging with knowledge of issues that involve social conflict. Further, not only does institutionalised education avoid conflicts and contemporary events that shape a child's lived present, but it also employs a similar approach in the treatment of conflicts that have shaped national history. He suggests that nationalist pride may limit the scope of teaching and learning about social conflict, contemporary events, and recent history in schools, an aspect reflected in the recent National Education Policy (2020).

Upon reviewing empirical work conducted in India, existing studies presented a slightly different overview of the current landscape. At the macro level, the national curriculum framework in India suggests that a single framework can guide peace education. In contrast, micro-level studies reveal that a single model of peace education cannot work across the country, and that diversity in approaches to peace education is India's greatest strength (Srinivasan, 2009). Furthermore, most studies imply that peace education efforts are advocated for and offered in response to issues of both direct and indirect violence, by sensitising young people to issues of power asymmetries and making invisible power relations visible (Mishra, 2017; Initiative & Kaul, 2012-15), but little is known about the impact of these programs (Srinivasan, 2009). The literature also indicates that the notion of conflict in schools is often linked to issues of violence and bullying (Thakkar et al., 2020), which remains "a poorly understood phenomenon in the Indian setting" (p. 24; Bhuyan & Manjula, 2017). More recently, studies (such as Kumar, 2022) reflect a shift towards a positive peace framework, where peace education curricula affirm a relational, holistic, and transformative understanding of peace.

3. Youth Perspectives and Interactions with Peace and Conflict

Literature notes that "most research on educational programming, to include peace education, is either from the teacher or administrator's perspective" (Duckworth et al., 2012, p. 85) and scholars (such as Nygren et al., 2020; King, 2018; Bickmore et al., 2017; Duckworth et al., 2012) contend that giving space to youth voices remains integral as they all argue for the criticality of youth perspectives. I situated my research in conversation with literature that already elevates youth perspectives on peace and conflict.

In my review of the literature, I found that young people might interact with or seek to engage with notions of peace and conflict differently than they are taught in schools/peacebuilding programs (Cunningham & Ladd, 2018). Contrary to peace education curricula that do not engage with contemporary or conflict-related issues, young people express a desire to engage with such issues/conflict constructively (Dovey, 1996). A few studies (e.g., Johnson et al., 2023; King, 2018; Bickmore et al., 2017) examine young people's understanding of social conflicts, and these studies highlight that young people have a stronger sense of agency and hope in relation to some kinds of conflict compared to others, since their sense of agency is linked to individual choices and actions. Young people seem to recognise

limitations posed by structural conditions/social structures, and regardless, tend to assert a sense of agency/self-efficacy. These studies emphasise that a high level of self-efficacy, which entails a belief in oneself, enables young people to believe that societal conditions need to be ameliorated, promoting stronger social justice/civic and peace attitudes. Some studies (such as Duckworth et al., 2012) that encourage young people to engage with the root causes of conflict find that youth may experience a sense of personal transformation. However, the literature affirms that unless student voices are incorporated into local or national policy, these peace education programs will not lead to social transformation.

In the Indian context, the literature notes minimal analysis of the structures and systems that maintain marginalisation, and few studies examine how Indian youth understand and experience social issues (Bhattacharyya et al., 2018). Some studies (Nygren et al., 2020) reveal that young people can identify acts of violence but find it challenging to offer strategies to solve conflicts in order to move towards peace. Research also draws connections between peace and happiness, with happiness, experienced through self-awareness, strong social relationships, and a sense of responsibility, contributing to young people's holistic development and well-being (Nanda et al., 2025).

Studies (e.g., Jadhav, 2016) that focus on young people's engagement with peace and conflict find that they broadly situate their understandings of these concepts in relation to individual and interpersonal interactions. They tend to perceive peace as silence and, as a strategy, would prefer to keep quiet to avoid conflict. Peace seems to be found in the absence of conflict. Contrary to these findings, some studies (such as Kumar, 2024) highlight that young people embody peace in their responses to conflict, showcasing the coexistence of conflict and peace. Nonetheless, young people tend to believe that the onus falls on each individual to nurture a peaceful community rather than reimagine the collective culture.

With the literature affirming the importance of young people's voices and perspectives, it is evident that they want to engage constructively with notions of peace and conflict. The few studies that have engaged young people with social conflict and social structures reveal their self-efficacy and belief in their ability to effect change. This sense of agency, however, is often linked to individual choices and actions rather than to reimagining or transforming the collective culture.

4. Conceptual Framework | Methodology

As young people explore their relationship to the social world, which is embedded in conflict, mediators offered by critical peace education and critical hope that include raising critical consciousness and embracing affect can enable the enactment of a peaceful world.

Scholars in the field of critical peace education (Freire, 1970; Bajaj, 2008) emphasise the importance of raising students' critical consciousness so that they can engage with existing conflicts to enact peace. They deem that critical consciousness can be raised through participatory research, which encourages learners to engage with generative themes that enable dialogue and dialogical thinking. Such a process would invite young people to engage with their personal/localised experiences and contexts (Hantzopoulos & Bajaj, 2021) while enabling them to understand structures that entail acknowledging/analysing existing power dynamics and privilege. A central goal of these spaces is also to encourage learners to critically engage with, analyse, and dismantle the root causes and manifestations of direct, structural, and cultural violence (Bajaj & Hantzopoulos, 2016).

Table 1

Critical Peace Education and Critical Hope Conceptual Framework

Conceptual Construct	Components and Description		
Conflict	Personal Experience: Engagement with one's personal/localised experience	Power Dynamics & Privilege: Examining one's power and privilege (or the lack of)	Complex & Unequal Social Structures: Existing stratifications in one's local context
Mediations	Critical Consciousness: (1) Raising students' critical consciousness so that they can engage with existing conflict in order to enact peace; (2) Includes cultivating a belief in one's own ability to transform one's environment, which could entail an analysis of future action	Self in Relation to Social World: Engaging with and understanding oneself and one's role in the world	Affect: (1) Reasons for despair are taken into consideration and possibilities of hope are imagined; (2) Emotions of discomfort and uncertainty; (3) Feelings of vulnerability and empathy
Enacting Peace	Conceptualising Peace: Understanding and meaning of peace	Exerting Agency: (1) Transformative change agents who critically analyse power dynamics, intersectionalities and forms of stratification; (2) The core component of agency encompasses an analysis of future action	Imagining & Taking Action: Conceptualisation of peace entails imagining and taking action around peace and justice issues

Engaging with unequal power relations and existing stratifications in one's local context (Brantmeier & Bajaj, 2013) creates possibilities to conceptualise the notion of peace. This would include cultivating a belief in one's ability to transform one's environment, enabling young people to exercise their agency (Bajaj, 2009). Drawing on Freire's (1970) work, Bajaj (2008) echoes the importance of raising students' critical consciousness so that they can be further empowered to become transformative change agents "who critically analyze power dynamics and intersectionalities among race, class, gender, ability/disability, sexual orientation, language, religion, geography, and other forms of stratification" (Brantmeier & Bajaj, 2013, p. 145). It is important to note that a core component of agency encompasses an "analysis of future action" (Bajaj, 2018, p. 15). Thus, the conceptualisation of peace would also entail imagining and undertaking action around peace and justice issues.

Relatedly, as young people seek to understand their position in relation to their social world, including their affective positions, critical hope considers how affect interacts with imagining, engaging in, and enacting a peaceful world. In this world of conflict, reasons for despair are considered and possibilities for hope are imagined. Critical hope draws our attention to a critical analysis of our emotions and how power relations can impact one's emotional ways of being in the world. The goal is to encourage learners to examine how their deeply embedded emotional dimensions may be complicit with dominant discourses while "deconstructing the powerful affective investments that normalise social orders" (Zembylas, 2013,

p. 23). Although feelings of discomfort and uncertainty can make the world seem chaotic, Zembylas (2013) contends that a critical inquiry into these emotions, including feelings of vulnerability and empathy, could restore humanity. Students could be encouraged to translate their emotional understanding into imagining new ways of living with others, so that they can cultivate a sense of hope and help create a peaceful world.

5. Methodology

Aligned with the conceptual framework, a youth participatory action research (YPAR) approach was undertaken to explore how a culture of peace can be nurtured in the Indian context. Scholars such as Bajaj (2008) note that “investigation of ... (a) local context echoes the (importance of) participatory research that Freire implores educators (and researchers) to engage in to develop the generative themes that will enable dialogue and raise students’ critical consciousness” (p. 140).

Viewed as a group process, participatory action research (PAR) “brings together community members and professionals to raise and study issues relevant to community needs and experiences, and to create action plans in response to the knowledge that is generated” (Smith, Davis & Bhowmik, 2010, p. 175). When young people are the community researchers, examining problems and proposing solutions based on their own lived experiences, the process is referred to as youth participatory action research (YPAR) (Smith, Davis & Bhowmik, 2010).

Resonating with the conceptual framework, YPAR emphasises a bottom-up approach that focuses on local perspectives, knowledge, and context, in which local realities are not only acknowledged but also form the basis for research and planning (Cornwall & Jewkes, 1995). A dynamic process that develops from learning experiences, needs, and challenges of a given group, there is dialectic movement between action and reflection (Smith, 1997), with possible change and understanding evolving as a result of this reflexivity (Kidd & Kral, 2005).

5.1 School Site

Located in New Delhi, the K-12 school was founded in 1957 and has a current strength of 1875 students. A private English-medium co-educational day school, the school is affiliated with the national board, namely the Central Board of Secondary Education. Within the international student fraternity, 13 nationalities are represented at the school, and it offers 6 foreign languages. Additionally, the curriculum documents highlighted that the school's founder played a prominent role in South Africa's liberation struggle, thereby catalysing the school's determined effort to uphold the dignity of man. The school's philosophy is epitomised in their motto, ‘one planet, the earth, one family, mankind’. To further this vision of a world beyond borders, the school curriculum is considered to be constantly evolving and dynamic, reflecting the school's pluralistic ethos, global thinking, and Gandhian values [as identified in the curriculum documents: humility, modesty, and reverence].

The school focuses on the oneness of humanity and a vision of a world beyond borders as an approach towards cultivating peace. Within this idea of the oneness of humanity, the school embraces diversity as the norm, emphasising the importance of students engaging with diversity and difference. This is broadly aligned with the idea of human education as a continual process of becoming more fully human by engaging in dialogue, fostering a strong sense of interconnectedness, and cultivating human character through inner transformation (Goulah, 2018). While engaging with ideas of conflict, the school focuses on fostering students’ understanding of world politics and building solidarity for the great struggles of

liberation movements faced across the world, such as South Africa's struggle against apartheid, participating in a 'toy for a Cuban Child' campaign, and building insight into the ongoing conflict between Israel and Palestine, with an emphasis on "edify(ing) that humanity must prevail all else" (Curriculum documents).

5.2 Participants

A total of 19 students participated in the research study. As part of an extension of their Psychology class, these senior secondary students volunteered to participate in this year-long research project to deepen their experiential understanding of how to research issues of peace and conflict. Ranging between the ages of 16 and 17, there were a total of 2 males and 17 females.

5.3 Data Collection and Analysis

During data collection, an iterative analysis employed both deductive and inductive approaches. The data gathered was analysed using the guiding conceptual framework of critical peace education and critical hope, while also deriving meaning and additional concepts from the data itself.

The research group met once a week to engage in discussion, brainstorm issues of personal and social relevance, conduct focus group interviews with one another, and plan to undertake action. More than participants being the unit of analysis, their collective efforts were directed towards engaging with structural components of their school policy that were analysed. The research project culminated with students presenting their concerns to their school leadership and teachers as they advocated for their own voices to be incorporated into the existing school policy. For this study, the preparation, final presentation to the teachers and school leadership, student reflections (appendix A), and the researcher's anecdotal records were analysed. Pseudonyms have been used to protect participant identities.

6. Findings

As part of the research process, students identified three components: (1) Stronger Connectedness with Peers and Teachers, (2) Transparency in School Policies and Processes, and (3) Students becoming Decision-Makers, which they believed would contribute towards nurturing a culture of peace.

For these young people, a culture of peace signified an inclusive environment where differences are not only accepted but also respected. A space where everyone "can listen with empathy" (Noor, Reflection). They emphasised the importance of questioning "why norms are the way they are, who defined them, and why they must be followed" (Nishant, Reflection). Malvika expressed that "our school having a culture of peace means to me that there is no discrimination against other people who are different from them" (Reflection). This was echoed by many participants who also shared that "to me, a culture of peace entails a community where, despite differences and conflicts, everyone has respect for one another, and everyone can find their own space of comfort and belonging" (Tanya, Reflection). For these young people, the notion of peace did not exist in the absence of conflict; it co-existed. As Tanya elaborated, "Culture of peace' does not necessarily mean there has to be calm or an extreme sense of tranquillity and stillness, but just simply a place where chaos and calm can coexist (Reflection). To nurture this culture of peace, the students recognised that collective efforts were integral "to the development of all-inclusive, concrete and effective solutions". As Nishant reflected, "collaboration is the strongest tool in impacting change" (Reflection). All participants engaged in analysing the school policies and proposed an action plan to the

school leadership to cultivate (1) Stronger Connectedness with Peers and Teachers, (2) Transparency in School Policies and Processes, and (3) Students becoming Decision-Makers.

6.1 Stronger Connectedness with Students and Teachers

Students shared that they felt disconnected from their teachers because of a packed school schedule that did not give them enough time to engage in dialogue beyond academics, which could help build personal connections. They delineated certain teacher qualities, which they believed would strengthen the student-teacher community. Rather than reprimanding students and making them feel they were not good enough, students wanted a humane connection that included the teacher's listening, kind words, and keeping conversations confidential and unbiased. Students expressed that a stronger interpersonal connection could be cultivated if the “teachers are accessible and vulnerable by sharing their own examples” (Nishant, focus group discussion) to motivate the students.

Students also believed that some teachers' pedagogical approaches were redundant and outdated, especially when teaching-learning practices were based solely on textbooks. They proposed initiating a peer education program in which classes could be flipped and led by students. Moreover, they wanted to spend more time interacting with younger students and advocated for student-led workshops on “issues of political awareness and social relationships” (Aliya, presentation).

6.2 Transparency in School Policies and Processes

In the presentation to teachers and school leadership, students highlighted the need for greater transparency in the student council election process. They referenced the school policy, which stated that “prefects are selected through a scrutiny of their general code of conduct and sense of responsibility to the school, family and society. This is followed by the democratic practice of elections of the nominated candidates only” (School Almanack, 2025-26, p. 49-50). A concern was expressed that students who had a popular vote amongst the student body were often not nominated. Furthermore, the students lacked clarity about the benchmarks teachers used to evaluate students' adherence to the code of conduct. Thus, the students expressed their desire to be included in the process of defining these benchmarks, which could then be disseminated amongst the wider student body.

Additionally, students demanded that their school policies be implemented to hold students who bully and discriminate against one another accountable. They emphasised the observed dissonance. For example, the school policy stated that “A student is forbidden from exercising casteism, communalism, or practising untouchability, making racist remarks” (School Almanack, 2025-26, p. 55-56). However, students' lived experiences revealed that some students continue to use casteist remarks such as “chamar hai kya” (Aruna, focus group discussion), which further exclude, hate, and alienate the student body.

The students shared that although the disciplinary committee includes student representation, student recommendations are often not taken into consideration. The student representatives suggest stronger disciplinary action because the current measures of placing students who bully and discriminate in community service or as support to primary students do not seem to result in deep reflection and a change in one's conduct. To cultivate a culture where each student feels safe and has a strong sense of belonging, students want stronger consequences to stop and prevent repetitive harmful behaviour. They also suggested that regular reports of the disciplinary committee should be circulated to the student council and wider student body. Relatedly, a discussion ensued about building citizen accountability so that when

students witness harmful behaviour, they can help ensure that the envisioned school policies are being implemented.

6.3 Students as Decision-Makers

One of the participants stated that “it is a common belief that students hold no power”; however, by participating in this research process, she felt it reinforced her belief that “student voices have power” (Tara, Reflection). Another participant iterated that students as decision makers “gives agency to students, giving them power”, and with a higher sense of responsibility, trust is extended towards students (Myra, Reflection). For these young people, the onus of decision-making included creating various student societies that celebrated the school's international student population. They advocated for gender neutral uniforms and for sanitary pad dispensers to be installed in washrooms.

Additionally, they critiqued one of the school policies on social media usage, which strongly advised students “to refrain from joining or creating any social media groups until they reach the age of 18” (School Almanack, 2025-26, p. 51). Recognising that students' realities differed, with the majority of students being on social media, the students urged the school leadership to organise discussions on both the advantages and disadvantages of using social media today.

Overarchingly, students recognised the complexities that are entailed in bringing about change. For instance, Noor reflected “Frankly, the policy drafting was the stage that challenged me the most - I had to push myself to be able to create concrete, actionable plans with my group, while also constantly trying to evaluate how effective these measures would be - if we were truly able to address certain structural issues (like bullying, violence, etc.) or if we were just making surface-level impact”. Students remained hopeful and expressed “the fact that a platform was given to review school policies gave me a lot of hope that change can be brought through the right methods and platforms” (Trisha, Reflection).

7. Discussion

Through the year-long youth participatory action research project, students engaged with their personal experiences as they delved into issues of personal and social relevance. They critically analysed their lived experiences in relation to their school policies. They challenged the common belief that students hold no power, while cultivating a sense of agency in their collective and collaborative efforts to effect change. These young people recognised the complexities involved in effecting and measuring change, especially as they conceptualised a culture of peace reflected in a stronger sense of connectedness, a higher degree of transparency and accountability, and an increased onus on decision-makers. By engaging with notions of empathy and vulnerability, students sought to restore humane connections and remained hopeful about the possibilities for change. As part of the YPAR project, these young people engaged in collective and collaborative efforts and took action by reviewing and drafting policy changes to ensure that school structures and systems incorporated student voices and experiences. Moving beyond individual choices and actions, these young people collaborated to reimagine and transform the school's collective culture to nurture a culture of peace.

8. Conclusion: Limitations and Future Research

Acknowledging researcher subjectivities that arise from one's personal history and life experiences (Pinar, 2009), I continue to engage reflexively with my positionality. Although students participated as co-researchers and actively presented their action plans to the school leadership, they did not participate

in writing this paper; thus, I have drawn on direct student quotes to represent student voices in this research study. Future research can include continuing the YPAR project to evaluate and measure the impact of the proposed changes, while incorporating perspectives from the broader student body to gain insight into students' experiences of these changes.

References

1. Bajaj, M. (2009). "I have big things planned for my future": The limits and possibilities of transformative agency in Zambian schools. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 39(4), 551–568. DOI: [10.1080/03057920701844503](https://doi.org/10.1080/03057920701844503)
2. Bajaj, M. (2018). Conceptualising transformative agency in education for peace, human rights, and social justice. *International Journal of Human Rights Education*, 2(1), Article 13. <https://repository.usfca.edu/ijhre/vol2/iss1/13/>
3. Bajaj, M. (Ed.). (2008). *Encyclopedia of Peace Education*. IAP.
4. Bajaj, M., & Hantzopoulos, M. (2016). *Peace education: International perspectives*. Bloomsbury Academic.
5. Bar-Tal, D., & Rosen, Y. (2009). Peace education in societies involved in intractable conflicts: Direct and indirect models. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(2), 557–575. DOI: [10.3102/0034654308330969](https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308330969)
6. Bhattacharyya, S., Kaur, J., Corpus, G., Lykes, M. B., & Heesacker, M. (2018). "There are many social evils... and only we can cure them": A thematic content analysis of privileged Indian youth's perspective on social issues. *Journal for Social Action in Counseling & Psychology*, 10(1), 2–23. <https://doi.org/10.33043/JSACP.10.1.2-23>
7. Bhuyan, K., & Manjula, M. (2017). Experiences of bullying in relation to psychological functioning of young adults: An exploratory study. *Indian Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 33(3), 240–247. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0971-9962.214604>.
8. Bickmore, K. (2006). Democratic social cohesion (assimilation)? Representations of social conflict in Canadian public school curriculum. *Canadian Journal of Education / Revue canadienne de l'éducation*, 29(2), 359–386. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20054168>
9. Bickmore, K., Awad, Y., & Radjenovic, A. (2017). Voices of Canadian and Mexican youth surrounded by violence: Learning experiences for peace-building citizenship. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 12(1), 26–45. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745499917699046>
10. Brantmeier, E. J. (2007). Everyday understandings of peace and non-peace: Peacekeeping and peacebuilding at a US Midwestern high school. *Journal of Peace Education*, 4(2), 127–148. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17400200701523520>
11. Brantmeier, E. J., & Bajaj, M. (2013). Peace education praxis: Select resources for educators and researchers. In E. J. Brantmeier, C. Lin, & J. P. Miller (Eds.), *Educating about social issues in the 20th and 21st centuries: A critical annotated bibliography* (Vol. 2, pp. 139–159). IAP.
12. Cornwall, A., & Jewkes, R. (1995). What is participatory research? *Social Science & Medicine*, 41(12), 1667–1676. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536\(95\)00127-S](https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536(95)00127-S)

13. Cunningham, J., & Ladd, S. (2018). The role of school curriculum in sustainable peace-building: The case of Sri Lanka. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 13(4), 570–592. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745499918807027>
14. Curriculum Documents. (n.d.). *School site documents*. New Delhi, India.
15. Das, P. (2008, September 13–26). Project Orissa. *Frontline, The Hindu*. <https://frontline.thehindu.com/static/html/fl2519/stories/20080926251900400.htm>
16. Dovey, V. (1996). Exploring peace education in South African settings. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 71(3), 128–150. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1492976>
17. Duckworth, C. L., Allen, B., & Williams, T. T. (2012). What do students learn when we teach peace? A qualitative assessment of a theater peace program. *Journal of Peace Education*, 9(1), 81–99. [10.1080/17400201.2012.664548](https://doi.org/10.1080/17400201.2012.664548)
18. Freire, P. (2007). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). Continuum. (Original work published 1970).
19. Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6(3), 167–191. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/422690>
20. Goulah, J. (2018). The presence and role of dialogue in Soka education. In P. N. Stearns (Ed.), *Peacebuilding through dialogue: Education, human transformation and conflict resolution* (pp. 55–70). George Mason University Press.
21. Hantzopoulos, M., & Bajaj, M. (2021). *Educating for peace and human rights: An introduction*. Bloomsbury Academic.
22. Jadhav, M. T. (2016). “Peace a reality or a distant dream”: A qualitative analysis of adolescents’ perception about peace [Unpublished manuscript/report].
23. Johnson, L. R., Mudryk, E., Kibanja, G. M., Drescher, C. F., & Malindi, M. (2023). Is positive youth development a pathway for sustaining peace in Tanzania? Predicting peace attitudes among adolescents. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 29(3), 225–234. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pac0000673>
24. Kaul, S. (2015). *Finding our way through together: Learnings from the Hum Kadam Education for Peace Initiative 2012-2015*. WISCOMP. <http://wiscomp.org/Publications/95%20-%2029%20-%20Finding%20Our%20Way%20Through%20Together%20Learnings%20from%20Hum%20Kadam%20Education%20for%20Peace%20Initiative%202012-2015.pdf>
25. Kidd, S. A., & Kral, M. J. (2005). Practicing participatory action research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52(2), 187–195. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.187>
26. King, E. (2018). What Kenyan youth want and why it matters for peace. *African Studies Review*, 61(1), 134–157. doi:10.1017/asr.2017.98
27. Kumar, K. (2017). *Education, conflict and peace*. Orient BlackSwan.
28. Kumar, K. (2022). Human and integral education: Educational paradigms from the Indian context that expand the meanings of peace and conflict. *Journal of Peace Education*, 19(3), 351–372. DOI: [10.1080/17400201.2022.2148639](https://doi.org/10.1080/17400201.2022.2148639)

29. Kumar, K. (2024). Critical peace education and critical hope: Co-researching with middle school students in India to imagine possibilities for social change. *Journal of Peace Education*, 21(3), 313–335. DOI: [10.1080/17400201.2024.2347207](https://doi.org/10.1080/17400201.2024.2347207)
30. Mandal, A. (2023). A critical analysis of the National Education Policy 2020: Implications and challenges. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, 4(7), 1971–1978. <https://ijrpr.com/uploads/V4ISSUE7/IJRPR15493.pdf>
31. Ministry of Education. (2020). *National Education Policy 2020*. Government of India. https://www.education.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/NEP_Final_English_0.pdf
32. Mishra, L. (2017). *Violence against girls in secondary schools of Mizoram* [Unpublished manuscript/report].
33. Nanda, M., Patel, J., Nath, S., & Ravindranath, S. (2025). Happiness in education from the lens of children: Photovoice of students in government-run schools in India. *Social and Emotional Learning: Research, Practice, and Policy*, 5*, Article 100103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sel.2025.100103>
34. National Curriculum Framework (2023). National Council of Educational Research and Training: New Delhi. Retrieved from https://ncert.nic.in/pdf/NCFSE-2023-August_2023.pdf
35. Nygren, T., Kronlid, D., Larsson, E., Novak, J., Bentrovato, D., Wasserman, J., Welply, O., Anamika, A., Bladh, G., & Guath, M. (2020). Global citizenship education for global citizenship? Students' views on learning about, through, and for human rights, peace, and sustainable development in England, India, New Zealand, South Africa, and Sweden. *Journal of Social Science Education*, 19(4), 63–97. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1281237.pdf>
36. Panda, A., & Gupta, R. K. (2004). Mapping cultural diversity within India: A meta-analysis of some recent studies. *Global Business Review*, 5(1), 27–49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/097215090400500103>
37. Pinar, W. F. (2009). The unaddressed “I” of ideology critique. *Power and Education*, 1(2), 189–200. DOI: [10.2304/power.2009.1.2.189](https://doi.org/10.2304/power.2009.1.2.189)
38. Ramakrishnan, S. (2019). Classified? The need to discuss discrimination in schools, The New Indian Express. Retrieved from <https://www.newindianexpress.com/cities/chennai/2019/sep/15/class-ified-the-need-to-discuss-discrimination-in-schools--2033871.html>
39. School Almanack (2025-26) School Policy, School Site, New Delhi, India
40. Smith, L., Davis, K., & Bhowmik, M. (2010). Youth participatory action research groups as school counseling interventions: professional *School Counselling*, 14(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759X100140020>
41. Smith, S. E. (1997). Deepening participatory action research. In Smith, S. E., Willms, D. G., & Johnson, N. A. (1997). *Nurtured by knowledge: Learning to do participatory action research*. IDRC, Ottawa, ON, CA.
42. Srinivasan, A. (2009). A survey of civil society peace education programs in South Asia. *Educational Policy Research Series*, 1(2), 1–74.

43. Thakkar, N., van Geel, M., & Vedder, P. (2020). A systematic review of bullying and victimization among adolescents in India. *International Journal of Bullying Prevention*, 2(4), 237–253. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42380-020-00081-4>
44. Wulf, C. (Ed.). (1974). *Handbook on peace education*. International Peace Research Association.
45. Zembylas, M. (2013). Affective, political and ethical sensibilities in pedagogies of critical hope: Exploring the notion of ‘critical emotional praxis’. In T. Henning & R. Strawson (Eds.), *Discerning critical hope in educational practices* (pp. 11–25). Routledge.

Appendix A

Reflection Research Group 2025-2026

Name:

Age:

Sex:

1. With our study being guided by a research question, ‘how do we nurture a culture of peace’, **describe what a ‘culture of peace’ means to you?**
2. As a collective group, below are some of the suggestions put forth by all of you. **Why do you feel these issues contribute towards nurturing a culture of peace?**
 - a. **Stronger Connectedness between Peers and Teachers**
 - Connectedness with teachers
 - Dedicated CTP’s (no academics)
 - Peer Education program
 - Flip classes with students teaching
 - Initiatives and workshops with student body
 - More time with smaller groups
 - Liberal topics, which include political awareness and social relationships
 - b. **Transparency in School Policies and Processes**
 - Transparency in election process of the student council
 - Discipline committee
 - Regular reports should be circulated to the student council and student body
 - Card systems (slips received), as envisioned in school policy, should be translated into action to hold any students who are bullying accountable

c. **Students as Decision-Makers**

- Creation of student societies towards international cultural festivals and celebrations
- Gender neutral uniforms
- Sanitary pad dispensers to be installed in washrooms
- Discussion on the pros of using social media in today's time

3. **How did this research process enable you to deepen your understanding of issues of peace and conflict?**

4. This project concluded with analysing school policies and presenting changes to the school leadership by incorporating your voices - **how does this further your own belief in impacting change?**

5. What action has been taken thus far, and **how will your collective efforts ensure their sustained implementation?**