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Abstract
In the literature, peace is often depicted in relation to conflict or war-affected areas e.g. the troubles in Northern Ireland or Colombia. By contrast, this study does not prioritise epistemologies of peace validated in spatial and conceptual spaces of ‘conflict-affected peace’, such as ‘everyday peace’ and ‘peacebuilding’. Instead, it has drawn attention to the possible polemologic vestiges of peace; and questions why peace is rarely investigated independently, and so often organised around encoded conflict narratives (Freire & Lopes, 2008; Gleditsch, et al., 2014; Stallworth-Clark, 2006; Van den Dungen & Witner, 2003).

Building on previous findings, the study has examined how young people understand peace as part of their everyday life, and how they understand their knowledge of peace as praxis. Influenced by participant action research, built around an original approach to photovoice, data were gathered longitudinally over two and a half years, from 21 inner-city young people (aged 15-24) in the Midlands, England. Using participatory photography, interviews, and dialogue groups, young people were offered genuine opportunities to take part and actively share their ideas and solutions for peace, both in and outside of the research. Throughout the study young people engaged with wider audiences speaking out about peace in their lives with their peers, families, professionals and senior management; and the researcher showcased their viewpoint to generate a groundswell of interest about peace, including curricula development, teaching, youth and community work, and consultancy.

The findings offer three key emergent themes. The first was characterised by how young people have understood peace as being more than ‘deficit peace’, characterised by non-binary peace, ahistorical peace, and change and peace. The second theme focused how young people understood peace as unreflexive and deliberate peace affirming tactics (PATs), consisting of how they spoke about their relationships to people around them, and how they are socialised into peace skills; and their deliberate and random tactics for peace as social coherence shaped by ideas of equality, respect, and social justice. PATs also highlighted the importance of participant’s self-initiated peace as self-regulatory and transformative; formulated as natural self-care, wellness, and coping. The third theme emerged from the participant’s concerns and aspirations for peace and illustrated how young people understood their knowledge of peace as self-representation and advocacy tactics (SRATs). SRATs carried messages about the importance of taking action for peace, such as ripple acts, voicing, and seeking a community response. SRATs also demonstrated how young people critically confronted their issues
of peace as critical literacy in the taken-for-granted-ness of their everyday language, and their everyday understanding of everyday life.

The study makes an original contribution to knowledge by shedding light on the ways young people understand peace, and what this means for the conceptualisations of peace in peace studies; and by giving careful attention to the continuum of peace as structure and agency in the minutiae of everyday life. Two, the study uncovers evidence of how young people’s knowledge of peace contributes to peace, and through a learning process in the context of research; that is, what young people do with what they know, which is rarely documented longitudinally. Three, methodologically, the thesis was influenced by Participatory Action Research and built around an original approach to photovoice (PV) to elicit young people’s perspectives and concerns. What is innovative is that it offered opportunities for participation within and outside the scope of the research, creating safe spaces for self-introspection, dialogue with peers, and for action by which young people engaged their communities. This thesis supports the idea that PAR can be a valuable tool in education, youth work, and peace work; and is ground breaking in its attempt to bring youth work, contemporary critical peace education, and public engagement together. The study has shown great potential for replicability, including engaging with significantly vulnerable communities, such as young people who are marginalised or at risk of violence.
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**Section 1 - Introduction**

**1.1 Chapter outline**

I am interested in the challenges presented by how we approach questions of young people and peace. This opening chapter will start by asking the reader to consider the problem of normative approaches to peace and universalised international instruments that act to promote peace. For instance, “Who constructs peace as an external and neutral entity?”, “Who speaks for peace?”, and “How are traditions of peace rooted in violence?” The chapter then considers how the thesis has been motivated by my prior experience, study, and commitment to issues of young people and peace. This includes my background in youth work, and my interest in critical peace education (CPE), influenced by the work of Galtung (the founding father of peace studies), and Freirean pedagogy as a mechanism to facilitate 'dialogue, consensus-building and active non-violence' (UNESCO, 2002, p.5). The chapter will end by bringing together some of these ideas to explore how they contribute a theoretical framework for the study.

**1.2 Introducing peace**

Peace can signify a journey, a condition, something that can be found, kept, broken and made. As a word, peace is dynamic, symbolic and descriptive. The significance of peace is shared through some of the oldest political, philosophical, religious and spiritual discourses in our history; often considered as something pertinent to the human condition (Beck, 2011; Dietrich, 2012). In keeping with these ideas, O’Brien (1994, p.85) suggests that peace shapes:

Rituals that are older than history: rituals of conflict avoidance, mediation, and conciliation, for example that may well have played a significant part, over many ages, in the survival of our species.

The Oxford English Dictionary [online] initially defines peace as, ‘Freedom from civil unrest or disorder; public order and security’ (2005, n.p.). This involves freedom from ‘quarrels’ or ‘dissension between individuals’, ‘anxiety’, inner and external ‘disturbance’, ‘conflict’; and ‘Absence of noise, movement, or activity’. In English, the word peace is derived from the Latin word ‘Pax’, commonly understood as a peace treaty or agreement for freedom, and the absence or cessation of war. This etymology is important as it contributes a paradigmatic order of peace in Western society, focused on the value of a ‘deficit peace’ i.e. that which is made up of the non-appearance or cessation of something else. In particular, this thinking has characterised peace research as a scientific attempt to understand ‘what to avoid’ (Rinehart, 1995) to bring about peace as the absence of war.
Alternatively, the word peace has also been used to communicate our sense of self and being (Diener & Tov, 2007). This micro-social value of peace emphasises concepts of harmony and tranquillity (Anderson, 2004; Rinehart, 1995), describing how peace can originate from within individuals. It accommodates psychological peace, cognitive peace, and emotional and spiritual aspects of peace, that unlike Hobbesian realism, can ask questions of peace and human agency which are not ‘fundamentally aggressive and conflictual, and the world need not necessarily be a threatening, competitive, and hostile environment’ (Rinehart, 1995, p.387).

It is difficult to operationalise peace as seen by the range of terminology that exists in peace scholarship e.g. liberal peace, institutional peace, constitutional peace, negative peace, positive peace, quality peace, just peace, elusive peace, conditional peace, cold peace, precarious peace, victor's peace, imposed peace, hybrid peace, Agonistic peace, and many others (Jarstad, et. al, 2019). In September 2013, derived from statistical analysis of over 4,000 cross-country data sets within countries and across the globe, the Institute of Economics and Peace (IPE) introduced the first empirical analysis of both qualitative and quantitative factors associated with peaceful societies. Variables included homicide, equitable distribution of resources, weapons imports, and acceptance of the rights of others. Such work displays the enormous breadth and unwieldy nature of engaging with peace as more than ‘just a utopian ideal’ (IPE, n.p.), but instead as some kind of ‘positive, tangible, and achievable measure of human well-being and development’ (ibid.).

An important commentary has developed in peace studies actively concerned with how the language and meaning of peace can be left unquestioned to represent a desirable process and a desirable state (Dietrich, 2012; Page, 2008; Mac Ginty & Richmond, 2013). The concern is that peace concepts can be interacted and reified as structures and processes that are taken-for-granted, with peace as an end-in-itself or its own justification. Page (2008) draws our attention to default ethical positions of peace that are inherently fideistic, whereby peace is pursued as an unquestioned moral and normative goal independent of reason. Theorists further challenge the mandate of who speaks for peace, such as Dietrich (2012), and Dietrich & Sützl, (1997), whose work illustrates the relativity and pluralism of the many ‘peaces’ existing across diverse cultural frameworks. Furthermore, critical peace education (Bajaj, 2015) and critical peacebuilding (Mac Ginty & Richmond, 2013) critique the homogeneity of prevailing Westernised cultures of peace as being a-historical, a-political, and deontological. Both approaches pay ‘close attention to local realities and local conceptions of peace, intending to amplify marginalised voices through community-based research, narratives, oral histories, and locally-generated curricula’ (Bajaj 2019 p.67). It is important to note the tensions and dangers presented by unquestioned or totalising narratives of peace e.g. Eurocentric, capitalist, and ‘Western modes of thinking’ (Bentz & Sapiro, 1998, p.57), which can impose normalcy of peace that is not congruent with social justice. I will return to these ideas later in this chapter.
1.3 The impetus for the study

My biography and professional experience have influenced my choice to do this study. I have experienced discrimination and violence, such as early teacher-pupil relationships, and experiences of misconduct and brutality during encounters with the police service in London as a young person. Numerous other incidents, and an awareness of the conflicted, unjust and inhumane disparities presented by global stratifications of privilege, opportunities, and right to life, have shaped my resolve about the essential need for social justice. This has motivated my practice, and for more than 33 years, I have been passionately involved with the theory and practice of youth work with teenagers, students, professionals, volunteers, educators, parents, and members of local communities, both in the UK and elsewhere. Such experiences inform and add value to the significance of the research.

Whilst recognising the value of other forms of specialist working, the tradition of youth work offers a 150-year tradition steeped in philanthropic guidance and support, education, and moral panics about the role of youth in society (Bright, 2015). A coherent approach to informal education, personal and social development, and issues of social justice (NYA, 2020), has traditionally distinguished youth work from other welfare activities. Youth work strives to keep young peoples’ needs and interests central to the learning process by being voluntary, educative, participative, empowering, and youth orientated (Alldred, et al., 2018; Davis, 2005). Put simply, it aims to enable young people so they can better the quality of their lives; and if interested, improve the lives of others (Batsleer & Davies, 2010; Ord, 2016). Yet, the nature and context of youth work are not self-explanatory, and it is undergoing significant changes in England in particular.

In a sea of ever-shifting positions, ministerial responsibility for youth work has recently moved from the Department of Education to a broader programme of ‘providing opportunities for young people’ (Civil Society Strategy, 2018). The state-funded statutory ‘Youth Offer’ no longer seems to have the traction it once had. State funding has been drastically reduced for youth work in England, and there is an emphasis on ‘youth services’ rather than ‘youth work’. A culture of commissioning, partnerships, joint funding, measurable outcomes, the value of service, and targeted impact, have all produced uncertainty about the future of local authority funded youth work (Davies, 2013, 2015). At the time of writing this, the Government is reviewing its statutory guidance and duty ‘to provide appropriate local youth services’ listed under the Education and Inspections Act (2006, s6.). Therefore, the potential for youth work as a ‘broader’ and ‘more universal’ offer, is not yet decided. In contrast, an All-Party Parliamentary Group for Youth Affairs (APPG) recently published findings on the role and impact of youth work, concluding that ‘Youth work can make a crucial difference to young people’s lives in their personal and social development’ (NYA, 2019a). Consequently, practitioners face new challenges working in increasingly diverse settings and...
contexts; often with competing expectations placed upon them by different stakeholders, including private and charity sectors, and businesses and philanthropists.

I am passionate about the type of youth work that can offer critical education, radical social change, and personal development, which is aimed at self-advocacy and empowerment (Cooper, 2018; Hurley & Treacy, 1993). Youth work is unique in that it is embedded in the everyday life of young people, and can respond ‘strongly to the moment’ (Smith, 1994, p.80). The potential of such practice is embodied in the relationship between the worker and the young person to:

Resolve problems through dialogue, with each other and as yet unknown others. (…) for young people to produce their own knowledge and understanding that did not always follow existing norms and values but were about transforming their ideas by learning to read the world differently. (Batsleer & Davies, 2010, p.37)

Drawing from the critically transformative pedagogy of Freire (1972) this approach has led me to open spaces for dialogue with those at the sharp end of social stratification and oppression. Importantly, it asks both young people and practitioners to be ‘critical and creative in their responses to their experience and the world around them’ (National Occupational Standards, 2014, p.3); and emphasises the connections between social systems and people. For instance, how structured violence and social harm correspond with the dominant culture, the power adults wield over young people, and who decides the type of society young people experience and inherit (Cooper, 2012; Salomon & Cairns, 2010). Such ideas correspond with critical peace education (CPE), defined by nonviolent confrontation, empowerment, and a commitment to creating a more peaceful society. It is an inherently political and unfinished practice (Davis, 2005).

1.3.1 Prior practice and research

Whilst employed with the statutory youth service in Staffordshire (1997-2008), I developed responses to social inclusion/exclusion with marginalised young people at risk. During this time, I recognised two trends. The first was that young people increasingly used violence as a means of amusement and problem solving; and secondly, an adult-led narrative of “gangs” had impacted on how young people self-identified, and contributed to altered (cultural and structural) expectations for how I “should” work with them.

The first of these trends coincided with the popularity of videos of young people fighting that were recorded on mobile phones and circulated by young people as entertainment. Also, new television shows like *Jackass* (2000), and *Dirty Sanchez* (2003), were mimicked by young people who “pranked” others, with the risk of getting hurt and causing harm. Then “happy slapping” appeared as a trend by which unsuspecting victims were filmed on mobile phones being slapped for the amusement of others (Shaw, 2005). When uploaded to YouTube (e.g. *Slap Happy TV*) these clips offered young people ‘15 minutes of fame’ (Harrison,
that mirrored the arrival of what came to be known as “reality television”. And ‘If caught, the defence was always the same: it was only a joke’ (ibid.). These instances of violence progressed from school bullying to the filming of vicious murders.

My second concern responded to the adult categorisation of certain groups of young people as gangs, and how this might be internalised and acted upon. In the early 2000s, the British media was riddled with headlines about gang lords, gang-related deaths, youthacide, and the lawlessness of inner-city youth (Helm, 2000; Thompson, 2000). At the same time it was reported that criminal gangs were proliferating as they moved from inter-borough to intra-borough sites (The Centre for Social Justice, 2009); whilst, the increasing popularity of “Grime music”, as a youth subculture built from the street, spoke about “crews”, and the realism of street violence. For instance, song lyrics by Grime artists, such as Dizzee Rascal (aka. Dylan Mills), included references to ‘Shottas, plotters, and HMP’ (Mills, 2003). Subsequently, a pattern of postcode identities appeared as representations for young people’s collective localised and shared identity. Each of these factors contributed towards reoccurring moral panic about young people's lawless behaviour, alarm about criminal gangs, and anti-social behaviour, influencing the first cross-Government Youth Taskforce Action Plan (Dept. CS&F, 2008); and changing the parameters of my youth work role.

In response, as part of my Master’s degree and national qualification in youth work in 2006, I explored how young people understood violence and peace in their lives. The study was qualitative and practice-orientated. Data were collected using focus groups with 14 social excluded young people (aged 13 to 19), in youth clubs in South Staffordshire, England. In addition to questions about violence, participants were asked “Have you ever made peace with someone?”, “How did you do it?”, “How do you think you can teach peace to young people?”. They were also asked to draw pictures of peace and to feedback about their drawings.

In summary, the findings showed that young people described actions associated with making peace e.g. ‘shaking hands’, ‘admitting where you went wrong’, ‘saying sorry’, ‘humility’, ‘making yourself smaller’, ‘taking time’, ‘cooling down’, ‘humour’, ‘talking’, ‘being willing to listen’, ‘having a cigarette’ and/or drink, ‘sitting down’, and being able to ‘make peace away from conflict’. These actions were situated e.g. ‘with parents’, other youths, partners, ‘with yourself’, with opponents in sport, strangers, with other groups of youths, and when violence was deemed inappropriate. The visual and verbal meanings given to peace became more multifaceted with age e.g. involving ideas of conflict, coexistence, equality, disarmament, human rights. And it was apparent that young women worded their pictures more. Overall, the drawings were primarily concerned with interpretations of peace that depicted people and their relationships; and a distinct physiology of peace emerged e.g. frequent images of hands, people, and smiles. Lastly, young people struggled to identify strategies for learning/teaching peace, as this was considered a personal pursuit.
Although, it was suggested that youth work should show young people what was ‘valuable’ about peace (Ogunnusi, 2006b).

In contrast, 13 demarcated typologies of group violence, personal violence, and environmental violence where identified; plus, the threat of violence, and a conceptual web of 11 causes and effects of violence, which were sub-cultured, gendered, and identified as ‘getting worse’. I felt the research reiterated what young people already knew about their intimacy with violence, whilst exposing their daily cycles of conflict escalation i.e. young people relied on ‘flight’ and ‘flight’ strategies that meant their conflict remained unresolved and removed from adults whose arbitrary messages they did not trust.

Subsequently, I published an article in 2006 based on my concerns. Later that year, I co-facilitated a group cultural youth exchange with eight young people from Punjab, India; and participants from the study had an opportunity to host the visitors, and perform their stories of peace during a joint event. This was followed by a 10-day multi-lateral exchange with staff from Bilbao, Palestine, Belfast, and Dublin. Three participants from the study attended, alongside young people from 10 other countries who identified as American, Basque, Spanish, Israeli, Palestinian, Protestant, and Catholic from Northern Ireland. The project aimed to tackle ‘borders to peace’, by building peace as a form of transformative resistance; helping young people to analyse conflict, and transfer this as activists in their communities. Built from their different perspectives and strategies, the activities recognised the ‘need to foreground difference and conflict as sources of learning and to learn to sit comfortably in the discomfort that this creates’ (Souza & Andreotti, 2009, p.82). Soon after this, I started freelancing and guest lecturing with community groups, volunteers, young people, and teaching staff across the UK and internationally e.g. The National Education Breakthrough Programme (Department of Health, NHS Institute for Innovation and Improvement), Calvados General Council and Caen Peace Museum. In April 2008, this work received an award for ‘Outstanding Contribution to the Community’ (from the Dept. CS&F).

All of these experiences have instilled a belief that:

Youth work revolves around a wide range of themes relevant to young people; from migration to active citizenship, human rights and sustainable development, interfaith understanding and gender equality, anti-racism, and social inclusion, as well as peace building and nonviolence. All these themes are, in one way or another, related to the topic of peace, and all of them have an intercultural dimension that should not be taken for granted. As youth workers engaging in different fields of action, this makes us powerful peace educators. (Peace Bag for EuroMed Youth, 2010, p.72)

Peace education draws from various legislative instruments, structures, and organisations. This includes the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UN General Assembly, 1948), and the United Nations Convention
on the Rights of the Child (UN General Assembly (1989, article 28-29). The latter of which states the need for children to have a right to an education that helps them 'to live peacefully, protect the environment, and respect other people'. Educating for peace has also been expounded by various bodies, such as the UN General assembly declarations and programmes for a Culture of Peace (UN Commission on Human Rights, 1998, p.3), and the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence for the Children of the World 2001 to 2010 (UN General Assembly, 2005). Such endorsements assert the duty of politicians, practitioners, educators, and parents to:

Ensure that children, from an early age, benefit from education on the values, attitudes, modes of behaviour and ways of life to enable them to resolve any dispute peacefully and in a spirit of respect for human dignity and of tolerance and non-discrimination. (UN General Assembly, 1999, n.p.)

More recently, in 2015, the UN Security Council (UNSCR) passed Resolution 2250 in recognition of the important role that young people contribute to building peace in their communities as part of international peace and security; suggesting they should be supported and developed through structures of ‘participation, protection, prevention, partnership, and disengagement and reintegration’ (UN Security Council, 2015, p.1).

In summary, my prior experience and commitment to peace have evolved and developed a critical approach to youth work that values peace in settings of informal education. This carries an interest in the attitudes and lived experiences of young people, a commitment to cultivating skills that spark new conversations and informed action, and transformative resistance.

1.3.2 The problem of youth peace

This section will briefly discuss the need to recognise and challenge social constructs that colonise young people including that which occurs within academia and the vocation of peace.

The definitions of young people are quite loose. The United Nations (1981) defines ‘youth’ as people aged from 15 to 24 years. This bridges a distinction between teenagers aged 13 to 19, and young adults aged 20 to 24. In Britain, the last definite youth policy, Positive for Youth (HM Government, 2011), dates back nearly twenty years and was aimed at 13 to 19-year olds, whereas the current Civil Society Strategy (HM Government, 2018) makes reference to 10 to 20-year olds.

There is a tendency for adults to dictate the social construction of what it means to be a young person. This has been culturally demarcated by a variety of ‘Age divisions and age-based vested interests and ideologies’ (Berents & McEvoy-Levy, 2015, p.116). Moral, biological, psychological, political, legal, and economic constructs have contributed towards the notion of a linear progression from childhood to adulthood, to
suggest youths are somehow incomplete and inferior. Traits such as having a fixed identity, being powerful, responsible, independent, and knowledgeable, are closely aligned to having autonomy and conforming to social expectations and responsibilities (Waiton, 2010; Wyn & White, 1997). This transitional youth status is infused with notions of young people as being “trouble” or “in trouble” (Roche, et. al., 2004).

Adult stereotyping and scapegoating actively dehumanises and pathologizes young people (Ardizzone, 2003) in labels and binaries e.g. contributors-inhibitors, perpetrators-victims, the future hope-the present insurgent demographic, etc. In England, the language of “yobs” and “gangs” have been stamped onto our common perception of teenagers, arguably more-so than their achievements. Moral panics reiterate how young people, especially males, saturate public spaces with acts of ‘intimidation, aggression, rowdiness, and ‘yobbish’ behaviour’ (DCFS, 2008). The inference is that youths are excluded from ordinary living patterns, customs, and activities - 'usually out of work, defiant of authority (…) and often aggressively reckless' (Power & Tunstall, 1997, p.9). Such ideas often translate into structures of consequence-based oversight and enforcement (Bawdon, 2009). Similar logic also informs the need to safeguard and protect young people by controlling “risk” and “risky childhoods”. Universalising potential problems as an approach to child welfare can homogenise young people as “disempowered”, “disaffected”, “disengaged”, “disenfranchised”, etc.; and create uncritical, discriminatory, and hegemonic conceptual repositories and related practices (Coppock & McGovern, 2014).

The youth problem is currently, but not exclusively, characterised by issues of:

- Inappropriate drug/alcohol use, underachievement, and withdrawal from work, study or training, Mental, physical and sexual health (Harris, 2001; Jeffs & Smith, 1999)
- Youthicide, whereby young people are stabbed, shot, stamped or beaten to death by a person, or people, of a similar age
- Counterterrorism and counter-radicalisation (Coppock & McGovern, 2014)
- Gang crime and County lines (Glover Williams & Finlay, 2019)

In England, young people’s agency, passion, and innovation is all too often buried under recurring themes of public space and safety, and arbitrary classifications of youth violence, offending and criminal behaviour. Consequently, we are told more about young people’s ability to “disturb the peace”, and “breach” or “break” peace, in comparison to how young people contribute to peace in our communities. Such narratives contribute to social oxymorons of ‘peacekeeping young people by force’ (Ogunnusi, 2006). Far from being a subversive underclass, or rebellious subculture, young people subscribe to similar dominant goals as adults (Williamson, 1997). Writers such as Honwana are keen to highlight the tenacity and innovation by which
young people develop constantly ‘new forms of being and interacting with society’ (2012, p.29) rather than against society. It can be argued that young people’s reality is shaped more by adult disaffection towards them than the opposite being true (Bloxham, 1993).

The problem of youth reinforces divisions between adults and young people in our communities. This realisation forms part of the theory of youth work practice; although, it is evident that the history of youth work and emergent youth policy continues to be shaped by a deficit approach to young people (Bradford, 2012; Bright, 2015). However, putting this to one side, there remains a tradition of youth work in England ‘based on a relationship with young people that seeks to be respectful, does not patronise them, and does not see them as not yet quite complete’ (Davies, 2008, p.5).

The following discussion will briefly introduce the origins of peace as the subject of research, and track how this has evolved to inform pedagogy and peace praxis.

1.4 Peace research and peace education
In the early 19th century, the scholarship of peace emerged as peace historians and intellectuals in Europe and America published and documented ideas opposed to war and injustice (e.g. Merle Curti, Arthur Beales). This included the ideological cross-fertilisation of pacifism, liberalism, socialism, abolitionism, suffragism, and feminism (Dungen & Wittner, 2003). Social campaigns for peace emphasised social action and education with a key message that poverty and inequality led to war. Other social movements included the First Pan African Congress in France (1919) with W.E.B. Du Bois, and Mahatma Gandhi’s struggle for truth (‘Satyagraha’) as part of Indian independence (1920-30s). In 1899, the first Peace College in North Carolina (USA) was formed.

During World War One (WW1), ‘War became an instrument to achieve peace, peace a future condition that justified the war’ (Mulligan, 2014, p.375). However, horror at the mass atrocities of World War One, prompted war scholarship (polemology), furthered by the international League of Nations and numerous academic institutions. War scientists (e.g. Lewis Fry Richardson, Pitirim Sorokin, Philip Quincy Wright) shared and published empirical research about the nature and causes of armed conflict (Dodonov et al., 2017). This work was informed by realist traditions about the intractability of violence and war, and ‘progressive’ liberal Kantian ideas of international peace achieved through state-centric world order. The field grew as International Law, and later International Relations (IR), concerned with treaties and accords for cooperation, collective security, and disarmament, as mechanisms to mediate national and international conflicts (Islam, 2013, Cortright 2008).
The inability of polemology to prevent World War Two prompted a more humanist and inter-disciplinary academic approach to international conflict and conflict resolution (Langholtz, 1998). This was spearheaded by the work of the Stanford group of academics in North America at Michigan University (e.g. Kenneth Boulding, Herbert Kelman, Anatol Rapoport, Harold Lasswel, Elise Boulding, Robert Angell, Stephen Richardson). The group founded the *Journal of Conflict Resolution* in 1956, which brought together academics outside of polemology and IR with a commitment to peace. Their work includes nationalism, war, law, political science, mathematics, social psychology and behaviour, economics, biology, physics, anthropology, sociology, and ethics (Islam, 2013). In Europe, Johan Galtung established the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) in 1959; and the first academic *Journal of Peace Research* dating back to 1964, and held the first chair in peace and conflict at the University of Oslo (1969). The PRIO is considered to be the earliest research centre dedicated to the study of peace with interest given to a global focus on security and peacebuilding, conflict and mediation, and later peace education. These North American and European academic movements signified the emergence of Peace & Conflict Studies (PCS) in the USA, Canada, and Europe (Langholtz, 1998). Galtung’s peace research is widely utilised as part of Peace & Conflict Studies within hundreds of colleges and universities (Wiberg, 2005; Barash & Webel, 2009). In the United Kingdom, this was led by the Lancaster Peace Research Centre with Lewis Fry Richardson (1959); and later the country’s first peace studies department at the University of Bradford (1973) with Adam Curle.

Peace Education (PE) was officially recognised in 1974 due to the campaigning of Betty Reardon who also pioneered the first Peace Education Center and Program at Teachers College in Columbia University (1980) i.e. through the Peace Education Commission (PEC) of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA) founded by Elise Boulding. PE is academically represented by *The Journal of Peace Education* (2004), which is sponsored by the IPRA. The journal covers a broad range of topics, such as conflict resolution, global issues, disarmament, environmental care, ecological sustainability, indigenous peoples, gender equality, anti-discrimination and racism, educational social movements, civic responsibility, social justice and human rights, cultural diversity, social futures, global citizenship, professional development, leadership and policymaking, adult life-long learning, mediation and reconciliation, non-violence, multicultural and intercultural understanding. A variety of international organizations and agencies, including the European Union, United Nations and the World Bank, have drawn on Peace & Conflict Studies to institutionalise the significance of PE and conflict prevention (Barash & Webel, 2009). PE continues to represent a key component of the UNESCO cultural peace programme; and the work of organisations like UNICEF, and international non-governmental organisations continue to campaign, publish and disseminate PE through global networks like The Hague Appeal for Peace Global Campaign for peace education (GCPE).
Next, the discussion will introduce certain ideas and theorists consistent with critical peace education (CPE) as a site of research and practice; and how such approaches have relevance for the sociology of everyday life.

1.5 Critical Peace Education

Pioneered by Betty Reardon, peace education is premised on Galtungian structural peace as a pedagogy that aims to challenge violence and advance peace and asserts the need for critical reflective inquiry linked to Freirean pedagogy (Reardon & Snauwaert, 2011).

Critical peace education (CPE) differs from PE in that its nature, content, context, actions, and corresponding impact are understood in terms of power orientated towards:

- Developing local human rights and participatory citizenship (Bajaj, 2008; 2015) that engages with local realities and conceptions of peace, and strengthens 'marginalised voices through community-based research, narratives, oral histories, and locally-generated curricula' (Bajaj, 2019, p.67).

- Teaching consciousness-raising, in and out of schools as dialogue for a non-violent transformative agency (Brantmeier, 2011, Bajaj, 2015, 2019). And to recognise schools and other sites as having potential for both marginalisation and transformation (Bajaj 2019).

- Offering pedagogues of resistance consisting of critical thinking and analysis; empathy and solidarity; individual and coalitional agency; participatory and democratic engagement; education and communication strategies; conflict resolution skills; and ongoing reflective practice (Bajaj, 2015, 2019).

- Scrutinising how the theory and application of CPE can influence structural and cultural violence, and resist uniformity of what is meant by CPE (Bajaj & Brandmeier, 2011) by engaging in dialogue with ‘critical pedagogy, postcolonial theory, critical race theory, and human rights education’ (Bajaj, 2015, p.157).

Contemporary CPE has offered the potential for new stories in peace studies and education that resist the status quo using knowledge and action (Bajaj 2019; Bajaj & Brandmeier, 2011; Diaz-Soto, 2005; Trifonas & Wright, 2013; Zembylas, 2018). It accepts our social sense of peace and justice and calls for a deeper understanding of the tension between agency and social structure ingrained in norms, power and order, and other structural impediments that perpetuate violence and diminish human rights and social justice. The idea is that change comes from within the affected community, prioritising marginalised voices and histories, through ‘disciplinary insights, critical analysis, and/or empirical research’ (Bajaj & Brantmeier, 2011, p.223). This includes why, how, and where, the learning is taking place.

CPE has recognised that social constructs of peace are not inherently consensual, inclusive, or innately peaceful (Trifonas & Wright, 2013; Zembylas, 2018). Dominant narratives or rules of peace are theorised as
being highly susceptible to, or intentionally manipulated by, experts and those most dominant in society (Mac Ginty, 2015; Mac Ginty & Richmond, 2013; Trifonas & Wright, 2013). CPE stresses the need for learners to ‘critically analyse power dynamics and intersectionalities among race, class, gender, ability/disability, sexual orientation, language, religion, geography, and other forms of stratification’ (Bajaj & Brantmeier, 2011, p.221).

CPE postulates that (Neo)Liberal constructs and legitimisation of Whiteness, Eurocentricity, authoritarianism, neoliberalism, democracy, development, pacification, etc., can be peeled back to reveal ‘functionalist, psychologised and often idealised perspectives’ (Bekerman & Zembylas, 2012, p.26). For instance, Western rationales for peace as the absence of war founded through the democratic process, individual human rights, and trade, have been shown to influence an orthodoxy of peacebuilding, exported and imposed across the world as an international, bureaucratic and top-down ‘external’ peace (Firchow, 2018). Peacebuilding is now generally understood to be homogenising and coercive if left unquestioned, especially as it can actively marginalise and disempower local knowledge and agency, which in turn increases the potential for the social reproduction of injustice (Mac Ginty, 2015; Trifonas & Wright, 2013). Some examine why we ‘attribute the term “peace” to states of affairs that are not truly peaceful’ (Sandy & Perkins, 2002, p.2) as being indicative of hegemony that influences and curtails our lives. Others are concerned about how peace structures, (cultures and industry) remain impotent in the global production of violence (Gounari, 2013), or actively collude with militaristic and war thinking states (Paris, 1997).

There is also an emergent consensus that post-critical theory, and the significance of post-colonial critical literacy, can cultivate a sense of transformative agency orientated towards peace as a social transformation that does not prioritise binary narratives (Baja, 2015; Pureza & Cravo, 2009; Zembylas, 2018). Such approaches encompass the hybridity of dominant and local marginalised narratives to consider ‘who describes peace, and how, as well as who constructs it, and why’ (Richmond, 2007, p.117). Similarly, global perspectives and global education, interested in ‘the elimination of conflict and dis-agreement’ (Andreotti, 2010a, p.11) have contributed a reflexive account of knowledge production and enactment as being complicated, historical and political, focusing on new solutions to North-South disparity, hegemony, ethnocentrism, Salvationism, and paternalism (Andreotti, 2012a). As an example, I have co-written about the significance of race, youth work, and global youth work for CPE, which discusses issues of agency, culture, identity, situatedness, and intersectionality (Sallah, et al., 2018).

By departing from traditional theories of resistance, contemporary CPE understands peace knowledge as ‘the possibility of imagining relationships beyond coercion, subjugation, and epistemic violences’ (Andreotti, 2011, p.18). These developing narratives complicate existing theories of CPE to move past simply
combining Galtungian peace and Freirean transformative agency. However, the work of Johan Galtung and Paulo Freire remains entrenched in the theory and practice of CPE and will be outlined in the following sections.

1.5.1 Galtungian peace
Motivated by Gandhian thought and other spiritual traditions, Galtung has interpreted personal peace as autonomy, voluntarism, self-realisation, well-being, and self-actualisation. As social practice, this includes ‘harmony (as emotional resonance and empathy); reconciling past trauma; (and) resolving present conflict’ (Galtung, 2017, p.3). However, Galtung’s theorisation of peace starts from a deficit position characterised by the proposition that the ‘stability or equilibrium’ (1967, p.12) needed for our inner peace is disrupted by conflict and violence which are built into the fabric of society.

Rather than a synonym for violence, Galtung (1996) theorised conflict as an incompatibility of goals. He proposed that conflict is comprised of deliberate and unreflexive physical actions, attitudes, and social contradictions in everyday life; all of which he suggested may provide opportunities for individual and social change. Galtung theorised that actor-based conflicts are escalated by behaviours, attitudes, and contradictions, each of which are rooted in the disparities of structure-based opportunities and access to fundamental human needs e.g. ‘security/survival’, ‘welfare/sufficiency’, ‘identify/closeness’, ‘freedom/freedom to’ (Galtung, 1978, p.14); and ecological balance (Galtung, 1990 p.292). This dynamic and conflicted relationship between agency and materialism is defined by Galtung (1967) as representing different levels (or spaces) of violence because it impedes human potential and realization. Subsequently, peace research, and the study of peace, has become a project focused on conflict (behaviours, attitudes, and contradictions); how to deal with conflict non-violently (through intervention and mediation); and the push for the ‘absence/reduction of violence of all kinds’ (Galtung, 1996, p.16).

Galtung names three types of violence. The first is direct violence, e.g. ‘events’ of war, rape, humiliation, often intended and visible. Second is structural violence that can be both manifest and latent e.g. ‘processes’ capitalism, racism, patriarchy. Third, is cultural violence that ‘invariantly’ legitimises and shapes the other two forms of violence. Galtung (1996, p.196) writes that:

The symbolic sphere of our existence exemplified by religion and ideology, language and art, empirical science and formal science (logic, mathematics) that can be used to justify or legitimate direct or structural violence. Cultural violence makes direct and structural violence look even feel right or at least not wrong.

Cultural violence can be understood as being overtly symbolic and hidden, to conserve the interests of those privileged by violence e.g. the rich in capitalism, the white/ness in racism, males in patriarchy. It eclipses
asymmetrical power relations, generating a sense of cultural cohesion i.e. as unquestioning acceptance and false consciousness, and so perpetuates injustice, inequality and brutality (Sallah et al., 2018). Examples for how cultural violence operates to normalise and legitimise oppression have been presented in the earlier discussion on the problem of youth, and the cultural imposition of peace(building).

The ability to transform conflict through non-violence forms the basis of Galtung’s theory at both actor-based and structure-based levels. The amelioration of violence presents opportunities for ontological peace, as a dichotomy between the ‘actual and potential state of the world’ (Hoivik, 1971, p.301). A negative peace typifies those spaces we inhabit that are removed from direct violence and the threat of violence. This is a ‘pessimistic peace’ (Galtung, 1996, p.4) that might not be able to prevent violence and is not always achieved by peaceful means. Negative peace does not necessarily contribute to those conditions needed for human potential and realization. Alternatively, Galtung’s work has popularised positive peace, as a break from polemology, representing a vision for peace as the development of social justice in addition to the elimination of violence. For Galtung, achieving positive peace is about building the ‘mechanisms that peace is based on’ (1976, p.297) in ways that become structured into society and self-sustaining. It is this call for structural and cultural change that has appealed to liberation theorists and CPE.

Given the significance of structural violence, and the insidious shared subconscious of cultural violence (Galtung, 2009), Galtung refers to a particular type of non-violent consciousness that is needed to see beyond the contradictions and legitimisation of violence in all of its forms. He proposes that:

Through consciousness formation and organization such conditions can be counter-acted precisely because any human interaction system is an open system. There is such a thing as increasing awareness; and one task of the peace researcher will always be to contribute to that increase. By no means can this be construed as an invitation to violence.
(Galtung, 1986, p.20)

In addition, Gandhian and Marxist thinking influenced Galtung’s (1985) references to nonviolent grassroot ‘confrontation’ and ‘struggle’ as mechanisms to challenge violent structures e.g. boycotting exploitative systems, and developing power sensitive social structures to empower and unite people both horizontally and asymmetrically.

Galtung’s work has had value for me as a peace educator and youth worker by presenting peace research as an unapologetic vision for normative social change that focuses on peace and social justice as the resolution of deeper-rooted structural contradictions of structural violence e.g. race, gender, sexuality, class, politics, military, economics and culture. More generally, Galtung’s work has diversified peace research. For example, writers such as Brock-Utne (1989) have added different levels for how structural violence can be
examined from a feminist perspective, demarcated as organised i.e. the response of the state, and unorganised i.e. micro-structures of violence located in families and communities. Galtungian peace has had far reaching significance for how peace is understood and taught as Peace & Conflict Studies, and how peace is engineered and mediated as part of international relations. Galtung’s theories have been adopted by the United Nations as part of An Agenda for Peace (1992) to include global issues of ‘freedom, property, security, and resistance to oppression’ (Kuźmicz, 2011, p.99). Yet, finding positionality in Galtung’s work is complicated.

Criticism of Galtung’s work includes ontological and epistemological concerns about his sociological underpinnings (Lawler, 1995; Rummel, 1979). He is criticised for both his liberal and conservative approaches, both of which have been challenged as being normative and non-critical (Brown, 1981; Dencik, 1982). It is not enough to assume that pragmatic pacifism can establish nonviolent confrontation, empowerment and the institutionalisation of peace structures. Galtungian peace was constructed using White, male, Westernised rationales and narratives, which are understood to disempower and dissipate local knowledge and agency (Mac Ginty, 2015; Trifonas & Wright, 2013). There are questions as to whether peace as an emancipatory project can be achieved when it is located in the ‘establishment’, including academic bodies (Fuller, 1992; Schmidt, 1968). Particularly, when this is seen to serve the dominant interests of those who maintain privilege; and the historical unwillingness of academics (Schmidt, 1968) to engage in the struggle of the oppressed. Similarly, how peace can be established in situations that are not peaceful, notably in social structures that do not carry the peace ideal (Paris, 1997), is problematic. More generally, Galtung’s concepts and terms of reference are critiqued for being too loose, all-encompassing and metaphoric (Barnett, 2008; Bonish, 1981; Boulding, 1977).

I also struggle with Galtung’s theory of violence as a measure for ontological peace, whereby peace is intrinsically understood as conflict-afflicted. This is a paradox that tells us to understand peace means we need to understand what peace is not. Furthermore, conflating developments of peace and violence in juxtapositions, or as variations, of the same thing will not necessarily account for the complexity of each as distinct phenomena (Rinehart, 1995; Anderson, 2004). Furthermore, Galtung’s earlier assertions that ‘personal violence is perhaps more 'natural' than personal peace’ (Galtung, 1969, p.179) relegates the urgency to understand peace in comparison to violence; and can be understood to reinforce realist and potentially hegemonic codes regarding how human beings are hardwired for violence rather than peace. Arguments for structural determinism require greater detail and synergy when gesturing, as Galtung does, towards transformative dialogue.
The next section will discuss Freire’s work with a focus on dialogue as being central to processes of transformative social change.

1.5.2 Freirean praxis

Freire’s work (1970, 1972, 1974, 1974a) has sought to encourage our natural ability to question and transform everyday life. Within CPE, Freirean problem-posing dialogue is presented as a mechanism to expose and reduce structural violence and bring about structural change developed from the ‘real day-to-day decision-making power’ of those involved (Cabezudo & Haavelsrud, 2013, p.9). For instance, Brantmeier (2011, p.357) offered a useful model for how Freirean pedagogy can be staged in practice, advancing from raising consciousness through to reflecting on transformative action:

1. Raising consciousness through dialogue
2. Imagining nonviolent alternatives
3. Providing specific modes of empowerment
4. Transformative action
5. Reflection and re-engagement

For Freire, this process is always political, as a deliberate challenge to the dehumanising effects of internalised and social oppression.

Freire’s theory is grounded in the praxis of how we understand ourselves, and our reality, based on what we know, how we act, and how we reflect on the world. Our humanity and social existence are therefore dynamic and open-ended. Importantly, for Freire, our social reality is conflicted by oppression. This creates limits to praxis by distorting how we see ourselves and our ability to transform reality. Oppression occurs with and without our knowledge or agreement and has effects that we might not be aware of. Consequently, the 'ordinary person is crushed, diminished, and converted into a spectator, manoeuvred by myths which powerful social forces have created’ (Freire, 1974a, p.5). Freire suggests both those assisting and suffering from oppression are dehumanised. The dominators do not regard themselves as violent, and the dominated find it harder to see the socially reproductive nature and extent of the violence that legitimises their oppression i.e.:

Whether or not the violence is expressed by drastic means. In such a relationship, dominator and dominated are reduced to things - the former dehumanised by an excess of power, the latter by lack of, and things cannot love. (Freire, 1974a, p.17)

Such ideas are very relevant to the impetus of this thesis. By positioning praxis as the historical truth of oppression alongside ontological unfinishedness, Freire adapts a dialectic approach to reject the ability of both objectivism and subjectivism to provide a full account of the tension that exists between the world and our conscious existence (Schugurensky, 1998). Instead, Freire (1972) contended that both are needed as part
of a unique pedagogy aimed at disrupting oppression based on dialogical, problem-posing, and conscientising.

Freire (1970, 1974a) theorised and applied (in Brazil, and other countries in the Global South) a type of dialogue rooted in being proactively committed to loving, humble, hopeful, trusting, and critical relationships. Freire makes a firm distinction between dialogue and traditional formal education. He criticises the latter as objectifying and dehumanising participants based on the division of teachers and learners as 'experts' and 'receptacles' of knowledge. Besides, this objectification of learners is seen to generate passivity, so contributing to the reproduction of social oppression; as it does not look to scrutinise praxis, power, and social justice. Freire suggests that a deepening of democracy built from horizontalized relationships can foster learning through dialogue. A situation that is grown and cannot be forced. Dialogue is a joint enterprise, described as ‘a meeting place’ (Freire, 1974a, p.133), for knowledge and critical consciousness. Both teachers and students are subjects in this process to uncover reality and create knowledge of the world to:

Develop their power to perceive critically the way they exist in the world with which and in which they find themselves; they come to see the world not as a static reality, but as a reality, in process, in transformation. (Freire, 1970, p.71)

Freire asserts that problem-posing dialogue can expose the hidden potential of a second reality, in which the oppressed, and those who oppress us, are transformed and liberated from oppression. In recognising praxis, we recognise our power to act in knowledge. In turn, this engenders a realisation that the world is not a fixed, or closed system. Subsequently, there is a deconstruction of internalised cultures of helplessness, hopelessness, inertia, and inaction that continue to be dehumanising (Shudak & Avoseh, 2015).

By acting ‘in’ knowledge, the oppressed can adopt ‘a stance of intervention’ (Freire, 1974, p.141), meaning how we change ourselves and others around us through continued dialogue; and to act collectively in response to the problems we are confronted with. This entails a specific transformation in consciousness, regarding how we know our ability to act and impact oppression, and represents the development of critical consciousness (or conscientisation) as distinguished from other forms of consciousness, summarised in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intransitivity or magical consciousness</td>
<td>Non-critical. Acceptance, passivity, inertia. Magic, miracles, cultural ideas of fate, and determination.</td>
<td>Non-active. Not self-determining. No response to ‘limit situations’ and so become an object of oppression. Social change is caused by powers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
or things unexplained, often deemed more substantive than human beings.

|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

As a political, educational, and philosophical theory, the work of Freire is difficult (Dale & Hyslop-Margison, 2011; McCormack, 2019; Zembylas, 2018). The work is underpinned by certain broad and non-critical assumptions. There are obvious issues of language regarding gender and class within Freire's emphasis on the culture of the oppressed. A decolonised reading of Freire requires more attention to be given to issues of knowledge, power, race, and intersectionality (Ahenakew, 2016; Brady, 1994; Hooks, 1994; McCormack, 2019; Zembylas, 2018). Freire's abstractions of critical progression/evolution/development carry dominant Westernised notions of rationale and consciousness that he used to denigrate Indigenous contexts of knowledge as being pre-rational. Similarly, renaming ourselves and others around us through continued dialogue need not be progressive, especially when this is understood locally to obscure and erode the significance of how local communities struggle to reinhabit and conserve their knowledge, power and place (Ahenakew, 2016; Bowers, 2008).

Freire’s arguments for progressive pedagogy, Marxism and liberation theology are also criticised for binaries presented in his work, such as banking education-dialogue, oppressor-oppressed, alienation-solidarity (Giroux, 1992; Schugurensky, 1998; Zembylas, 2018). It has been suggested that Freire's theory could benefit from a greater analysis of power as decentralised (Bartlett, 2005). Issues of power also include how coordinators of culture circles avoid imposing their will whilst recognising their role is never neutral; and the difficulties presented by being directive but not authoritarian (Schugurensky, 1998). Freire’s work also poses problems about who holds knowledge as a form of false consciousness, and how it is possible to liberate ourselves and our oppressors when we all occupy both roles at the same time. (Zembylas, 2018). In the context of peace, Freire was reported to disapprove of violence, but his work does not account for the value
of non-violence. Neither does it introduce parameters to reduce violence, or the duplication of existing oppression (Glass, 2001).

As a practitioner, a researcher, and an activist, I am heavily influenced and motivated by Freire’s work as a way to theorise my sense of self and action as a ‘transformative ontological tool’ (Morrow & Torres 2002, p.39). Dialogue is by its nature humanising and corresponds to Galtung's notion of peace as the ability for human beings to realise their potential. This depth of problem-posing can expose deep-rooted structural issues of peace, and barriers to peace referred to by Galtung as being 'hidden to the unguided eye' (2009, p.20). Freire’s work also informs how peace can be understood to inform a dialogic process that is humanist, hopeful, and caring, comprised of local human agency; and the ability of those inside the problem to disrupt the direct, structural, and cultural constructs of oppression. Ontological praxis and epistemological dialogue are key to the complexities of oppression/domination, feminism, post-colonial theory, critical race theory, and post-modernism.

As part of CPE, Freirean pedagogy can be developed using a post-critical lens (Andreotti, 2010, 2016) to examine how a ‘Third World intellectual’ can be situated in the privilege of the West (Giroux, 1992), and how Freirean pedagogy can be adapted to push against the dominance of Western rationality, comprised of how we think, word, and sense our reality (Andreotti, 2016). An interest in bringing silenced and overlooked narratives to the fore necessitates a recognition of heterogeneous knowledges that span ‘multi dimensional worlds’ (Ahenakew, 2016, p. 328), to include onto-epistemologies that are othered, minoritised, non-Western(ised), and indigenous. This calls for co/learners to deconstruct totalising narratives by moving dialogically between the distinctness and hybridity of our situatedness and social-historical contexts, including that which is invisible and ‘noticeably absent’ (Ahenakew, 2016, p. 333). Intersectionalities of oppression, such as Galtungian structural violence, can be analysed locally by engaging with our perspectives and those of others. And by being prepared to move away from the comfort of what we think we know, applying learning, and then re-enacting the process from ‘a new cycle of unlearning, listening, learning and reaching out again at another level’ (Andreotti & Souza, 2008, p.29).

Lastly, Freirean pedagogy is further complicated in the continuum of agency and structure in everyday life as being unfinished and incomplete. Therefore, how Freire’s work has been socially constructed and applied remains limited by knowledge that is intangible, unknown, unknowable. The following section will start to outline a theoretical framework for the thesis that prioritises the work and influence of Galtung and Freire and starts to synergise CPE and the sociology of everyday life.
1.6 Critical Peace Education meets Everyday Life

A recognised sociology of peace is still emerging as part of everyday life ‘in which ordinary, taken-for-granted, habitual social life is performed’ (Brewer et al, 2018, p.15). Rooted in the work of Galtung (1969) and Lederach (1997, 2005), current thinking is entrenched in issues of (post/armed/protracted) conflict and local indigenised bottom-up peacebuilding. The focus is on those who are victimised, silenced, marginalized, and neglected in peace processes (Berents & McEvoy-Levy, 2015; Brewer et al, 2018; Marijan, 2015). Such ideas will be discussed further as part of the review of the literature.

In response to the research aims, I am keen to examine how narratives of peace can be understood with attention given to the type of praxis that accepts that our social reality can be arranged differently as part of our everyday life. Additionally, I am interested in how young people might take ownership and disrupt existing peace narratives, as part of their situated knowledge and action of peace in their everyday life. This raises questions about how we navigate social space and social encounters, and the conscious and unreflexive responsibilities and nuances that are presented by the spaces we co-habit; and informs a need to be conscious of the everyday ‘in’ the everyday (Magnuson, 2009).

Sztompka (2008) states that everyday life is the only social reality that we authentically know. In a significant departure from the traditional sociological schism of individual and society, and voluntarism and determinism, Sztompka suggests our social existence occurs at ‘the level between structures and actions’ (2008, p.25). Moving away from the abstract interpretation of social reality, Sztompka (2008, p.2) relocates our social existence to the level of ‘people amongst other people, together with them, side by side with them, in cooperation, competition, conflict, or struggle with them, in love or hatred, but never alone, in isolation.’ He postulates that social reality ‘occurs nowhere else but in our everyday experiences’ (Sztompka, 2008, p.8). These ideas offer a useful conceptual site for this thesis.

I am particularly interested in how young people might understand peace as praxis in their everyday life, and how such practices are “regulated” and “regular” (and) collectively orchestrated’ (Bourdieu, 1977, p.72) to influence knowledge and acts, including that which might not occur otherwise. Freire (1970) and Galtung (1969) interpret the quest for peace as part of the self-inflicted and socially constructed, theft of our capacity for personal and social growth as self-realisation and self-reliance. Both theorists point to structural narratives designed to indoctrinate us and obstruct our ability to push against the normalcy and historicity of everyday life. In another approach to everyday life, De Certeau (1984) focuses on how ordinary people navigate spaces based on production and consumption, orchestrated through mundane, ordinary, and opportunistic everyday practices. This is important for De Certeau, as he posits that such practices can adapt and subvert everyday spaces that are by nature structured through ‘operations’ i.e. hegemonic powers
attempting to control our actions and organise everyday life for their own benefit. De Certeau (1984, p.14) describes our negotiations and incursions into spaces of everyday life as the ‘surreptitious reorganisation of power’. This talks of praxis as a diffuse agency, which is overt, silent, invisible and hidden, and works in defiance of hegemony. However, De Certeau concludes such agency forms the ‘polemology of the weak’ (1984, p.40) as it cannot gain traction and gather structural permanence.

Sztompka’s (2008) notion of praxis is also a relevant one. Yet, Sztompka rejects structural determinism and would refute claims that we can know the truth of reality. He suggests that the specificity, situatedness, and temporality of our social experience means we are subjects in a state of praxis i.e. both “being” and “becoming”. For instance, although, repeated, ritualised, and habitual, our social practices change depending on how we feel, when and where they happen, and who is involved. Sztompka acknowledges how the visceral nature of everyday life, like intuition, emotion, and physicality, intersects with the unpredictability and “one-offs” experienced in everyday life. Crucially, such factors can influence our freedom to act with the same potency as those structures which envelope us. Like Freire, Sztompka suggests that the praxis of engaging with social reality means that our reality is constantly being made and remade (Neil & Morji, 2015).

Sztompka’s (2008) work allows for an expression of peace as being structured in routines, relationships, and specific contexts, which involve different social spheres and levels of actors. This accommodates questions about young people and peace as being inherently embedded and enacted in the experience and action of everyday life. Crucially, this means peace ‘is no longer a lofty goal to be strived for elsewhere in the world; rather, it is viewed as an ongoing process embedded in everyday practices’ (Dutta et al., 2016, p.100). The non-reductive nature of Sztompka’s theory also provides a useful lens for the relativity and plurality of peace which can exist as ‘unrealized’ and ‘indescribable’, or ‘disjointed and, ultimately, disruptive’ (Mitchell, 2010, p.38). Compatible with the open ontological systems presented by both Galtung and Freire, and CPE, and rather than seeking the universalism of peace, Sztompka’s (2008) sociology of everyday life leans towards ‘relativism, seeing the ‘others’ in their specific circumstances of time and place’ (Van Der Pijl, 2009, p.96).

In summary, the synergy of the theories presented for Galtung and Freire as post-critical CPE, and Sztompka’s (2008) assertion of the importance of the everyday, extends peace as being:

- Visible, visceral, and emotive.
- ‘Cyclical, rhythmic (…) routines’ and rituals including cultural symbolism (Sztompka, 2008, p.10).
• Unconscious or not necessarily deliberate as part of ‘un-reflexive, deeply internalized scripts’ (Sztompka, 2008, p.10).
• Localised in both private and public space, understood as being socially contextualised in meaning i.e. even when we are alone, we engage in reflexivity.
• Temporal.
• Not defined by class, race, gender, although these intersect in the human experience, both intersubjectively, physically and structurally.

These ideas contribute a theoretical framework for my study and will be revisited throughout the thesis.

1.7 Summary

This first chapter has introduced certain themes and tensions that will be explored in the thesis and outlines some of the challenges presented by how we approach questions of young people and peace. It has started to position the research topic, by introducing my professional and theoretical approach to the thesis, with an emphasis on being purposefully power sensitive and critically distanced from totalising and oppressive narratives. My interest in exploring young people’s situated knowledge of peace in the wider context of language, knowledge, and power, is transparent; with CPE offered as a lens to value young people through dialogue. Lastly, the sociology of everyday life has been put forward as a means to help theorise the social construct of peace in spaces that influence and constrain us; lived and embodied in the fabric of our everyday experiences.

The following chapter will explore extant literature to show how young people have been asked about peace, outlining some of their responses, and investigating how such knowledge has been generated and interpreted. The chapter draws from developmental psychology, work with young people and youth work with an interest in peace education and peacebuilding, and PAR; to contextualise how the literature has documented young people’s understanding of peace. This will include how certain gaps in the literature have influenced and positioned the aims of the study.

Following a review of the literature, the structure of the thesis includes a methodology chapter, findings, discussion, and conclusion. The methodology chapter will cover the philosophical arguments and the values underpinning the research, the methods used, ethical considerations and practices to example power issues, exploration of the relevance strengths and weakness of the chosen approach with a consideration of reflexivity, and detail for data analysis. The findings of the study are then presented across three chapters with some discussion. The first outlines the stages of the research, young people’s first impressions of peace, and some initial peace concepts. The second introduces how young people understood and expressed peace
as part of their tactics in everyday life. And the third, examines critical engagement and impact, including young people’s self-representation and advocacy, and researcher-led activity. The findings are followed by a discussion chapter that will cover how the study has met its aims, giving an analysis of the findings, and an introduction to the Sociology of Peace in Everyday Life (SoPiEL). This chapter also reflects on the original approach to photovoice (PV) used for this Ph.D. and the benefits and challenges of the study. The thesis then concludes with a summary of the original contribution to knowledge, suggested outcomes for youth work, and recommendations for practice and further research, finishing with a reflective statement.
Section 2 - Literature Review

2.1 Chapter outline

As noted in the previous chapter, the meaning of peace is relative, subjective, and socially constructed across various historical and theoretical paradigms and assumptions. This chapter will provide a context for my research using a scholarship on how young people have understood peace. Preference is given to studies that have specifically asked young people “What is peace?”. The chapter maps challenges presented by the literature search and then looks at post-positivist studies rooted in developmental psychology; followed by ethnographic responses to young people’s understanding of everyday peace that have been shaped by concepts of contested space and everyday peace. The chapter will end by examining how gaps in the literature have influenced and positioned the aims of the study.

It has been challenging to map literature for a tradition of youth work in England that is interested in peace; and in particular how young people in England understand peace. In the literature, issues of young people and peace are often depicted concerning conflict or war-affected areas. The broader literature domains for young people’s conceptualisation of peace are typified in the diagram below (fig. 1) which includes youth work as a site for prior research in contested spaces and everyday peace. Extant literature straddles different sets of literature that are not entirely distinct or mutually exclusive. However, there is a common interest in the mitigation and prevention of direct and structural violence (Galtung, 1969), as well as how to deal with conflict non-violently.

2.1.1 Some challenges mapping the literature

Keywords were identified from the research question and searched for as word threads and combined search sets using electronic databases e.g. Google Scholar, Scopus, Research gate, plus the De Montfort University Open Athens (Shibboleth) account. I hoped to find literature featuring how young people have been asked about peace from a youth work perspective in England. More specifically, youth work that favours a critical peace pedagogy as discussed in the introduction. However, there was a tendency for the literature to describe youth work as a response to the problem of youth (chapter 1) i.e. ‘to establish boundaries around challenging behaviour, preventing and de-escalating conflict’ (NYA, 2019, p.14). An example is The Peace Pack (Chamberlain & Rogers, 1991) published by Youth Clubs UK, which regardless of the title, offered a response to conflict rather than peace.
Further searches of peer-reviewed journals were based on the criteria of whether their stated aims included 'peace', 'youth work', 'peace education', 'critical peace education', 'peacebuilding', 'youth', 'young people'. At least 18 journals included the word ‘peace’ in their title with numerous others having periphery relevance e.g. the Journal of Peace Research, Journal of Peace Education, Peace Review, Peace & Change, Journal for Peace and Justice Studies and Peace, Conflict and Development. Similarly, youth work was not catered for in any one particular journal. The London Metropolitan University’s Metronet listed 58 Journals in their ‘Youth Studies & Youth Work Library Guide’. Children & Young People Now is the official publication for members of the National Children's Bureau, and Youth and Policy is the journal launched by the National Youth Agency, the national body for youth work in England and Wales. Results generated heterogeneous literature, typified by concerns about contested spaces, conflict and violence e.g. international youth work, intercultural youth work, global perspectives, cross-community youth work, integrated education in Northern Ireland, community praxis, and restorative practices. Also, international youth work, global youth work, and humanitarian youth work, all offered tangential fields of theory and practice in England.

The most relevant literature was focused on young people and peace (as peacebuilding), characterised by conflict and post-conflict with topics that involved transformative dialogue, music and music education, reconciliation, sharing spaces, art, encounters, community relations, sports, political engagement, post-
conflict reconstruction, interfaith dialogue, and youth resistance. This literature responded to issues of conflict, violence, and war in Northern Ireland, Eastern Europe, the Middle East, and the Global South e.g. prior studies of youth work in Northern Ireland comprised a distinct professionalisation of how youth work is understood as peacebuilding (Grattan & Morgan, 2007).

This literature was reviewed further based on whether prior research reported asking young people about peace as part of the stated aims or methods. Supplementary key terms included: ‘youth[work]’ + ‘daily peace[building]’, ‘everyday peace[building]’ + ‘young people’ + ‘attitudes’ ‘narratives’ + ‘voices.’ Additional filtering was then created by searches for key theorists that snowballed using references to key texts, moving from one bibliography to another.

Providing an exhaustive account of the literature was problematic. When, or if, peace was titled, it was rarely included as an independent term. And when peace was identified as the object of study, it was normal for the publication to focus on both war and peace (e.g. Juhasz & Palmer, 1991; Lourenço, 1999; Myers-Walls & Lewsader, 2015; Spielmann, 1986). How young people understand peace was often associated with how they make sense of violence and conflict, and peacebuilding. Titles and key words did not always reveal whether peace featured as part of the content. Key terms were often used interchangeably and inconsistently across theory and practice. Consequently, the results were immensely diverse e.g. psychology, youth work and peacebuilding in contested areas, peace education in school-based communities, or international peace projects. Each of these had further possible associations with young people’s knowledge and experience of peace as community development, community work, community organisation, community action, social planning, community education, empowerment, capacity-building, peace and conflict studies, and so on.

Likewise, drawing comparisons across extant literature was also challenging. The breadth of research philosophy, methodology, data collection, and analysis, spans differing sample groups and research instruments e.g. interviews, questionnaires, focus groups, essay writing, drawing, photography, and participant observation.

2.2 Children and young people's responses to peace and war

2.2.1 The “scientific” peace concept

In Europe and the USA, the study of how young people understand peace has stemmed from peace psychology and its interest in children’s developmental understanding of war and peace. This is based on the idea that children constitute a vulnerable group, particularly in societies experiencing war and armed conflict. Research has focused on the structure and contents of children’s knowledge, and how and when this
knowledge was formed, in addition to the cognitive reasoning, attitudes, and behaviour associated with such knowledge. Costin’s (2006) overview of children and young people’s developmental issues regarding peace and war is structured into typical topics that include:

- Young people’s attitudes and understandings of war and conflict.
- Attitudes to nuclear war.
- Children and adolescents as peacemakers.
- Child soldiers.
- The impact of violent conflict on psychological development (general & trauma)
- Refugee children.
- Crisis-ridden locations (The Balkans, The Middle East, Northern Ireland, African countries, and South America).
- The USA.

Key concerns have focused on children’s and adolescent’s attitudes about specific wars, their understanding of war, political attitudes, trauma and the psychological effects of conflicts and violence; and peace education as the ‘definition of universal and contextual developmental prerequisites for peacebuilding’ (Lourenço 1999, p.95). The developmental lens aims to find a scientific significance for children’s conceptions of peace and war, and what they mean psychologically, when tested against variables such as:

- Internal (fundamental, essential, or fixed) categories such as age, gender, and children's cognitive abilities.
- The development of interpersonal understanding or role-taking abilities.
- Response to major events in society.
- Changes in the social environment.
- Socio-cultural differences between countries and socialisation agents.

(Adapted from Smith, 2006 p.61)

Early work was steered by differing applications of a Piagetian quantitative model of cognitive development (Álvik, 1968; Cooper, 1965; Haavelsrud, 1970; Mercer, 1974; Rosell, 1968). Later studies looked towards social-cognitive developmental to examine the conceptualisation of peace and war as something derived from social experience and socio-cultural roles (Hakvoort & Oppenheimer, 1993; Lourenço, 1999; McLemon & Cairns, 2001; Mohammad, 1996; Oppenheimer & Kuipers, 2003; Trebjesanin, et al, 2000). This involved issues of socialisation, exposure to war, and ‘political ideologies, institutional practice, social conventions, norms and traditions’ (Hägglund, 1999, p.193). More recently, the sociocultural approach to young people’s development has included the work of Vygotsky (Lewsader & Myers-Walls, 2017; Myers-Walls & Lewsader, 2015; Özer et al., 2018).

A consensus in the literature tells us that children and young people understand peace. How these concepts are reported has tended to follow adaptations of the nine key responses identified by Hakvoort (1996) listed below:
Table 2: Peace Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Missing</td>
<td>No conception of peace, not classifiable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Positive emotions</td>
<td>(a) Individual level: Happiness, love, joy, happiness, being friendly. All soldiers are friends, love in the world, economic and Commercial collaboration. (b) Macro level:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The negation of war or the negation of war activities</td>
<td>(a) Individual level: Absence of quarrels, absence of quarrel activities, conflict resolution. Absence of war, war activities, and hostility; cooperation between nations, quietness, stillness, calm, inactivity, ceasefire. (b) Macro level:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Disarmament</td>
<td>No (nuclear) weapons, no army.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Humane Attitudes</td>
<td>(a) Presence of: Respect, tolerance, no discrimination, acceptance, justice. Lack of the above. (b) Absence of:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Hakvoort, 1996; Hakvoort & Oppenheimer, 1993; Smith, 2004)

Other examples of how the peace concepts of children and young people have been categorised are listed in Appendix 14: Table of Studies with Children & Young People. The country, age of participants, and method of data collection have also been included to add detail.

Cooper undertook one of the first studies in 1965. He studied 300 English and 113 Japanese children and young people using word associations, open-ended questionnaires, and interviews. He concluded that children pass through developmental stages that cause ‘significant age trends’ for how they intellectualise peace and war; and that by the age of 7-8 children have ‘well defined ideas’ of peace and war (Cooper, 1965, p.3). His findings suggested peace was conceptualised as:

- Inactivity (freedom from stimuli, tranquillity, relaxation, silence)
- Respite (end to hostility, no fighting, no war)
- Sociable activity (friendship)
- Reconciliation (avoiding war, sustaining international peace).

(Adapted from Cooper 1965, p.4)

Three years later, Ålvik (1968) gathered data from drawings, word association, and interviews with 114 children and young people from different socio-economic levels, using Piaget’s ideas of cognitive reasoning to interpret his findings. He confirmed that children were able to define concepts of war and peace by the age
of 8. Children were reported to ‘know much more about war than about peace’ (1968, p.171), and that the (Norwegian) participants held negative peace concepts. It was concluded that the children focused more on the concrete aspects of war as ‘weapons’, ‘fighting’, ‘killing’, ‘dying’, compared to ideas of peace as ‘inactivity’ and ‘respite’. Socio-economic background was understood to influence findings, with middle class parents seen as ‘deciphering’ wider perspectives of peace for children. Ålvik asserts that young people’s knowledge and conceptualisation of peace can remain undeveloped if adults provide ‘too little information and explanation concerning what lies at the bottom of conflict conditions on the personal and intergroup level’ (1968, p.173). Without this, he suggests that young people’s concepts of peace can remain ‘inactive’ and distanced from their ‘general sphere of interest’ (1968, p.173). Ålvik’s work asserted the need for adults to do more to stimulate children’s abstract interest in peace.

Peace concepts are shown to become increasingly multifaceted with age, moving from children’s negative constructs of peace as the absence of war, to more developed positive peace concepts in adolescence e.g. coexistence, equality, disarmament, human rights, pollution, etc. (Haavelsrud, 1970; Hakvoort & Hagglund 2001; Hakvoort & Oppenheimer 1993; McLemon & Cairns 2001; Myers-Bowman et al., 2005; Oppenheimer & Kuipers, 2003; Souza et al., 2006; Walker et al., 2008). It is agreed that the conceptual concreteness of weapons, soldiers, killing and death, is articulated earlier by children than the abstracted norms and of prosocial ideas and behaviours associated with peace e.g. sharing, being kind, friendship, non-violent conflict, and de-escalating conflict (Ålvik, 1968; Cooper, 1965; Covell et al., 1994; De Souza et al., 2006; Hakvoort, 1996; Hakvoort & Hagglund 2001; Hakvoort & Oppenheimer, 1993; Özer, et al, 2018; Myers-Bowman et al., 2005; Raviv, et al., 1999; Walker et al., 2003). In the absence of peace, children and young people were still reported to be able to answer about war (Hakvoort & Oppenheimer, 1993), contributing to the definition of peace as a ‘second-order phenomenon’ used by children to describe avoiding/reducing the primary phenomenon of war (Lourenço, 1999).

In some cases, there was a gap of several years from a mean age of six years old (Hakvoort, 1996), until the age of 12, with peace shown to remain vague and more imaginary, rather than real life (Rosell, 1968; Yılmaz, 2018). As an example, Raviv, et al. (1999) wrote about the tendency for children to stare blankly, or remain inactive when asked to “play peace” compared to their vivid activity when playing war. Children’s concepts of peace were also considered to be more passive than those of war e.g. a ‘state of stillness’ (Hakvoort & Oppenheimer, 1993, p.70) rather than ‘something which must be actively obtained and maintained’ (Ålvik, 1968, p.171). Therefore, a consensus has appeared in developmental studies for the conceptualisation of peace as something that is less defined in children and young people’s intentions and actions (Sarrica & Wachelke, 2010) across different settings e.g. with former-East German children (Falk & Selg, 1982) and Canadian children (Covell et al., 1994). Although, Hall (1993) did not support this.
The work of Juhasz & Palmer (1991) offers a fairly unique qualitative study focused specifically on young people’s perceptions of peace and peacefulness influenced by cognitive development theory (Vygotsky, 1978). The study included 126 participants aged 13-14 from Australia, Canada, and the USA, who responded in writing to a questionnaire. The written questions asked, “What do you think when you hear the word peace?”, “How would you define peace?”, and what changes would make the participants propose to make their lives more peaceful. The questionnaire also included a written response to the statement “Peace in society depends upon peace in the family”. Juhasz & Palmer (1991) used thematic analysis to described three themes centred around feelings (inner joy, happiness, calm and tranquil atmosphere); relationships (‘sharing, caring, understanding, cooperation, and harmony’ (p.851) in families and between USA and Russia; and negative peace responses (‘no fighting, killing, violence, war, hatred, conflict’) (p.852). It was reported that war was seen as a threat to peacefulness, as was fighting and violence located in the family, the ‘neighbourhood’, and the world. Also, the production of arms, gang activity, and violence on television were mentioned as particular concerns for participants. The suggested changes for peacefulness made by participants included self-awareness and eliminating conflict, the role of families in fulfilling the young people’s needs for others, and having social consciousness. An example, a young person was quoted as saying ‘Peace with self depends on self; you and only you can make yourself feel at peace’ (Juhasz & Palmer, 1991, p.852). Juhasz & Palmer stated that participants prioritised solutions rooted in interpersonal interactions at micro and meta-levels for ‘compromise’ and ‘cooperation’. These comprised of talking to people about problems with empathy, calmly, to agree, meet needs, and work together. It was also reported that young people believed a change of attitude was needed for peace that included their moral opposition to war. An example was given in which a young person stated that ‘Politicians if they wanted could make peace tomorrow’ (Juhasz & Palmer, 1991, p.852). In concluding, Juhasz & Palmer (1991, p.855) were struck by how the participant's comments revealed a ‘deep emotional response’ to the topic of peace.

Studies have shown that children’s attitudes and behaviours of/for peace and peace knowledge are impacted by their relationships and their social environment e.g. family, community, friends and school; as well as media, religion, and political environment (Álvik, 1968; Covell et al., 1994; Haavelsrud, 1970; Havoor, 1996; Havoort & Oppenheimer, 1999; Rosell, 1968). As an example, Rosell (1968) looked at how children internalised negative peace culture, while others have examined cultural differences (Dinklage & Ziller, 1989; Hakvoort & Oppenheimer, 1998). Hakvoort & Oppenheimer’s (1993) work adopted a model of social-cognitive development with an increased focus on social experiences, interpersonal relationships, and sociocultural differences. This work has informed research from the 1980s to the 1990s (Covell et al., 1994; Dinklage & Ziller, 1989; Falk & Selg, 1982; Hall, 1993; McCreary & Palmer, 1991; McLernon, et al., 1997; Mohammad, 1996; Spielmann, 1986). Such studies interpreted the significance of the social environment
based on children’s exposure and proximity to war, which was shown to alter how children conceptualise peace (Cooper, 1965; Covell, et al., 1994; Coughlin, et al., 2009; Havoort, 1996, Havoort & Hagglund, 2001; McLernon & Cairns, 2001; Spielmann, 1986). Cooper (1965) found that English, compared to Japanese, children did not prioritise the negation of war or positive human emotions on a macro level. Dinklage & Ziller (1989) reported that, when interviewed about their photographs of peace and war, German participants, in comparison with children in the USA, were shown to place greater importance on war as being destructive, and emphasised interpersonal relationships as the close associations between peace and people. Alternatively, when McCreary et al., (1991) studied war and peace concepts with children and young people in Australia, Canada, and the USA, they reported no difference between countries. Instead, they found different localisms for how peace intersected with the environment shaped by cultural attitudes of patriotism (USA), and responses to structural peacekeeping (Canada). In other work, Braun-Lewensohn, et al., (2014, p.8) reported that experiences of direct violence generated militant and realist fatalism with young Jewish adolescents who expressed there was ‘no way to achieve peace.’

In war, violence, and post-conflict, children are reported as defining peace as the absence of war or ceasefire, which, as stated, positioned peace as a second-order phenomenon (Lourenço, 1999). The literature has also indicated the young people’s desire for “normality” as something found in everyday life (McLernon & Cairns, 2001; Myers-Bowman et al., 2005, Özer, et al., 2018). For instance, in a study of 4 to 13-year-olds from Belgrade and Subotica, Serbian participants spoke about the value of peace as ‘when people live, when they are happy, when buildings are not destroyed’, and ‘when there are no electricity shortages’ (Trebjesanin, 2000, p.371). They also reported a wish for freedom, quiet and daily activities, such as playing, going to McDonalds, and the zoo. Similarly, for young people in Turkey, including those inhabiting a Syrian refugee camp, ‘peace meant simply being able to play, have food, have schools that were not destroyed and have a normal, safe life’ (Özer, et al., 2018, p.69). This is echoed in Israel, by young Palestinians, who prioritised peace as freedom of movement, rather than interpersonal non-violence or intrapersonal tranquility (Spielmann, 1986). The study also demonstrated how specific lived experiences (such as a visit from the Egyptian president) could dramatically change how the participants understood the construction and possibility of social peace. Such findings start to offer an important insight into the situational factors for how children give meaning to peace (Raviv, et al, 1999). This will be revisited later in this chapter to suggest that concepts of peace are incomplete without context.

Referring back to Galtung’s (1969) work (chapter 1), it would be possible to conclude that all children conceptualise peace within cultures of violence (Cairns, et al., 2006); including how children understand war as a practical strategy to achieve peace (Biton & Salomon, 2006; Lourenço, 1996). However, Law, et al., (2014) offered an alternative narrative situated outside a Western paradigm within the context of
Globalisation, in which 10 young peacebuilders, aged 18-29, were interviewed in Southeast Asia to examine their conceptualisation of peace. The work evidenced a shared sense of personal and cultural peace derived from what participants described as the lack of inter/national militarism and war. This was articulated as having traditional significance in their everyday life:

Laos is a peaceful country because Lao people are sensitive, have empathy, are sympathetic, and like to help other people by nature. These make Laos a liveable place. We don’t initiate conflicts with other countries... this seems to refer to our specific historical past; we like to go to temple to meditate. (Law, et al., 2014, p.115)

The work of Law, et al. (2014) adhered to Galtung’s positive and negative peace concepts, but is divergent as it disrupts standardised patterns of micro/macro peace and the significance given to peace evidenced in and through a Western developmental lens.

To bring this section to a close, there were discrepancies in the literature about gender differences. Traditionally, boys were considered to be more concrete in their understanding of war, and the objects and activities that make up war (Cooper, 1965; Fargas-Malet & Dillenburger, 2014; Hakvoort & Oppenheimer, 1998; Hall, 1993; McLernon & Cairns, 2001). It was also suggested that peace is more likely to elicit a ‘sensation of dullness, no excitement’ for boys (Hakvoort, 1996, p.2). Girls are seen to be less tolerant of war and its consequences, and more pacifist (Hakvoort & Oppenheimer, 1993; Hall, 1993). During violence, anxiety was said to be increased in young women (Braun-Lewensohn, et al., 2014). Girls are also reported to exhibit greater expression of feelings and value interpersonal relationships more, including their conflict behaviour (Haavelsrud, 1970; Halvoort & Oppenheimer, 1993) to correspond with processes of socialisation (family, education, media) and gender identity and roles (Covell, et al., 1994).

The next section will review the developmental peace concept.

2.2.2 Reviewing the “scientific” peace concept

The research considered so far has favoured objective analysis and the search for universal truths about the nature and occurrence of peace knowledge. This presents several challenges. As part of their systematic review of 21 developmental studies, Hakvoort & Oppenheimer (1998) questioned the relevance of early Piagetian conjecturing and argued for a more developed and coherent approach regarding how theory is applied. They queried how standardised questioning is replicated from earlier work, a trend which is continued e.g. Fargas-Malet, & Dillenburger, 2014; Özer, et al, 2018; McLernon & Cairns, 2001. Also, Hakvoort & Oppenheimer scrutinised the bias presented by how questions were structured, concluding that questions of war outnumbered those about peace. They also examined how questions were communicated during data collection. For instance, when Covell et al., (1994) used free associations they generated one-
word responses to the question of peace that were not investigated further. Hakvoort (1996) had already recognised the need for researchers to be active as part of the research process to obtain fuller responses about the concepts of war and peace, in accordance with participant’s verbal abilities and fluency. Hakvoort & Oppenheimer (1998) further asserted the need for researchers to be active, to probe and engage with participants for complexity, rather than falling back on reductionist and stereotypical responses.

Regarding issues of reliability, validity, and verification, Hakvoort & Oppenheimer (1998) also questioned how different levels of reasoning are observed in the variations between rigidly standardised data collection and that which is open ended (Covell et al., 1994; Hall, 1993), or combined questions with other activities, such as drawing (Fargas-Malet, & Dillenburger, 2014; Jabbar & Betawi, 2019; Yılmaz, 2018; Walker et al., 2003). Hakvoort & Oppenheimer (1998) also questioned how findings were analysed, and whether this was methodically consistent across studies. Early research has been shown to interpret the absence of ‘concreteness’ or ‘activity’ in peace concepts as negative peace. Responses about personal ‘tranquillity’, ‘quiet’, and ‘silence’, were analysed as being ‘passive’ and ‘empty’, and so potentially dismissed as being devoid of ‘noteworthy qualitative transformation in adolescent attitudes’ (Mercer, 1974, p.247). Lourenço (1999) went even further, stating that ‘It seems that peace researchers assume that peace consequences are negligible outcomes, and hence, that their attention should be directed to the outcomes of conflict and war’ (pp.97-98). Furthermore, Lourenço (1999) refuted the asymmetry given to peace and war in everyday life. He used the classifications produced by the Hakvoort & Oppenheimer (1996) to demonstrate that children understood peace as an absence of war, yet war was not articulated as the absence of peace. Similarly, war was understood as something undesirable more frequently than peace was expressed as being desirable. Paradoxically, whilst reaffirming the binary significance of how peace is structured in concepts of war, Lourenço still managed to highlight inconsistencies with oppositional and reductionist notions of war and peace. These trends contribute a broader discourse about how the impact of peace binarism is conceptually neglected within peace research.

It is important to note that Hakvoort & Oppenheimer (1993) and Haavelsrud (1987) proposed early links between the ‘everyday’ significance of peace, peace education, and dialogue; heralding a need for ‘strategies to attain peace from an everyday perspective’ (Hakvoort & Oppenheimer, 1993, p.65). Hakvoort & Oppenheimer (1993) concluded that when participants located peace in their everyday situations their responses were more ‘salient’ (p.72). Such ideas are picked up by Vriens (1999), who offered a useful second review of literature, charting trends such as the nuclear fear of the 1960s to the 1970s, which peaked in around 1980 to 1988. Vriens’s review valued the arrival of a more holistic and interpretive approach in the late 1980s, which she described as a ‘step aside from adult meanings and presuppositions in favour of taking the child’s own experiences and utterances seriously’ (1999, p.43). Such ideas are very pertinent as they
move away from the objectification of participants and their knowledge, and strive to keep their voices central in peace research. Again, these ideas are incredibly significant for my study (chapter 1) and will be revisited later in this chapter.

The third review of the literature by Smith (2004) was more critical. By revisiting his involvement with research in Northern Ireland (McClernon, Smith & Cairns, 2001), Smith hoped to disrupt a natural science paradigm. McClernon, Smith & Cairns (2001) asked 809 children (aged approx. 7-11) in Northern Ireland to write a short poem in their school classes entitled “What Peace means to me”, and then analysed the children’s poetic narratives against categories adapted from the earlier work of Hakvoort & Oppenheimer (1993). The results identified the following peace concepts in the children’s responses:

- War-related images
- Religion/church
- Material related
- Nature
- Colours associated with peace
- Positive emotions at an individual level
- Positive emotions at a global level
- Negation of war at an individual level
- Negation of war at a global level
- Disarmament
- Freedom for the [political] prisoners in prison in Northern Ireland and England
- Human attitudes
- Universal rights,
- Positive evaluation of peace
- Negative evaluation of peace
- Reference to paramilitary groups
- Ceasefire

(Adapted from Smith, 2004, p.66)

On reflection, Smith stated that the research reaffirmed existing narratives about how children understood peace. For instance, war was interpreted as the primary phenomenon; girls were seen to ‘express positive emotions on an individual level more than boys’ (2004, p.66); and there was partial confirmation that ‘older children would use a greater number of more varied images to describe peace’ (Ibid.). He states how such findings constituted an oversimplification, produced by objective and post-positive assumptions about standardised questionnaires and interviews as fixed measurements and designs. Smith’s account rejects ontological realism and the premise that it is possible to universalise human experiences in essentialist and determinist categories, such as gender and age. Smith acknowledged the necessity for interaction and interpretation rather than ‘an assumption that subjects were interpreting the issue in the same way as the researcher’ (2004, p.69). Such post-positivist assumptions become even more tenuous when researchers openly assume their expertise has enabled them to think deeper on behalf of the participants e.g. Dinklage & Ziller (19890 explained their interpretation of data as an analysis which existed ‘below [i.e. beyond] the level
of awareness of the group members’ (p.309, my italics). Smith’s review concluded by stating a need to focus more on ‘the socially grafted tools of language and communication’ (2004, p.67) as a method to explore the nuanced complexity of the world. For Smith, this included an awareness of social interaction and a greater acknowledgement of how the research is experienced by participants, and their interests, as part of a normative commitment to social peace.

Smith’s (2004) work critically engaged with how trends and patterns identified in the scientific approach to peace and war, and how children and young people’s conceptualisation of peace (and war), are enveloped in subjective and cultural expectations of those conducting the study. The next section will offer some background to how questions of young people and peace have been approached from an interpretivist paradigm, which prioritises young people’s agency for peace. This includes settings of youth work that have valued peace (education/building) as a mechanism for change, to educate and empower young people in contested and divided social environments.

2.3 Contextualising young people’s understanding of peace

In the last 20 years, participative and increasingly ethnographic research has responded to calls for a fuller dialogue about how peace is understood and achieved by children and young people (Haavelsrud, 1987; Hakvoort & Oppenheimer, 1993; Smith, 2004; Vriens, 1999). It is a heterogeneous literature with varying applications of constructivist (e.g. McEvoy, 2000) and critical theory (e.g. Berents & McEvoy-Levy, 2015; Dutta et al., 2016). Rather than looking for peace knowledge as an object category or absolute truth, the literature shares a common interest in young people’s voices and youth agency. This has relevance for CPE and the sociology of everyday life as ways to develop a deeper understanding of peace and its ‘contexts of use’ (De Certeau, 1984, p.34).

2.3.1 The “peacebuilding” peace concept

McEvoy (2000) offered one of the first responses to the premise that peace research can inform peacebuilding dialogue and education about what peace means to young people from a youth perspective. Focus groups and self-completed written questionnaires were used to collect data in six urban and rural schools in Post Accord Northern Ireland with 58 young people (aged 12 to 25). McEvoy’s study aimed to present and promote the voices of young people using PAR influenced by Freire (1970). Her findings included how young people made sense of peace in local and contested spaces with reference to their experiences of conflict and proximity to violence. More detail for her work will be provided later in this chapter.
Ardizzone spoke to young ‘marginalised’ New Yorkers, who were involved in community-based organisations, about their motivation ‘to address issues of direct and structural violence as peace builders’ (2003, p.420). She collected data from questionnaires, interviews, and observations, with 25 young people (aged 14 to 22). Ardizzone’s approach was informed by Galtungian peace theory (1969) and Freire’s (1970) construct of emancipatory learning. Although the study did not ask young people directly about their knowledge of peace, Ardizzone’s work signalled a distinctly critical discourse asserting that the voice of young people added credence to peacebuilding with the proposition that, ‘Youth who are most affected by structural violence hold out the most promise for changing the social conditions that lead to direct violence’ (Ardizzone, 2003, p.423). Ardizzone reported that young people’s involvement with community-based activities and informal education resulted in increased confidence, self-esteem, social skills; and broadened their perspectives and learning for legal rights, local-global perspectives, advocacy, criticality, engagement, social responsibility and making a difference. Her work clearly located peacebuilding in young people’s lived experience as something internalised and externalised through praxis i.e. young people actively work ‘to build peace within themselves, in their communities, and in the larger society’ (Ardizzone, 2003, p.440).

Del Felice & Wisler (2007) continued with the theme of peace knowledge and/as youth agency as part of an approach to peacebuilding that was faithful to the ideas and work of Galtung (1969) and Lederach (1997). Del Felice & Wisler were keen to reject reductionist pretexts of youth and actively reframed deficit models of young people, including those who might be hard to reach. By advocating for young people’s potential as peacebuilders, Del Felice & Wisler debunked the ‘youth problem’ (chapter 1). Furthermore, they challenged notions that youth are hardwired for violence, the academic exclusion of youth in existing peace literature, and adult thinking that holds young people responsible for adult aspirations for the future. Six case studies involving conscious objection in Israel, a Serbian resistance movement, an Argentinian youth centre, a peace project in Sierra Leone, the Scout Movement, and the United Network of Young Peacebuilders (UNOY); evidenced an early attempt to define ‘youth peace work’; and to highlight the significant and relevance of young people as ‘protagonists [in the here and now]’ (Del Felice & Wisler, 2007, p.18; brackets in original). Importantly, the work of Del Felice & Wisler introduced a “youth agency lens”, signifying youth people’s ‘capability to effect change independent of outside actors’ (McEvoy-Levy, 2011, p.64). Recent reviews of the literature have shown a consistent interest in young people’s engagement with peace as peacebuilding (Del Felice & Ruud, 2016; Lopes et al., 2015). This has included an open document compiled to ‘describe, analyse and/or demonstrate the positive and constructive roles of youth as peacebuilders’ published by Del Felice & Ruud (2016, p.1).
2.3.2 The “everyday peace” peace concept

Rooted in the work of Galtung (1969, 1990) and Lederach (1997, 2005), the concept of everyday peace (Berents & McEvoy-Levy, 2015) constituted a shift towards blending ‘personal biographical experience, social structural conditions, historical forces and political power’ (Brewer et al., 2018, p.17), with more naturalistic inquiry (Berents, 2014; Berents & ten Have, 2017). It emphasises peace processes as local collaborative, bottom-up practices, aimed at structuring a peace derived from everyday conflict spaces. Developed from the literature of critical localism (Mac Ginty, 2015; Richmond, 2007; Richmond & Mac Ginty, 2013), everyday peace remains concerned with how people and victims in conflict spaces take action for peacebuilding; and how they can be excluded from peacebuilding structures and practices. Furthermore, this discourse seeks to understand how people exist in contested spaces that can obscure their local realities of peace and peacebuilding. Consistent with theories of everyday life (De Certeau, 1984; Sztompka, 2008) the literature points to how the co-production and use of space is not neutral.

Derived from an interest in youth work, as a form of peacebuilding and peace education in Northern Ireland (Harland, 2011; Leonard & McKnight, 2011; Magnuson & Baizerman, 2007), references to ‘contested’ space have shaped the investigation of young people’s concepts of peace in geographical flashpoints, and interface areas, in and between divided communities. The literature interprets the significance of interpersonal relationships, and interactions between participants and their environment; exposing how ‘subtle but profound decisions’ (Harland, 2009, p.181) impact the knowledge and enactment of peace and conflict; often set against the background of the peace process. As an example, contested spaces include:

- Schools, streets, local transport, parks, families, city centres, youth clubs, bars, parades and social events. Also contested are broader: issues such as faith, religion, sexuality, race, ethnicity, gender, personal beliefs and values, morals, drugs, alcohol consumption, education, behaviour, law and order, employment/unemployment. These are issues that many if not all young people wrestle with no matter where they may live. (Harland, 2009a, pp.16-17)

Rituals, symbolism, culture, trans-generational power, time, beliefs, history, social access, mobility, and exclusion have all been shown to contribute to how young people and youth workers in Northern Ireland understand peace, conflict, and violence in their everyday life (Magnuson & Baizerman, 2007). For instance, how young people socialise, protest, and riot; or their response to adult’s ‘wariness’ of them being ‘uncontrolled’ in public spaces (McEvoy-Levy, 2012, p.16). Or even how young people reported being ‘fearful of the consequences of not being violent in certain circumstances’ (Harland, 2009, p.181).

The ‘everyday peace’ concept of peace emerged from narratives of contested space and peacebuilding to examine:
Activities of conflict containment, resolution and transformation that lay people accomplish as part of their everyday life in spaces and spheres wherever routine activities are performed, such as in the home, at work, in leisure, school, across garden fences, in the supermarket and the like. (Brewer et al., 2018, p.265)

Everyday peace is focused on how social practices of peacebuilding can be studied as everyday choices, relations, spaces, and placemaking, as indications for how young people understand and express peace and/in violence (Berents, 2014, 2018; Berents & McEvoy-Levy, 2015; McEvoy-Levy, 2012). For instance, Brewer et al. (2018) presented a sociological conceptualization of peacebuilding to explore how victims in Northern Ireland, South Africa, and Sri Lanka, compromised after conflict. It was concluded that everyday life peacebuilding needs to be supported by top-down structures, whilst remaining aware of the ‘mundane reasoning’ that influences everyday life and civic engagement for peacebuilding; including how post-conflict victims can suffer from ‘despair and disillusionment’ (Brewer et al., 2018, p.265). In another example, Firchow (2018) carried out longitudinal PAR in four communities in Colombia and Uganda, with direct and indirect victims of war, aged 18-30, to identify local bottom-up everyday indicators of peace i.e. ‘through the eyes of the communities experiencing conflict’ (p.59). Participants were asked “What does peace mean to you?”, as ‘signs’ and ‘factors’ in their communities. Responses were listed, reduced, and verified by participants; and then revisited using mobile phone surveys to measure the (absence of) peace and effectiveness of peacebuilding interventions. Some of these are listed below. Firchow’s work showed that that ‘people often look toward very localized, contextual indicators around them, in their communities and homes, in order to determine whether they are more or less at peace in their daily lives’ (2018, p.109).

In Uganda, everyday peace indicators were found to prioritise issues such as:

- Local business booming
- Development of roads
- Available medical care
- Children at school
- People digging their gardens
- Walk freely at night
- People asleep safely in their homes at night
- People don’t hear gunshots
- Non/abducted people live together peacefully
- Leaders listen to community views
- Presence of NGOs
- Victims of crimes lay charges
- Internet available
(Adapted from Firchow, 2018, p.112)

Alternatively, in Colombia, everyday peace indicators included:

- Reparations
- Jail time for armed groups
Police/military presence
Victim support
Health care
Ability to study
Development of infrastructure
Taking care of the environment
Freedom of expression
community participation
activities with neighbouring communities
potable water
dialogue within the community
(Adapted from Firchow, 2018, pp.113-114)

Interestingly, Firchow concluded that increased levels of peacebuilding equated to higher levels of ‘development’ plus increased levels of ‘insecurity’. Furthermore, an increased intervention was not shown to equate to ‘higher levels of peacefulness’ (2018, p.148). Such work reaffirms the need for peacebuilding to decolonise how it thinks about applying external peace to peace processes in order to decrease the disparity between external and community-based definitions of peace and what is needed for peace.

Having looked at the key concepts of contested space and everyday peace, the next section will focus on studies of everyday peace that have examined young people’s responses to “What is peace?”.

2.4 Young people’s interpretation of “What is peace?”

This section introduces a range of literature that is heavily influenced by Siobhan McEvoy-Levy (McEvoy/McEvoy-Levy, 2000, 2001, 2006, 2007, 2011, 2011a, 2012), and Helen Berents (Berents, 2014; Berents & ten, 2017); and others such as Baser & Celik (2014), Dutta et al. (2016) and Pruitt (2008, 2013). Preference has been given to studies that have clearly asked young people “What is peace?” Consistent with the preceding discussion, the selected literature forms part of an interpretive inquiry understood in the ‘contextually-specific roles of youth’ (Berents & McEvoy-Levy, 2015, p.2) and what this means for the ‘peacebuilding’ peace concept with a common interest in:

- How peace research should represent and value young people’s perspectives as part of the study of peace.
- A qualitative and ethnographic approach as adding value and depth to the study of how young people understand, interpret and interact with concepts of peace.
- Peace knowledge situated in relation to its circumstances and lived experience.
- How a youth agency lens can inform and contribute to peacebuilding/education.

Generally, the literature aimed to elicit young people’s actions and motivations for peacebuilding and peace education from an insider’s perspective, studying how meaning was attributed to everyday peace and how this affected decision-making. Included are young people’s identity, roles, narratives, structures and practices
(Baser & Celik, 2014; Berents, 2014, 2017, 2018; McEvoy, 2000; McEvoy-Levy, 2001, 2007, 2011; Pruitt, 2008, 2013); and how young people have expressed their knowledge of peace as ‘understanding’ (Berents 2014; Dutta et al., 2016; McEvoy, 2000), ‘meaning’ (Pruitt, 2013), ‘experiences’ (Berents, 2014), and ‘visions’ (Baser & Celik, 2014). Furthermore, the selected literature continued to challenge how young people ‘are (mis)understood (or ignored) in peace studies’ (Pruitt, 2013, p6); and build on existing evidence for how youth agency is best understood in the narratives of young people.

The following discussion will introduce some of the common findings generated from prior studies that have asked young people “What is peace?” This discussion will be structured around subheadings for positive/negative peace, power of adults in everyday life, youth agency, gender, and dialogue.

**Positive/negative peace:** As mentioned, McEvoy’s initial research in 2000 investigated how young people in the wake of the Good Friday Agreement in Northern Ireland (1998) considered ‘community’, ‘attainability of peace’, and ‘their roles in peacebuilding’ (2000, p.85). Focus groups and self-completed questionnaires were used in six schools with a total of 58 young people (aged 12 to 25), to ask, “What is violence?”, “What is community?”, and “What is peace?”. McEvoy provided examples for how young people understood peace, summarised as ‘secure environments and free debate and disagreement without violent consequences’, and ‘coexistence and non-interference’ (2000, p.95). The former was articulated negatively, as physical and psychological security, safety in conflict, and freedom from the threat of assault. In contrast, positive peace was interpreted as ‘a convergence of interest, a bond of love or affection, the ability to coexist peacefully, caring, support, and friendliness' with links to religion and beliefs (McEvoy, 2000, p.92). Other positive peace responses included acceptance of others, trust, cooperation, human rights and needs, equality, class tolerance, respect, understanding, and social justice. Young people repeated the significance of peace as ‘sticking together (…) in times of trouble’ (McEvoy, 2000, p.92). McEvoy also identified that the ‘bipolarity of the political system in Northern Ireland’ (2000, p.97) impacted how young people understood peace. So, supporting existing ideas about how primary and secondary socialisation can shape peace concepts (McClerm, 1998, Rosell, 1968). McEvoy (2000, p.94) also suggested that:

> Interviews with young people in areas that have experienced little violence revealed a strong tendency towards abstracting and distancing the conflict and the peace process (…). I hypothesized that this was by necessity since they had more to lose from a return to the status quo.

In Turkey, Baser & Celik (2014, p.274) asked a total of 55 young Kurds, from lower-income families, to talk about their vision of peace with regards to the Kurdish issue, using open-ended questions in focus groups to give space for youth voice. Responses were interpreted negatively as peace as an absence of social exclusion i.e. discrimination, stereotyping, and socio-economic marginalization, such as the absence of and poverty i.e.
poverty of development and investment in their communities such as education and employment. This negative narrative of peace was extended to include the wider role of adults in positions of power:

If these generals, instead of spending their money on guns, construct factories in Diyarbakır … if they give [Kurds] jobs, there won’t be any unemployed… And there will be peace. (Baser & Celik, 2014, p.278)

Positive peace was interpreted as political and cultural rights as social belonging and identity i.e. ideas of freedom, speaking out, social wellbeing, and tolerance; including the freedom to use their mother tongue. Such factors continued the theme of bipolarity in the young people’s immediate and historical environment.

In addition, the authors reported that:

Violence had become part of the everyday lives of many young Kurds at the time of the field research, almost all participants in the focus groups emphasized nonviolence as the way to achieve peace. However, (…) these young Kurds stressed the need to understand the reasons for resorting to violence. (Baser & Celik, 2014, p.281)

This echoed the need expressed by young people to “stick together” in contested spaces, and the complexities of how they understood violence as a means of achieving peace.

**Power of adults in everyday life:** Everyday life is evidenced in both studies (Baser & Celik, 2014; McEvoy, 2000) as the lived links between micro and macro processes of peace. In both instances, young people spoke about their desire and need for peace as normalcy in social settings that were divided, contested and conflicted. Similarly, in situations of protracted and armed conflict, young university students in Palestine referred to their difficulties in ‘having a social life and not being able to see relatives, and fears about not being able to start a family or find work because of the occupation’ (McEvoy-Levy, 2011, p.171). There was frustration with how adults (in positions of power) are seen to contribute to peace processes, and young people’s desire to have peace as normalcy:

There is no peace for children or for all Palestinians. May be our leaders talk about peace. Peace as means of agreement. There is no security. Peace would be that you cannot ask anymore to talk about the occupation, that we can live together with soldiers and settlers. Another definition of peace - not the peace our leaders hope for - is a peace of just to live. (McEvoy-Levy, 2011, p.11)

Drawing from her earlier work (2006, 2007), McEvoy-Levy reported a young people saying, ‘There’ll never be peace; it will be what you call peace’ (2011a, p.161). This and the previous example both offer important indications for how young people reported being disempowered and overlooked within narratives of peace. The lack of the ability to “just live” was evidently positioned as an adult failure. Similar messages were found by Berents (2014) who reported that ‘Young people also expressed frustration and distrust of the state
and local authorities while simultaneously using the language of rights and citizenship to articulate how and why these structures should be providing them with services’ (Berents, 2014, p.377).

**Youth agency:** As part of her four-month ethnographic research in Colombia, Berents (2014) focused on how young people ‘talk about their own understandings and experiences of violence and peace’ (Berents, 2014, p.367). Naturalist inquiry was used to engage with young people’s lived roles and responsibilities, to understand the ‘ways young people actually conceive of and engage with notions of peace in their current everyday lives as actual beings, not just potential becomings’ (2014, p.368) i.e. Berents was interested in young people as ongoing protagonists, rather than potential contributors to a future peace. She used participant observation and semi-structured interviews with 28 young people, aged 10 to 17, who were described as being in ‘structurally vulnerable positions’ (2014, p.368). Data collection was supported by interviews with teachers, community workers, and parents. Berent’s interpretation of what she observed and questioned was framed in everyday local peacebuilding and conflict transformation; and the findings demonstrated how young people ‘find and articulate understandings of peace through everyday choices they make as well as the sites they inhabit (home, school, the Fundación), and the relationships they build (family, friends)’ (2014, p.371). Although framed by violence, Berent’s work contributed to questions of young people, agency, and space, with assertions that the experience of violence or protracted conflict does not determine ‘totalising narratives’ about young people’s peace knowledge and actions. As such, it challenges how violence, or in fact peace, can be reduced as something ‘normal(ised)’ by young people. Berent’s later work (Berents, 2018; Berents & ten Have, 2017) continued to add depth to the ‘everyday peace’ peace concept, interpreting how young people manoeuvred strategically in unpredictable social landscapes by using ‘avoidance’ ‘resilience’ and ‘resistance’ in their responses to ‘violence and insecurity’ (Berents & ten, 2017, p.113).

The work of McEvoy (2000), Baser & Celik (2014), and Berents (2014), have contributed useful examples of how the conceptualisation of everyday peace can move from, and between, individual actor-based analogies of peace towards structured-based understandings; and the significance of youth agency as a counter-narrative of/for peace (building) in contested space.

Pruitt’s work (2008, 2013) focused on youth agency, as to how young people might advance positive peace, in, and through, the personal and social skills of learning music and dance. Pruitt (2008, 2013) collected data from two case studies. In Australia, she used 10 semi-structured interviews with young people, aged 12-25, and participant observation, supported by three interviews with facilitators in a youth-run project. And in Northern Ireland, she interviewed 22 young people, aged 12-17, and four facilitators, in an after-school project. One of the initial questions on the interview schedule asked participants “What does peace mean to
you?”. Unfortunately, Pruitt’s work does not detail the participant’s direct responses to this question. Instead, Pruitt’s analysis focused on how arts-based youth work provided alternative forms of dialogue, advanced young people as potential peacemakers, and offered space for building peace in the young people’s everyday lives, with attention given to issues of gender, inclusion, and peacebuilding practice. Pruitt recognised music and dance as dialogic spaces constructed by young people to ‘transmit a strong sense of self’ (2013, p.24), both individually and as youth culture, as a lens for youth agency; and as tactical apparatus, for young people to understand, create and communicate peace by ‘(re)producing and revising identities, both of individuals and groups, and of self and others’ (Pruitt, 2008, p.22). Much like Ardizzone (2003) before her, Pruitt interpreted young people’s shared goals and collaborative work as being indicative of their actual and potential peacebuilding. These skills included developed self-awareness, confidence, and conflict skills, such as managing anger and deconstructing stereotypes of racial and cultural differences. Lastly, Pruitt emphasised the significance of spaces for dialogue and peacebuilding as being inclusive and collaborative, highlighting issues with gendered space and participation; and the value of such spaces as being safe and diversionary from the potential of direct violence.

**Gender:** Young people are reported as believing that a ‘longing for peace’ is something mutual (Baser & Celik, 2014, p.283). Yet, issues of gender are presented in the literature. In situations in which young people understood violence and non-violence to achieve peace, young women were said to disapprove of the violence more than their male counterparts (Baser & Celik, 2014). Other findings showed how young women positioned themselves as victims rooted in gender politics and the ‘poorly understood subversion of gendered expectations’ (McEvoy-Levy, 2007, p.103). McEvoy-Levy’s work also discussed gendered proximity to conflict as having ‘the most far-reaching and deep definitions of peace and, among women at least, the greatest inclination to be actively involved in peace building’ (McEvoy, 2000, p.97). There were also suggested discrepancies in how young males and females accessed and used space (Pruitt, 2008, 2013). In contrast, young males were identified as sharing a ‘pessimistic inability to imagine peace’ (McEvoy, 2000, p.99); and unique in their articulation of everyday peace as wanting to be ‘left alone’ (McEvoy, 2000, p.93) with potential links to direct violence.

The literature presented in this section has highlighted the value of young people’s knowledge, roles and agency. It brings together a perspective derived from young people’s narratives that is highly contextualised and ever changing. For example, McEvoy-Levy (2007, p.01) describes the intersecting complexities of young people’s understanding of peace as being:

Angry, excluded, rejected by and rejecting religion, confused, curtailed, concerned, domesticated, independence, longing, tribal, teen, school girl/boy protestors. They are simultaneously excited and bored with it all.
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The writers presented in this section were keen to highlight how contested experience shapes young people’s agency, including the development of their knowledge and attitudes by which they encounter daily life. A consensus is presented to suggest that young people hold a ‘defiant’ belief in change that ‘mediates the impact of war and other forms of violence on them’ (McEvoy-Levy, 2011, p.167). This is further understood as a way to give meaning to how young people understand peace, mediate conflict, and engage in peacebuilding and education. Additionally, the analysis of how co-habited spaces and spaces weighted towards the individual and shared identities of young people, translate into spaces of/for peacebuilding and peace education, offers an important account for how young people can impact structures in everyday life that are organised to control and oppress (De Certeau, 1984).

**Dialogue:** Alternatively, there is evidence that some young people did not provide a direct response to what peace is. McEvoy-Levy referred to a young person who stated that ‘Nobody knows what peace is. You could ask that question to anyone and nobody will know what peace is’ (McEvoy-Levy, 2006, p.1). In 2007, she also quoted a young person as saying ‘Peace is not a real goal. You need somethin’. You need a reason why peace is there. You need to bring down the barriers that created war in the first place’ (McEvoy-Levy, 2007, p.99). Furthermore, young people are reported as saying that the word peace ‘is not understood enough’ (McEvoy, 2000, p.95). Although, McEvoy (2000), Baser & Celik (2014), Berents (2014), and Pruitt (2008, 2013), all refer to the use of dialogue, or the significance of understanding peace through the eyes and experiences of young people, these apparent conflicts, presented by young people’s scepticism and criticality about how they understand peace, are not directly addressed.

McEvoy (2000) and Pruitt (2013) assert that dialogue should be understood as transformative, aimed at empowering young people to design and implement initiatives grounded in ‘a thorough and ongoing analysis of the experiences of the conflict, their interest in peace’ (McEvoy, 2000, p.100). Yet, the impact of dialogue, or the proposed change, is not made clear. Dutta et al., (2016) presented one of the few case studies to specifically address dialogue as part of how young people respond to the question “What is Peace?”. The research aimed to explore everyday peace and everyday violence with nine Peace & Conflict Studies students at the University of Massachusetts, using democratised teaching and discussion boards, to examine the student’s ‘principles and action, to mobilize peace consciousness’ (Dutta et al., 2016, p.99). The study was guided by three questions. The first, asking for a definition of everyday peace. The second, asking how they applied/integrated everyday peace in their lives. The third, asking what was understood as ‘the role of collaborative processes in understanding and promoting everyday peace’ (Dutta et al., 2016, p.99). The study was informed by PAR, Galtungian theory, and the critical analysis of Freire, to position everyday peace as a theory of change for social action led by the students. However, there were implications presented by the context of the study, as it was located as part of formal education and accreditation.
In keeping with earlier differentiation of positive/negative peace, positive peace was identified as awareness, empathy, agency, empowerment, and justice e.g. a ‘sense of belongingness, equality and respect, mutual understanding of rights and obligations are all necessary conditions of peace’ (Dutta et al., 2016, p.89). Two of the student’s dialogue about structural peace and the interpersonal effects of inner peace are illustrated in the extracts below:

Everyday peace would mean gender equity, decreasing gaps between rich and poor, building understanding and tolerance between nations and individuals of different faiths, ethnicities, etc. The concept of empathy would permeate throughout the world. (Dutta et al., 2016, p.87)

Peace is a process that starts within your heart and soul. Then it radiates out in action and cultivates in your community and surroundings. (Dutta et al., 2016, p.90)

These extracts tell us about movement and an interrelatedness emanating from individual actor-based analogies of peace towards structured-based understandings. The study provided evidence that favoured a positive operationalisation of peace, as it was suggested that ‘a peaceful society, while difficult to envision, would at the very least begin with a personal commitment to values of compassion and social justice’ (Dutta, et al., 2006, p.p97).

As an additional contribution, the study was keen to determine how dialogue might be used to understand the concept of everyday peace. This process was outlined in three stages to include:

1. A conceptualization of everyday peace based on values and social processes that occur at different levels in society.

2. An application of everyday peace principles based on compassion, making critical local-global connections; and a culture of peace (skills, attitudes and knowledge), including conflict transformation.

3. Collaborative approaches to everyday peace as the move from individual to collective agency; critical engagement; reflexivity and critical self-awareness regarding internalised oppression and positionality within structural violence.

(Adapted from Dutta et al., 2016, p.88)

Dutta et al. (2016) went on to show how, as part of the process, students acted for peace on campus by ‘organizing an open peace forum (…) to create a space for campus and community members to process their reactions and reflect on collective action’ (p.91). This action was reported to occur as a dialogic response to a local act of terrorism in Boston that prompted a further understanding of peace for the students as compassion, and making local-global connections e.g. the ‘complicity of the USA in violence in other
countries’ (Dutta et al., 2016, p.90). The idea of how dialogue can be used to elicit young people’s understanding of peace as praxis is important to this study and will be revisited.

The next section will discuss some of the challenges presented in the literature.

2.5 Responding to the gaps in the literature

The work discussed in this chapter shifts from the ontological objectivism and epistemological absolutism of the “scientific” peace concept, towards an interpretivist and critical lens interested in the youth narratives and agency as part of the ‘peacebuilding’ peace concept, and everyday understanding of peace framed within the ‘everyday peace’ peace concept. Each of these stages has placed greater emphasis on the voices of children and young people with reference to dialogue (Dutta et al., 2016; Haavelsrud, 1987; Hakvoort and Oppenheimer, 1993; McEvoy, 2000; Pruitt, 2013; Vriens, 1999). Interpretivist and critical studies have prioritised peace from those inside the problem to understand how this might inform local bottom-up decision-making as part of the wider peacebuilding narrative (Jarstad, 2019).

Both qualitative and quantitative approaches hold common threads and overlapping ideas interpreted as variations of negative and positive peace. However, it is evident that the personhood, intersubjectivity, and transactions between researcher/researched cannot be ignored. The proposed (in)activity of the researcher has been seen to affect the research process and data collection (Havervoork & Oppenheimer, 1988; Havervoork, 1996; Smith, 2006). Later work has become increasingly immersed in the social existence of young people, generating a wealth of relative and pluralist qualitative data. This has added complexity to what was previously known about how young people give meaning to, and act for, peace such as the significance of intersecting selfhood, criticality, social structure and social action (Berents, 2014; Berents & ten, 2017; Dutta et al., 2006; McEvoy, 2000; Pruitt, 2013).

The literature has clearly shown that peace is rarely investigated independently. This has meant conflation when peace is investigated as part of other social phenomena e.g. national and cultural peace processes (Baser & Celik, 2014; McEvoy, 2000); plus, an inconsistent coupling of war, peace, and conflict that can overshadow and relegate the epistemological significance given to peace. Even when the word peace was identified as part of the research schedule there appeared to be an inherent bias that positioned peace as being ‘second-order’ and ‘insignificant’ (Lourenço, 1996) compared to theoretical and geographical contexts of war and conflict. These factors comprise a deficit approach to peace as something that results from and is secondary to, an existing problem i.e. war. It is important to acknowledge how such ideas can influence the expectations of researchers and shape their focus and interpretations of data (Smith, 2004). And also, how such decisions are structured methodologically so that participants are asked fewer questions about peace,
and research schedules offer less detailed questions about peace (Hakvoort & Oppenheimer, 1998). For example, it is curious that some researchers chose not to disseminate data collected in response to the question “What is peace?” (Pruitt, 2013). It is evident that the analysis of peace can be reductionist (Hakvoort & Oppenheimer 1998); yet even when the concept of peace is met with indifference (Sarrica & Wachelke, 2010) it tells us a story.

The inextricability of peace, war, and conflict (i.e. contested space and everyday peace) is problematic. The literature does not question the logic rooted in the work of Galtung (1969) that continues to inform the analytical binarism of peace as the absence of violence, and euphemisms for social change and justice. Galtung’s work has immense value (chapter two), but there is a need to critically engage with the assumed epistemological validity given to peace as ‘creative responses to violence’ (Del Felice & Wisler, 2007, p.21). When left unquestioned, such assumptions reinforce polemologic beliefs that prioritise learning about war and violence as a means to learn about peace. A critical reading suggests this thinking may well be influenced by insidious global (or Western) cultures of violence.

It is important to note that in the study of young people and peace, conflict narratives dominate how peace is studied and operationalised (Freire & Lopes, 2008; Stallworth-Clark, 2006). The literature is bound by an order of peace circumscribed by ‘conflict-afflicted peace’ i.e. how peace language, knowledge and practice, is theoretically and geographically contextualised in terms of conflict. This includes conflict settings, armed conflict, conflict zones, protracted conflict, and post-conflict; and social, economic, political, and state-sponsored conflict. Therefore, young people are often selected with a view towards ‘whose lives are still impacted by the legacy of the conflicts’ (Bau, 2018, p. 423). Surely, this focus curtails how peace research engages with young people and limits what is known more widely about young people and peace.

To summarise, peace research with young people has been dominated by two main discourses as a way to understand and achieve peace. These include violence (direct/indirect) and conflict (mediation and transformation). These ideas are illustrated below (fig. 2) using the work of Bartolucci & Giorgio (2008, p.10) who did not question the inherent trends presented in their image of the progression from negative and positive peace. The diagram is representative of a wider paradigm in peace research that quickly contaminates the concept of peace with other ideas. There is a need to elaborate and challenge taken-for-granted assumptions about the value of peace.
Fig. 2: Conflict-affected peace

Reviewing the literature has strengthened my interest in how young people’s knowledge and experience can deepen how peace is known to occur, or fail to occur, on different conceptual levels. Especially, as it is generally recognised that young people are under-represented (Pruitt, 2008) and ‘under-appreciated’ (McEvoy & Berents, 2015, p.119) in the literature. A youth lens has been shown to add epistemological worth, including that which is potentially transformative for young people and researchers as agents and (co)producers of knowledge and social action. This corresponds with the evolution of everyday peace (Berents & McEvoy-Levy, 2015), which exposes how peace research has not only neglected but actively stifled or muted how young people express knowledge and action of peace.

To question how young people understand peace in relation to their circumstances and lived experience offers possibilities for peace knowledge which is firmly located and contextualised in the daily routines of a grass-roots people-to-people peace (Akansoy, et al., 2000), premised by the belief that ‘stripping context decreases relevance’ (McCandless, 2007, p.122). As Stzompka (2008) posits, it is in everyday life that the actual and potential interact; in (and through) our everyday language, thinking, and behaviour.

Except for the work of Firchow (2018) and Dutta et al. (2006), the impact or proposed change of prior research has not made clear in the extant literature. There is seldom evidence for how young people’s knowledge of peace has achieved peace, especially as a consequence of engagement with research. This
trend persists with studies that describe using dialogue. For example, Baser & Celik (2014, p.282) emphasised the ‘need to create spaces for dialogue to nurture mutual understanding.’ McEvoy suggested that youth peace work ‘could begin with the dialogue’ (2000, p.100); and she highlighted the value of dialogue in groups as enabling young people to ‘speak in community-as a form of witness’ (McEvoy-Levy, 2011, p.365). Other examples include studies that have employed participatory photography and PAR aimed at young people and peace (e.g. Bau, 2015, 2018). There is a distinct lack of detail regarding the realisation of outcomes for participants either inside or outside the research. Furthermore, apart from Dutta et al. (2006), there is little evidence for dialogue as a theory and process of change. Dialogue is often left as something implicit or inherent to peacebuilding and peace education, which I suspect is an omission or possible misappropriation of the ideas of Freirean praxis. As such, the literature is only starting to answer how young people understand peace as an ‘expression of power’ (Kilgore, 2001, p.59), both in, and as a response to their everyday life.

Extant literature has offered examples of young people’s peace concepts as changeable and relative, with movement and an interrelatedness, comprised of individual actor-based analogies of peace and structured-based understandings. I am interested in studying this further, positioning peace as something unrestricted in everyday life; especially as the literature has indicated how young people can feel disempowered and overlooked by external narratives of peace (Firchow, 2018). This builds from the theorisation of youth agency and everyday peace as a ‘locus of knowledge and of social change’ (Berents & McEvoy-Levy, 2015, p.121). Further still, when care is given to the type of Freirean dialogue discussed in chapter 1, opportunities can emerge to deepen how young people understand peace and elaborate on how young people understand peace as praxis. This might well encourage young people to peel back and untangle some of the conflicts presented in the literature about their apparent scepticism regarding peace; and help to complicate the existing knowledge for how young people understand peace.

Furthermore, a dialogic approach is consistent with my commitment to challenge the marginalisation of young people and their corresponding norms of silence (Harland, 2009) (see chapter 1). For instance, young people who have not recognised their own voice, or associate hopelessness with their voice; or those who are not heard, and whose voices are actively silenced or muted. A theory-driven approach to dialogue can offer young people an opportunity to experience the study as a choice to self-advocate and self-represent about/for peace. This is consistent with CPE (Bajaj, 2019) and my theoretical framework, with a focus on how young people might take ownership and disrupt existing narratives of peace as part of their situated knowledge and action of peace in their everyday life. More so, it asserts the need to purposefully distance questions of young people and peace from traditional narratives of youth as a problem, including the problem of ‘conflict-affected peace’ in which peace becomes buried under other adult concerns.
It is evident in the literature that research philosophies and epistemology can easily default to paradigmatic orders of peace, and instrumental trajectories of peace that seek to universalise or homogenise knowledge and action. The focus of this study is removed from conceptual and geographical locations of peace that are prefigured and validated by notions of conflict, violence, or war. However, part of this challenge is to remain reflexive and aware of the impact of the polemologic origins where peace is consequentially made and kept. Listed below are certain questions that have emerged from writing this chapter. Moving forwards, they will continue to shape a reflexive approach to the relationship between my work and certain problems and gaps in existing research. Such ideas are compatible with my theoretical framework discussed in chapter 1 and suggest how the research might contribute towards the duality of praxis and consciousness, both in and outside of the research.

Table 3: Reflexive questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where is the voice of the powerless in peace (research)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does peace research actively challenge, disrupt, or maintain the status quo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is peace achieved by those within the problem?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why do we not interrogate youth constructs of peace in England?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why do we not interrogate youth work in England as a tradition that has (and continues) to respond, and talk directly, to everyday peace?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would some young people benefit more than others as research participants?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lastly, even though the study is inextricably rooted and biased by my personal biography and professional experience, I retain a ‘passion of not knowing’ (Caputo, 1997, p.338) that attests to my willingness to be introduced to things about peace that are unknown (to me), including that which might remain unexplainable, or unknowable.

### 2.5.1 Aims of the study

The research aims are to:

*Generate new knowledge by:*
Exploring how young people understand peace in their everyday life, and how young people relate to their knowledge of peace as praxis.

*Showcase the viewpoint of those being researched by:*
Documenting and encouraging young people’s concerns, aspirations, and active solutions, for peace in their communities.
2.6 Summary

This chapter has discussed extant literature that has contextualised the research question, and informed the development of the aims of the thesis. The research has been justified in the context of extant literature with emphasis given to peace in the importance of everyday life, young people’s knowledge and counter-narratives; and the identified need to challenge paradigmatic orders that threaten to homogenise peace knowledge and action. The following chapter will outline the philosophical and technical elements of the methodology and subsequent issues.
Section 3 - Methodology

3.1 Chapter outline
This thesis aimed to build on previous findings to further examine how young people understand peace in the praxis of their everyday life, and how they related to their knowledge of peace as praxis. Based in the Midlands in England, data were collected from 21 young people (aged 15-24), informed by the need to centralise the viewpoint of those who are often under-represented and misrepresented. The study was influenced by participant action research (PAR), built around an original approach to photovoice (PV). Data were gathered longitudinally from participatory photography, photo-elicitation, dialogue groups, and interviews; and thematically analysed, guided by the conceptual framework outlined in chapter 1.

Working from a PAR informed perspective for public engagement, young people were offered genuine opportunities to take part and share their ideas and solutions for peace both in and outside of the research. Using their photography, words, and dialogue, participants planned, influenced, and led peace-themed events with wider audiences in their communities; to speak out about peace in their lives and communities. Throughout the study I highlighted and reaffirmed the participant’s viewpoint to generate a groundswell of interest about peace. This included curricula development, teaching, youth and community work, and consultancy.

This chapter will outline the rationale for my choice of ontological and epistemological frameworks, and the theory of the methodology and subsequent issues. It gives an account for my methodological approach, the rationale for choosing the methods adopted, and my ethical approach; including issues of data management, procedures for analysis, challenges, and the steps taken to achieve rigor.

3.2 Methodological approach: concepts and theory

3.2.1 Interpretivist paradigm
Within social science three fundamental research paradigms have been classified as being positivist, interpretivist, and critical, and they are often construed in terms of conflict i.e.:

A clash between positivism or post-positivism, on the one hand, and a broadly interpretivist approach, founded on such traditions as phenomenology, symbolic interactionism, hermeneutics and Verstehen, on the other. (Bryman, 2006, pp.111-112)

My choice is influenced by an interpretivist and post-critical (Andreotti, 2010) paradigm that deviates from pure interpretivism by distancing itself from the post-positivist need for scientific worth. This is informed by
a belief that natural science and social science are fundamentally different, due to the need of the latter to ascertain what we experience and how we interpret what we experience. The study of social science is also dependent on both structural and subjective processes of human existence that affect constructs of value-laden and value explicit social meaning, social situations, and social action (Overgaard & Zahavi, 2009).

In everyday life (Sztompka, 2008) social reality is framed simultaneously within our minds, and as part of broader social structures and constraints. The known/knower are interactive and inseparable, shaped, and altered, through our multiple readings and tensions of self-concepts, social interaction, and social structures. Structural processes of everyday life are not irreducible to individual actors, especially if we accept that certain (underlying) structures and powers might not be detected, expressed, or known, as part of our understanding of what is real. The (re)production of history, knowledge, and networks of power relations, are socially constructed through, and operate within, mediations of human agency, consciousness, and social activity as being uniquely context-bound. The situatedness and temporality of our social experience means we are subjects in a state of both “being” and “becoming”, shaped by the alterity of our knowledge, beliefs, dispositions, and experience. There is ‘No universalism here, but rather a tendency to relativism, seeing the ‘others’ in their specific circumstances of time and place’ (Van Der Pijl, 2009, p.96).

Likewise, our practices can exist outside of any particular socialisation or determinism; and change depending on how, when, and where events happen, and who is involved. As an example, the visceral nature of our intuition, emotion, and physicality, can intersect with the unpredictability of events in everyday life and influence our freedom to act, with the same potency as those structures that envelope us (Sztompka, 2008). Our experienced and expressed reality is further complicated by praxis embedded in the context of everyday life, and how we make meaning of social interactions comprised of an array of purposeful, deliberate and incomprehensible choices and routines that we employ each day to navigate, negotiate, and push against, the normalcy and structural processes of everyday life; including that which seeks to control or curtail us.

In summary, rather than ontological certainty, objectivism, or presenting an ability to predict and control the world, I refute claims that we can know the truth of reality. Instead, we can seek to interpret the meaning of reality as a quest for subjective knowledge and interpretative understanding. By necessity, this encompasses feeling and willing, rather than just pure intellect, to describe and understand human experience.

3.2.2 Epistemology

It is widely accepted that pure objectivity is unobtainable within research and the knowledge it creates (Habermas, 1990; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Research will always be guided by the undeniable choices,
actions, and biographies of those involved (Bryman, 2001; May, 2001). This has been supported by the
discussion in the literature review (chapter 2) for how post-positivist demands for scientific worth, when
researching children and young people’s concepts of war and peace, were riddled with problems - noting that
ideas of objectivity, reductionism, and instrumentalism, represent value positions (Smith, 2006).

To accept that we cannot separate ourselves, or what we know, from how we act and reflect on the world,
means that (the nature and construct of) knowledge is neither neutral, static, nor universal. Knowledge
cannot be simply produced and transferred (i.e. banked) from one owner to the next, as fixed objects and
transferable truths (Freire, 1970). Instead, knowledge is always in the process of being unfinished and
fallible, and should be challenged and exposed using epistemological questions of how “truth” is formed and
by whom (May, 2001). As such, the epistemological approach of the study seeks to understand the meaning
of human action, and asks open and critical questions about knowledge that is contextualised and interpreted
in the social world.

More so, the study is motivated towards generating new knowledge, as well as enabling those being
researched (Glassman & Erdem, 2014; Kindon, Kesby & Pain et al., 2007) to understand peace in their
everyday life, and to encourage them to develop this knowledge for active solutions. This constitutes a
‘combination of objective analysis and normative commitment’ (Rogers & Ramsbotham, 1999, p.753)
orientated towards deepening the understanding of peace, and contributing towards more peaceable societies.
In keeping with the impetus for the study, and my theoretical framework (chapter 1), the thesis hopes to
contribute towards social reality in a particular way. Influenced by CPE (Bajaj, 2019), Freire (1970), and
Sztompka (2008), this represents a hopeful approach to knowledge as language, power, reflexivity, and
change. It is steered by a desire to influence the actual and possible status quo for ‘a more equitable and just
vision’ of peace (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999, p325).

The study is interested in how peace knowledge (production/enactment) can open new questions about how
young people understand peace, and how to reorganise and reconstruct assumptions about the lived
experience of young people and peace. As a result, both the researcher, and those being researched, are
identified as active stakeholders, rather than being disembodied, or distanced from the production of
knowledge or the wider research process. The study constitutes an opportunity steered by the epistemological
worth of knowledge that looks beyond what we have been conditioned to know (see chapters 1 and 2). This
is important, as stated by De Certeau (1984, p.42) there is a real danger presented by how:

Scientific institutions belong to the system which they study, they conform to the well-known
genre of the family story (an ideological criticism does not change its functioning in any way;
the criticism merely creates the appearance of a distance for scientists who are members of the
institution); they even add the disturbing charm of devils or bogey-men whose stories are told during long evenings around the family hearth.

Some of these “stories”, referred to by Certeau, have been raised in chapters 1 and 2; such as the “problem of youth”, and the paradigmatic and potentially polemologic expectations and organisation of the concept of peace.

The philosophical premise of the research paradigm is compatible with the research design, influenced by participant action research, to open spaces for young people to take ownership of their situated knowledge and action of peace in their everyday life. This will be discussed next.

### 3.2.3 Photovoice as PAR

My research design was built around an adaptation of photovoice (PV), as a form of participant action research (PAR), combining participant-led photography, photo-elicitation, and dialogue. It fits well with the diversity of peace research methods that have been used with children and young people e.g. drawings (Ålvik, 1968; Fargas-Malet, & Dillenburger, 2014; Jabbar & Betawi, 2019; Myers-Walls & Lewsader, 2015; Özer, et al, 2018; Walker et al., 2003; Yilmaz, 2018), essay writing and poems (Dinklage & Ziller, 1989; Juhasz & Palmer, 1991; McLernon & Cairns, 2001; Spielmann, 1986), photographs (Dinklage & Ziller, 1989); and participatory research, including dialogue (Berents, 2014; Dutta, et al., 2016; McEvoy/McEvoy-Levy, 2000, 2001, 2011), music and dance (Pruitt, 2008, 2013).

The origins of PV are attributed to the feminist theory of Wang & Burris (1994, 1997) who pioneered the method to expose the experiences of marginalised and oppressed women in rural China. Influenced by Freire’s problem-posing dialogue, and his early work with participatory photography (Delgado, 2015), Wang & Burris formulated PV around the schematised images of photographs to stimulate dialogue.

The three main goals of PV are:

1. To enable people to record and reflect their community’s strengths and concerns.
2. To promote critical dialogue and knowledge about important issues through large and small group discussion of photographs.
3. To reach policymakers.

(Adapted from Wang & Burris, 1997, p.369)

In PV, photographs are considered in terms of how they might translate into action that impacts wider audiences and key community stakeholders (Spencer, 2011). True to the principles of PAR, PV is structured to collaborate with those being researched. It values the context of local knowledge and meaning, and opens a dialogue for participants to think critically and structurally about their community and everyday social
lives. In its truest form, PV adopts a critical dialogue to position the significance of photographs as a visual sociology ‘based on the authority of the subject rather than the researcher’ (Harper, 2002, p.15). Typically, this has involved supporting participants inside the problem to produce and critically review their photography in groups, with a view to challenge the status quo by sharing and exhibiting their work.

PV is a tested methodology that has been widely used and reviewed (Catalani & Minkler, 2010; Delgado, 2015; Hergenrather et al., 2009; Sanon, et al., 2014). It has been applied differently with young people. Some examples include ‘Peace Through Photography’ (2008), coordinated in the Balkans by Stepanavan Youth Center, that aimed to build young people’s capacity ‘to advocate and implement conflict prevention and peace’ (Salto Net, 2008). ‘Picturing Peace’ (2012) in the City of Minneapolis, which used photography to document young people’s ‘reflections and hopes for peace and safety in their communities [and] their perception of the strengths and assets that support community peace’ (Minneapolis DID, 2012, n.p.). And ‘Eye Contact to the Youth’ (2017), facilitated at the Peres Center in Israel, based on photography, and ‘providing a safe and cultivating environment for self-expression and exploration, while promoting mutual understanding and re-humanization of the other’ (Peres Centre, 2017, n.p.). When used for research with young people, examples of PV have been characterised by studies of ‘conflict-affected peace’, such as issues of violence with urban youth in the USA (Chonody, et al., 2013; Kane, 2012; McIntyre, 2000), and young people who have been impacted by conflicts in the African Great Lakes region (Bau, 2015, 2018).

Participation will occur in differing ways in PV. As such participants can be expected:

- To participate in the creation of the instruments, and thus learn their meaning.
- To show commitment according to one’s talents, abilities, experiences, and particular relationships to the situation investigated.
- To participate actively in the development of the research problem and the action in the search for solutions: in short, of all stages of the work.
- To collaborate in the decision-making, both in issues of the research and in questions of the action.
- To be cautious in dealing with the official release of results, and prudent in the generalisations.
- To behave professionally and use one’s knowledge and experience to question the researcher.
- To be willing to take part both in the research and in the ensuing actions.
- To accept to live with the uncertainty and instability inherent to all dynamic situations, where total predictability is impossible.
- To live intimately the experience and try to objectivate it and share its meanings with the group.

(Adapted from Franco, 2005, pp.493-94)

My approach has favoured participants generating and reflecting on their photography, using photo-elicitation and dialogue. Young people were asked to choose and photograph representations of peace in
their everyday life, and then select which photographs they wanted to bring to interviews and dialogue groups. It was informed by the idea of triangulation. Although triangulation can expose independent and mixed weaknesses of each of the research instruments used in the study (Flick, 2014, May, 2001), when managed effectively, the combination of methods is generally regarded as being beneficial, as it can enable a unique range of perspectives for the same topic (Carter et al., 2014).

The research was designed to be accessible and inclusive, to help build a depth of participation for young people, to increase the richness of data, and to enable participative and creative approaches in the research that were ‘youth-friendly and relevant’ (Delgado, 2015, p.135). In England and elsewhere, digital images have become increasingly commonplace through social media and camera phones. PV utilises photography with immediate and tangible rewards for young people as something creative, fun, and generally easy to learn (Delgado, 2015; Royce et al., 2006; Wang & Burris, 1997). The power of PV is that it offers a practical tool to harness the experiences of young people as their photographs offer distinct illustrations for how they make sense of their social worlds, through their eyes and words. As such, PV offers a direct response to some of the issues raised, in chapters 1 and 2, about the representation of young people generally, and more specifically in peace research (McEvoy & Berents, 2015; Pruitt, 2013). For instance, after using PV to study how Black kindergarten children make sense of violence in Connecticut (USA), McIntyre (2000, p.142) stated that:

By putting cameras in the hands of young people, we hoped to enrich our understanding of how they perceive their lives within the community (…) In turn, these images, along with other activities the participants engage in, become points of entry into exploring solutions for community development purposes. The participant’s multiple photographic stories are powerful tools for illuminating the lives of young people who do not always have a forum with which to express themselves.

However, it must be acknowledged that empowerment cannot be assumed as the product of PV, or simply ‘handing out cameras (…) and using pictures’ (Pauwels, 2015, p.108). Writers such as Liebenberg (2018) stress the need for PV to be implemented within a PAR framework to be effective. There is growing concern about the rigor in the application of PV, especially due to the ‘user-friendliness’ of the methodology as an alternative to in-depth ethnographic engagement (Liebenberg, 2018). Prior research has placed differing emphasis on the nature of participation, research, action, and change (Liebenberg, 2018, Thomas, et al., 2018); and there are particular concerns about the absence of rigorous analysis regarding the impact that PV has on communities (Catalani & Minkler, 2010; Liebenberg, 2018). Systematic reviews carried out by Sanon, et al., (2014) and Catalani & Minkler (2010) highlighted the lack of analysis in the literature about the action potential in 30 PV research studies before 2008, and in 37 PV projects published between 2008 and 2013. It is evident that PV often struggles to evidence ‘system level change’ (Sanon et al., 2014, p.10). For example, Wang et al., (2008) reported how they enabled female participants in rural China, who were
typified by a culture of silence, to present their perspectives to those in power. Yet, the authors recognised
that this process did not shift power from one group to another, or move participants into positions of local
decision-making (Wang et al., 2008; Wang & Burris, 1997). Such discrepancies about the nature, action, and
impact of PV has created tensions for researchers, researched communities, and academic bodies sponsoring
or assessing the projects (Cameron, 2007).

There are also some common difficulties presented by PV. It is a lengthy and committed process,
characterised by protracted dialogue for participants to reach consensus about shared meaning, findings, and
actions. It can be taxing and impractical for both the researcher and the researched. Also, there are questions
about the tenuous causality in PV that links self-understanding to collective action; and how ‘power sharing’
and ‘participant involvement’ are realised (Benjamin-Thomas et al., 2018, p.5), especially when ‘outsiders’
are positioned to galvanise transformative action with those inside the problem. The ‘good intentions’ of PV
as PAR are not enough in themselves to overcome assumptions about the binary relationships between
researcher-researched/knower-learner that are ‘often explicitly or implicitly built on deficit assumptions of
learning and knowing, and reiterate taken-for granted structures of power’ (Call-Cummings et al., 2018, p.1).
Such challenges are particularly significant for PV as a tool for research and change because it places the
burden of change on those who might be most marginalised or silenced in society.

Other challenges of PV have been listed as:

- Technical aspects, documentation and interpretation of findings, ethics, and translating findings
  into action (…) scheduling, time restrictions for developing group relationships, and
  consequences related to lost or stolen cameras. Other problems include (1) lack of youth trust in
  adults; (2) arriving at a consensus on the focus of a photo voice project; (3) obtaining requisite
  funding and potential conflict; (4) lack of adequate preparation; (5) labour intensity and time
  limitations; and (6) obtaining parental permission. (Delgado, 2015, pp.23-24)

Despite these difficulties PV has been recognised as a valuable tool for research with young people. This has
included those who are vulnerable and marginalised. PV offers unique opportunities for young people to
present their perspective as PAR, ‘through a different lens, quite literally, through a new lens; one that no
longer pathologizes them as deficient but as strong and possessing the capacity to take action’ (Krieg &
Roberts, 2007, p.157). The tangential studies of young people and violence, and violence prevention, have
shown PV being successfully utilised as PAR to generate a range of engagement activities with young
people. For example, Cahill et al. (2008) used PV in their research to examine stereotyping of young women
of colour in New York, USA. The participants reported PV as a transformation of critical and Freirean
‘openings’ i.e. how they saw their community differently, how they saw themselves differently, and how
they saw the future differently; and how these factors influenced the desire for change and action. The PV
project informed a ‘sticker campaign, two websites, a youth friendly research report, and presentation at
conferences, schools and local community-based organizations’ (Cahill et al., 2008, p.117). In the study carried out by McIntyre (2000) about how inner-city Black teens in Bridgeport (USA) constructed meanings of living with chronic violence; the participant’s ideas and strategies were used to promote nonviolence in their school and community. Alternatively, Chonody et al. (2013) used PV in Philadelphia (USA) to investigate representations of violence through the eyes of Black young people who were at risk of violence. This work culminated in the participants giving a presentation to a public audience that included their peers, family, staff, and university staff.

PV, especially that which is rooted in Freire, fits well with the aims of the study. It provides a method to understand the research question through the eyes of those who experience it, centred around young people’s photography and young people’s accounts of their lived experience. PV is also well suited to an epistemological interest that embraces different ways of knowing, to value youth perspectives and responses to the problems raised by the research question.

In order to keep my approach to PV close to PAR, I revisited the following principles. They have helped to shape my thinking about the planning and design of the research:

- Commitment to social justice as a challenge to those practices and structures that perpetuate and justify inequality and injustice.
- Researcher and participants as competent reflexive agents throughout the research process.
- Knowledge is situated or ‘context bound’ orientated towards real-life settings and problems.
- No worldview is neutral.
- The ‘values and beliefs that are indigenous to the community’ as central to the research process, analysis and outcomes and so collaborates with the knowledge of participants.
- ‘Construction of new meanings through reflections on action.’
- The validity of the research is considered in accordance with the action that is derived from the research especially in terms of ‘community self-determination.’

(Adapted from Kindon et al., 2007, p.14)

The following discussion will examine the process of asking young people about their photography as a form of photo-elicitation. This will include the unique relevance of photographs as visual stimuli, and how photo-elicitation has brought certain possibilities and challenges to the research.

3.2.4 Photo-elicitation

Photo-elicitation was used in the study during interviews and dialogue groups as part of a collaborative approach. The idea of photo-elicitation (Collier, 1967) emerged in anthropology (Chalfen, 2011), visual sociology (Becker, 1974; Harper, 1998; Wagner, 1978), and ethnography (Pauwels, 2015). Photo-elicitation
has particular significance for the study as a tool to actively elicit knowledge within PV, based on how participants give meaning to their photography.

Before selecting the participants, and collecting data, I made the decision to define the research questions. The reasons for this have been discussed as part of the impetus for the research (chapter 1), and as a response to the identified gaps in the literature (chapter 2); i.e. to focus on how young people understood peace (as a primary object of study), and how they made sense of their knowledge of peace as praxis and possible action. The research schedule for photo-elicitation followed a set of questions commonly used in PV, referred to as the ‘SHOWeD’ schedule (Wang & Burris, 1997) i.e.:

- **S**: What do you **See** here?
- **H**: What **Happened** or is Happening in the picture?
- **O**: How does this relate to **Our** lives?
- **W**: Why does this problem, concern, or strength **Exist**?
- **D**: What can we **Do** about it?

(Adapted from Amos et al., 2012, p.15; and Delgado, 2015, p.139)

This schedule has been used in a breadth of academic research with young people (Cahill et al., 2008; Chio & Fandt, 2007; Delago, 2015; Johansen & Le, 2014; Royce, 2004; Royce et al., 2006; Sanon et al., 2014; Strack et al., 2004; Walker & Early, 2010). Questions in the ‘SHOWeD’ schedule are relatively clear and accessible, and focused on the content and nature of the participant’s photography. The questions are also open and not leading, and provide scope for additional questions as they occur within the context of the interviews or dialogue groups. Further still, the ‘SHOWeD’ schedule was formatted to move from researching knowledge, towards positioning the participant as a potential agent of change (Liebenberg, 2018). This intentionally mirrors the dialogue proposed by Freire, in which images are approached as ‘codifications’ and ‘situation-problems’ (1974a, p.45) that require problem-posing dialogue. Wang et al. (2008) refer to this process as ‘contextualizing’; wherein, PV participants use their photography to ‘identify the problem or the asset, critically discuss the roots of the situation, and develop strategies for changing the situation’ (p.80).

As with previous studies, certain questions were amended, and added, for clarity and purpose (Amos et al., 2012; Chonody et al., 2013). This was done to strengthen the validity of the schedule by focusing the dialogue on what peace means to young people. See Appendix 1: Research Schedule. The same questions were used during interviews and dialogue groups to increase familiarity, deepen understanding through repetition, and to develop continuity. These questions were also given to participants for them to document their photography in advance of the interviews i.e. to reduce young people’s apprehension about the interviews, and to be transparent about what was expected of them during interview. See Appendix 7: Photo
Other PV studies (Johansen & Le, 2012; Royce et al., 2006; Strack et al., 2004) supported the use of the SHOWeD schedule with workbooks. I felt this might feel too “schooly” and present a possible barrier to participants.

Photographs have long been recognised as having relevance as “documenters” of the visibility of everyday life. They are vivid and abstract cultural products that communicate things about the photographer. As an alternative form of non-verbal communication, photographs have great potential to help young people to transmit complicated ideas and negate some of the challenges presented by language and literacy (Delgado, 2015; Royce et al., 2006; Wang & Burris, 1997). Seeing, sharing, and discussing their tangible photographs can also help participants to feel validated in their narratives. In turn, this may help to horizontalise power dynamics as it means ‘the person being questioned’ becomes closer to ‘the role of an expert’ (Pauwels, 2015, p.98) when talking about their photography. This is particularly important for young people who are not used to speaking, lack confidence, or might be uncomfortable when questioned by an adult.

Giving meaning to photographs also requires a different kind of reflection. Rather than neutral documents, or objective records of reality, photographs offer visual stimulus that differs from words and text i.e.:

The parts of the brain that process visual information are evolutionarily older than the parts that process verbal information. Thus images evoke deeper elements of human consciousness than do words; exchanges based on words alone utilize less of the brain’s capacity than do exchanges in which the brain is processing images as well as words. These may be some of the reasons the photo elicitation interview seems like not simply an interview process that elicits more information, but rather one that evokes a different kind of information.’ (Harper, 2002, p.13)

As such, visual images can stimulate interviews (Wagner, 1978), more so than traditional methods of questioning, to evoke new thinking, and to facilitate broader, freer discussion. This includes iterative or emotive responses that participants may be less conscious of. Such instances are referred to as ‘breaking the frame’ and offer something very useful to dialogue in the possibility that participants might express ‘a new view of their social existence’ (Harper, 2002, p.15) as something unexpected.

In the following sections I will outline the staged methodology, including the recruitment of participants, how the investigation was established, and the use of photographs, interviews, and dialogue groups, to collect data.

3.3 Methods
3.3.1 Participants

My sampling choice was demarcated by a focus on young people who were described, or labelled, as ‘marginalised disadvantaged, socially excluded, overlooked, the invisible, or the inarticulate, and service-resistant’ (Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate, 2002). This classification was quite loose, inspired by a commitment to PAR designed to include young people who might not have been known to “speak out”, or to “be heard” as discussed in chapter 1. The sampling frame was not meant to exclude or preclude how young people self-identified, nor was it meant to simply replicate crude and reductionist accounts that fail to acknowledge how young people can occupy more than one role at any given time.

Participants were recruited as part of a two-step process. I recruited the gatekeepers first, who then selected the young people that were most likely to benefit from the research. This process was purposive, as opposed to hoping to form statements about probability or representativeness (Sarantakos, 1993). It was more important to me to increase the likelihood of rich and relevant data than to compare young people’s experiences as ‘like for like’ across predetermined variables or demographics.

Access to participants was subject to gatekeepers who were purposively selected guided by certain known characteristics (May, 2001), such as whether they had access to, and worked with, young people who matched the eligibility criteria. My knowledge of gatekeepers was derived through my existing networks, word of mouth, prior knowledge, or supporting information. The suitability of gatekeepers was also assessed during our preliminary meetings, when they were asked to identify and recruit potential participants based on their local knowledge i.e. as stakeholders, advisers, and actors, with experience of the researched community.

During our preliminary meetings, the sampling frame was interpreted by gatekeepers who spoke about potential participants as being ‘marginalised’, ‘vulnerable’, ‘at-risk’, ‘hidden’, or ‘hard to reach’ and ‘engage’. The gatekeepers explained their choices for potential participants they felt were best suited to the study. This included young people who were known to be experiencing issues of conflict and violence in their family, among peers, and as part of their school experience; physical and mental health problems; drug and alcohol misuse; and experiences of offending and violence, bullying, and discrimination. The gatekeepers often reinforced these accounts by referring to the wider challenges in the communities in which the young people lived (see chapter 3, table 7). As such, the initial preliminary meetings with gatekeepers offered a useful insight into local contexts, which included me being shown around different ‘youth’ facilities, ‘walking the patch’; and being introduced to young people and other professionals who were working with the researched community.
The preliminary meetings with gatekeepers were designed as a quick way to share information about the study and to galvanise interest. This included information about the project aims, objectives, methodology, timescale, and benefits for participants; as well as additional materials to support recruitment such as flyers, and the participant information and consent forms. The preliminary meetings also provided opportunities for me to stress the influential capacity of gatekeepers to recruit participants, and to support them to attend the project; and to help participants share and disseminate their work as a response (or result) of the research in ways that were sustainable.

### 3.3.2 Procedure

Once participants were identified, I worked with gatekeepers to arrange suitable and convenient dates, and meeting spaces, to collect data. The gatekeepers were then asked to support participants to attend the first dialogue group, after which time, young people decided for themselves whether to be part of the research.

The first sessions engaged young people in activities to identify what peace meant to them. They were then asked to operationalise peace through their photography, and then discuss their photographs during interviews and dialogue groups. The methodology was designed to move from individual to collective problem-posing (Wang & Burris, 1997). In the later stages of the study, the participants had opportunities to respond to the issues raised during the research. This included the potential of exhibiting their work as a form of public engagement (see table 4 below).

Table 4: Outline of Staged Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialogue group with activities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduce research, aims and objectives, expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish the investigation of peace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camera workshop:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discuss composition, visual messages, cameras, safety and ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice taking photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice taking consent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camera time:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual participants to take photographs in their own time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-structured interviews:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants to share 4-5 of their photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual photo-elicitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialogue groups:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants to share 2 of their photographs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group photo-elicitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dialogue groups for public engagement:
Participants to consider issues raised during photo-elicitation
Participants to consider youth-led exhibition/engagement
Handover to gatekeeper

Event planning:
Participant-led planning supported by a gatekeeper

Public engagement events:
Participants to publicly present photographs with their point of view
Participants to promote ideas for change based on their concerns and aspirations for peace

The following sections will provide more detail for the staged methodology outlined above, including the strengths, weaknesses, and difficulties.

3.3.3 Establishing the investigation

At the start of the initial group, the aims, objectives, methodology, timescale, etc., of the project were introduced. I checked that the young people understood their commitment to the research, and had completed consent forms. It was also explained that participation in the study was voluntary. I then opened space to discuss shared expectations for group processes and communication aimed at building cohesion and strengthening group dialogue. It was agreed that the researcher and participants should try to listen to each other, get used to speaking in front of each other, and accept in advance that we will have different opinions and ideas. I also emphasised that the staged methodology had been designed to be interactive and flexible, with lots of space for questions and suggestions. After checking that the participants were ready to begin, the sessions were recorded. Each of these actions responded to certain ethical issues that will be examined in this chapter.

As part of the data collection, participants listed and shared their responses to the word “peace”. Consequently, the group experienced which words were ‘weighted with existential meaning (and thus the greatest emotional content)’ (Freire, 1974a, p.43). In groups, participants were then asked to write down how they understood the broader dimensions and determinants of peace in their everyday life. This meant that the young people interacted, expressing and experiencing different and shared meanings and priorities relating to peace in their lives; and they started to critically interpret their situation structurally using their own words. It is hard to assess how such activities may have intruded upon, or constrained, data collection (McIntyre, 2000). However, the activities were worthwhile in so far as they helped to establish the investigation of peace by stimulating participation, and engaging participants who may have had difficulty in articulating their views and sharing their ideas, especially within the research environment.
When facilitating the groups, it was necessary to make decisions about when to refocus the discussion, and when to provide space for drift. The latter enabled opportunities for new directions of inquiry. It was unlikely, that all interactions in the group were monitored, so the ability to read situations was very important. For instance, sensing the nature and feel of interaction and responses, and the nuances of nonverbal communication (Bryman, 2001; May, 2001). It has been shown that group dynamics (Tuckman, 1965) are affected by the identity, culture, roles, personal attributes, levels of association, perceived status, authority, leadership, and shared characteristics of group members, which includes the role of the researcher. The unpredictability of everyday life also impacts how group members may interact at any time, on any day (Bryman, 2001; Hollander, 2004). Such dynamics will inevitably affect the pace and content of the group discussion, including who feels able to speak when, conflict, and how consensus is reached. Given these challenges, I tried to remain aware of group dynamics influenced by how participants appeared to be comfortable, or willing, to share their feelings and thoughts, and the effect of public scrutiny in the group (Barlow & Hurlock, 2013). I was also keen to model participation, rather than assume it would occur naturally (Strack et al., 2006). This was important as the group members had not necessarily worked together before, particularly in ways that were collaborative or dialogic.

In preparation for the study, practical tips and suggestions for facilitating groups were compiled from numerous PV manuals and publications (Amos et al., 2012; Dahan et al., 2007; Delgado, 2015; Orton, 2015; Palibroda, et al., 2009). Some of these are summarised below:

- Planning/staging sessions that are culturally, psychologically, geographically, and practically accessible.
- Planning/presenting content that is appropriate to the participant’s ability and needs.
- Prioritising young people friendly spaces as places known and valued by participants.
- Planning flexible session times and breaks.
- Minimalizing interruptions and distractions.
- Planning for available support from youth workers/gatekeepers both in sessions and/or on-site
- Determining strategies (with participants) for group processes including conflict transformation caused by anything from over-enthusiasm to insensitivity and contention for leadership.

Groups were kept to a total of five or six participants so that each member could be heard, and to avoid attrition caused by boredom, or lack of opportunities for individuals to contribute (Strack et al., 2004). I also felt it was important to engage with more than one group, to enable a broader and richer range of data; and to provide scope to analyse young people’s responses in, and across, different settings (Chonody et al., 2013).
3.3.4 Photographs
PV is premised on the idea that participants will present ‘complex or abstract ideas through their photographs’ (Palibroda et al., 2009, p.17). In preparation for this, the second session focused specifically on photography, and introduced the possibility that photographs can become ‘educational tools’ for stakeholders, policymakers, professionals, and other young people, in the local community and beyond (Wang & Burris, 1997, p.379). Like previous PV studies with young people (Cahill et al., 2008; Chio & Fandt, 2007; Delago, 2015; Johansen & Le, 2014; Royce, 2004; Royce et al., 2006; Sanon et al., 2014; Strack et al., 2004; Walker & Early, 2010), the session covered a range of topics including:

- Introducing participants to the cameras
- Offering basic instruction for taking pictures and camera care
- Group based camera activities
- Basic concepts of composition
- Ethics of photographing others
- How to manage issues of representation and photo ownership
- Issues of safety and respect
- Practicing methods of obtaining consent from subjects who may appear in their photographs.

Building on my experience of group work with young people, and Wang & Burris’s (1997) assertion that meetings should not impede creativity, the camera workshop involved practical activities and role-playing; as well as covering the documentation needed for camera use i.e. consent forms, information sheets, introduction sheets, camera tips, and a ‘Participant Photo Record’, each of which was explained and distributed. See Appendix 7: Photo Record Handout.

There are various approaches to giving young people cameras to capture their ideas as photographs, which inevitably involve ethical issues of what might be appropriate and safe. Strack et al., (2004) did not allow participants to take the cameras home, or allow young people to use them without adult supervision. This was done to prevent the cameras from being lost or stolen. McIntyre (2000) lent cameras (with film) to participants for five days for use in school and at home. Royce (2006) provided disposable cameras, which meant they became the property of young people. Johansen & Le (2012) provided camera phones ‘so that youth would be able to call 911 if an unsafe situation were to occur’ (p.554). Some projects mapped the community first, with thought given to how participants would enter the field i.e. alone, as part of a buddy system, in small, self-selected teams, or accompanied by adults (Cahill et al., 2008; Strack et al., 2004). I provided participants with cameras that were purposefully robust for young people to use independently. The cameras were purchased using a donation from the Stourbridge Quakers, in addition to an award given by De Montfort University. The choice to let participants take photographs independently was aimed to encourage
participant-led photography; wherein, young people could create visual representations, and ‘codifications’, of peace that were less biased by the presence of others or ‘outsiders’.

In addition to activities and information about keeping safe during camera time, I asked participants how they would like to enter the field. Each of the three groups opted to do their photography independently and individually. However, I was asked by the young people in YC2 to accompany them when they first took pictures in their local area. Participants in each of the groups, were given one to two weeks to take as many pictures as they wanted that represented peace in their lives. These photographs belonged to them, and they could determine which images they wished to keep and share. This is a process that is almost immediate with digital cameras. It has been suggested that this form of ‘De Facto self-censorship’ (Wang & Burris, 1997, p.274) can make it difficult to determine what data might be omitted, or missing, from the research. As such, I opted to ask participants, during the interviews, what photographs were not taken, and why (O’Grady, 2008). As a response, some participants reported feeling uncomfortable, and awkward, photographing subjects that were unknown to them; and being too intimidated to obtain consent from strangers. Similar trends have been identified in other PV projects (Hannes & Parylo, 2014). Between them, the young people generated over 528 photographs, of which they selected 53 for interviews and subsequent dialogue groups i.e. to express and share how they understood peace and its related issues as part of their everyday lives. The findings in chapter 6 will examine how two groups of young people (YC1 & C) went on to exhibit 25 photographs in five separate public peace engagement events.

Wang & Burris (1997, p.375) warned that ‘photographs are easy to gather but difficult to analyse and summarise because they yield an abundance of complex data that can be difficult to digest.’ I chose not to use participant’s photographs as a primary source of data; although, the young people’s photographs remained central to the process of photo-elicitation as a tool to provoke data (Silverman, 2014). Using an adaption of the SHOWeD schedule, participants were asked to give meaning to their photographs of peace, as visual stimuli, during interviews and dialogue groups. As photo-elicitation, this actively supported the impetus, and aims, of the research, by concentrating on how young people understood peace, and how they understood their knowledge of peace as praxis. Crucially, talking about their photographs opened spaces for young people to test, adapt, challenge, and transform, their own understanding of peace with each other.

3.3.5 Interviews

After one to two weeks of taking photographs, young people were asked to select four to five of their pictures for an interview. Consistent with PV, and a critical constructive stance in photo-elicitation (Pauwels, 2015), the interviews actively encouraged young people to explore and problem-pose their photographs as ‘typical existential situations’ (Freire, 1974, p.45) of peace in their everyday life.
Interviews have been used in several ways with young people for PV research. For instance, Delgado (2015) used interviewing to recruit participants; whereas, Walker & Early (2010) used interviews to collect primary data. Following an adaptation of the SHOWeD schedule, I designed the interviews to be semi-structured; somewhere between ‘focused’ (Merton, et al., 1956) and what is loosely termed ‘dialectical’ interviewing (Ritchie & Lewis, 2004). Semi-structured interviews are useful as participatory and adaptable forms of data collection. They can give space for ‘people to answer more on their own terms’ (May, 2001, p.123), while maintaining compatibility and replicability (Merten et al., 1956).

During interviews, the adapted SHOWeD schedule allowed follow up questions for extra detail and clarity. This accommodated:

Topics to be covered in the order most suited to the interviewee, to allow responses to be fully probed and explored and to allow the researcher to be responsive to relevant issues raised spontaneously by the interviewee. (Ritchie & Lewis, 2004, p.141)

Supported by open questions, the focus on participant’s photographs helped to provoke critical and unpredicted responses (Harper, 2002), by which interviewees examined ‘avenues of thought they had not explored before’ (Ritchie & Lewis, 2004, p.142). Examples for this are provided in the next chapter.

There are certain inherent difficulties with the notion that ‘correct’ questions will allow participants to formulate ‘correct’ answers to express their reality (Lambert & Loiselle, 2008). The way questions are asked, probed, and ordered, has been shown to generate discrepancies in peace studies with young people (Havoort & Oppenheimer, 1998; Smith, 2004). Furthermore, interviewees will select what they disclose, biased by their personhood, and their experience of the interview/er and topic being discussed (Flick, 2014; May, 2001). In keeping with a dialogic approach, I saw my role as dynamic, characterised by active listening, empathy, judgement, critical enquiry, interest, and respect. I tried to build rapport (Richie & Lewis, 2004), and I encouraged interviewees to talk openly about their thoughts, feelings, and experiences. I also took steps to improve the interaction by avoiding closed and leading questions, and personal opinions; and I remained aware and reflexive about verbal, and non-verbal, communication. For instance, hesitancy, pauses, movements, motions, tone of voice, etc. I also regularly checked in with participants to find out if they were okay, and if they felt the process was working for them in agreement with the aims.

At the end of the interviews, participants were asked to choose two photographs (from those used in the interview) to share in dialogue groups with other participants.
3.3.6 Dialogue groups

The choice to include dialogue groups was influenced by the idea of ‘culture circles’ (Freire, 1971), and examples given by Freire (1974a) of his work in Brazil, in which he used dialogue generated from images. As discussed in chapter 1, Freire’s ideas have particular significance for the study, especially in terms of how dialogue can be used to bridge ‘scholarly knowledge production and social action’ (Pauwels, 2015, p.113).

To recap, during the initial contact activities participants identified and responded to their ‘generative words’ of peace. They then started to identify structural positionality about their knowledge, interests, and concerns, regarding peace. Some of the groups then went on to take photographs, as tangible visual ‘codifications’ of peace in their everyday life, which they then discussed and problem-posed in interview. Following on from this, the purpose of dialogue groups, as opposed to focus groups, was to further examine how young people understood their knowledge of peace in the praxis of their everyday life, and how they related to their knowledge of peace as praxis. This included how young people, supported by their photographs, might move from individual to collective knowledge; as a shift from ‘explanation to representation’ (Chonody, 2013, p.93).

Again, the groups were kept to a total of five or six participants, and lasted approximately two hours, to avoid being too lengthy and demanding. Challenges of group membership, identity, power, and dynamics have already been discussed; including the need for researchers to be able to sense and read situations in groups (Hollander, 2004). The importance of building trust becomes even more significant when opening the type of dialogue that starts from real-life situations, and calls on those involved to (re)see, (re)read, and (re)understand, themselves, others, and society. Questioning the normalcy in the arrangements and interactions of everyday life can be extremely challenging and uncomfortable (Ogunnusi, 2019). The process of dialogue requires the critical scrutiny of self-concepts, including internalised, and environmental, processes and structures, which are underpinned by varying degrees of knowledge, agency, power, conflict, and consciousness. Freire (1974a) reminds us that ‘the possibility to create, to change things’ requires a ‘live and creative dialogue, in which everyone knows some things and does not know others, in which all seek together, to know more’ (p.133).

Additionally, I hoped that dialogue groups would encourage an affirming experience for participants - possibly in ways that might not occur elsewhere in their lives. Therefore, the groups were designed as ‘a meeting place where knowledge is sought and not where it is transmitted’ (Freire, 1974a, p.133). As such, it was important to remain power sensitive in a way that was rooted in a concerned compassion for those involved. As the coordinator, I openly demonstrated a willingness to be taught by, and about, the participants and their knowledge; rather than to objectify or manipulate them. This formed part of a conscious attempt to
horizontalise and democratising relations i.e. in the groups, and more generally throughout the research process. Such practices are key to the nature of Freirean dialogue, and the relationships that underpin it, as a particular form of communication, which shows a readiness to move from being an objective expert (Freire, 1970). It is a challenging approach that required continual reflexivity about my role, competence, and decision-making.

Enabling the young people to hear and see each other’s photography in the groups stimulated rich responses (Pauwels, 2015), and the nature of dialogue meant they questioned their common-sensical and conventional explanations about peace in their everyday life. The participants successfully moved between their individual and collective interpretations, identified areas for further enquiry, and constructed new ideas. This included how they questioned their shared experiences, beliefs, norms, and structural limits to peace in their everyday life (chapters 4 to 6). When thinking about the duality of praxis and consciousness, it was also encouraging that groups of participants, who were those most impacted by the problems presented by the research (Cahill & Torre, 2007), used their knowledge to inform public engagement/impact events (chapter 6).

The next section will examine some of the ethical issues presented by the research.

3.4 Being ethical in photovoice

This chapter, and preceding chapters, have revisited the importance of creating and maintaining ethical spaces by being (ethically) active in the research process. The impetus for, and aims of, the study, have been explained to demonstrate my belief that young people:

> Are social actors who have a right to be involved in research about issues of concern to them. It is important to note that we not only seek to involve CYP [children & young people] in research because they have a right to be involved but also to improve the quality of the research itself. (Shaw et al., 2011, p.4; my italics)

Furthermore, it has been recognised that the nature of dialogue, as part of the methodology, is more inclined towards building trust to deepen and reframe knowledge. This calls for honesty, compassion, and care; and ongoing awareness and reflexivity; as being key to the authenticity of the study based in ideas of fairness and inclusivity (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Chapters 1 and 2, have stressed the importance of such ideas when working with young people, and especially those who are identified as being marginalised, vulnerable, at-risk, hidden, or hard to reach and engage. Reflecting on these issues has given rise to difficult ethical questions, such as those posed towards the end of chapter 2. For example, how and why participants in the study were positioned and engaged in the research; and how participants were valued and enabled as part of the intended, and actual, consequences of the research/er.
In 2015, I attended PV training for three days at the London College of Communication. Included was a discussion of a coherent Photovoice Statement of Ethical Practice (Tiffany, 2009). This document was structured around certain core principles such as:

- ‘Choice’ about content and withdrawal.
- ‘Creativity’ as key to participation and space that should be protected and respected.
- ‘Partnership’ as a participatory process and ongoing support.
- ‘Sustainability’ as locally based long-term impact.
- ‘Cultural sensitivity’ as training locally-relevant facilitators, and culturally sensitive images and codes of behaviour and language.

(Adapted from Tiffany, 2009, p.3)

The discussion of ethical practice also included key areas of ethical concern in PV such as:

- Protecting ‘the best interests’ of participants by managing risk (emotional, psychological, political, economic, cultural, social, physical) e.g. such as having DBS checked facilitators.
- Managing the ‘well-being’ and expectations of participants throughout e.g. planning for closure and exit strategies.
- Responding to the specific needs of ‘public exposure’ that are presented by PV.
- Thinking about ‘facilitation’ and working with ‘project partners’.

(Adapted from Tiffany, 2009, pp.3-6)

These (and other) ethical issues featured throughout the study, and were spoken about with gatekeepers and participants in ways that were participative, inclusive, understandable, and jargon-free.

Early discussions with gatekeepers and participants offered honest, open, and transparent accounts about the purpose of the research, and what the research involved, to enable informed consent. Following existing protocols for PV, participants were given written consent forms to obtain informed consent (Wang & Redwood-Jones, 2001). See Appendix 2: Participant Information Sheet & Consent sheet. Participants were only expected to consent after being informed by their gatekeepers, and the researcher, about the ethical protocols and commitments that were structured into the research process i.e. how it affects them, what they can expect, the risks, benefits, how to complain; and how data would be collected, accessed, and securely stored. I read this information out during the initial meeting to check the participant’s comprehension, and to confirm their capacity to understand what they are being asked to do.

Issues of photography and taking photographs were tackled in the early sessions, such as how participants could safeguard themselves and their equipment; and preparation for taking photographs in private and public spaces. These discussions addressed ‘power and ethics, emphasising safety and the authority and
responsibility that comes with using a camera’ (Wang & Redwood-Jones, 2001, p. 570). This involved ethical and safe ways of going out into the community with protocols for emergencies, plus the need to consider the risks posed by others, and certain areas when carrying cameras (Chonody et al., 2013). Explanations were presented in different ways, supported by questions, role plays, and handouts. See Appendix 7: Safety & Respect Handout.

Consistent with existing protocols for PV (Wang & Redwood-Jones, 2001), participants were given a second consent form specifically concerned with taking photographs in the community. See Appendix 3: Consent Form for People Who May Appear in Photographs. This form was designed to obtain consent from subjects before they are photographed. The form included a short statement that could be read aloud to help participants articulate the purpose of the research. Given the demands of the project, I thought it would be useful to provide a statement that could be easily carried and read by the young people when seeking to gain consent from people they wished to photograph (Hannes & Parylo, 2014). How appropriate this statement was, including the wording, was openly discussed; and participants were actively encouraged to reword it in their own way.

PV presents particular ethical issues for how safe participants feel with their photographs, and sharing their photographs. During the initial session, it was useful to agree on ground rules to reaffirm the nature and culture of the dialogue groups, including confidentiality (Amos, et al., 2012; Cahill et al., 2008; Strack et al., 2004). Participants were also reminded of their choice not to share information that makes them uncomfortable. It was also made clear that confidentiality would be breached if participants disclosed any information that suggested they, or others, may be at risk of significant harm.

Language, words, and photographs of peace can represent ‘emotional laden content’ (Delgado, 2015, p.162). Therefore, asking participants to create, share, and talk about, photographs of peace might be unpredictably disturbing; and provoke heightened, unpleasant, and even traumatic emotional states. These concerns were discussed at different stages of the research, with space for young people to express their feelings. Participants were informed that they could, and should feel able to, take time out individually, collectively, or with a gatekeeper. Alternatively, it was made known that the research could be discontinued if needed. When speaking to participants and gatekeepers about how best to respond to these situations, strategies were included to signpost participants to relevant information, staff, or services, for additional support if necessary.

There is an additional responsibility in PV, whereby the facilitator is open and transparent about their interest in social change, and how this influences the purpose of the contact with participants (Wang & Burris, 1997).
Also, this creates some challenges regarding the confidentiality of information, and anonymity of those involved i.e. when PV is situated in community-based activities, such as the public exhibition of participant’s photography. Therefore, it was discussed in the early sessions, and during the participant’s planning of public engagement events, that photographs are ‘tangible documents (and) to consider the risk that they could be used against them’ (Wang et al., 1998, p.84). This included the possibility of images being selected for publications, reports, websites, and public exhibitions; with young photographers as named and, or, present. We spoke about how safe participants felt being associated with their photographs, and any additional concerns and issues raised by the study; and any potential actions that might emerge from the research. Cahill, (2008, p.187) described this as ‘what is safe to say aloud and share with the others within and beyond the research team.’

To allow more control for participants regarding their photographs, they were given a third consent form that listed image consent and model release about the use, ownership, and reproduction of their images. See Appendix 4: Consent, Copywrite & Model Release Form. This form helped to explain and clarify how participants held the intellectual properties of their photographs, but not the data generated by the research. The form also provided an effective way for young people to review their photographs, and to have a choice about how they would be used. Regardless, of their responses, I decided that the names of the young people would be anonymised. As such, each participant has been given a pseudonym and a code for the setting in which the data was collected. See Appendix 8: Participant Codes. Where there are photos of participants in this thesis, and elsewhere, they have signed an informed consent form to agree to its inclusion.

It was also necessary to prepare young people for the possibility that they might not have the experience they wished for when sharing their photography in public spaces (Delgado, 2015). These discussions were given particular attention during the preparation for young people’s self-representations and advocacy (chapters 5 and 6).

Ethical approval for the research was received on 27.01.2016. See Appendix 5: Ethical Approval.

3.5 Data management and procedures for analysis

The findings (chapters 4 to 6) have been drawn from audio-recorded interviews and groups that were transcribed and documented as word files, along with photographs, post-its, and flipcharts. In total, I spoke to 21 young people aged 15-24 about peace. This involved 17 dialogue groups, three camera workshops, one street-based photography session, 12 interviews, and five public engagement/ impact events. The process lasted just under two and a half years, between 2016 and 2019, moving from one group to the next, across five inner-city settings. See table 5 below:
Table 5: Data Set Generated in This Research Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Youth Club 1</th>
<th>Youth Involvement Team</th>
<th>Youth Club 2</th>
<th>Youth Offending</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>(n=3) *</td>
<td>(n=4) *</td>
<td>(n=6)</td>
<td>(n=2) *</td>
<td>(n=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue group with activities</td>
<td>(n=3) *</td>
<td>(n=4) *</td>
<td>(n=6)</td>
<td>(n=2) *</td>
<td>(n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera workshop</td>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>(n=6)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>(n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street-based photography session</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>(n=4)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with photoelicitation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue group with photoelicitation</td>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td>(n=4)</td>
<td>(n=4)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>(n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue group for public engagement &amp; handover</td>
<td>(n=3) **</td>
<td>(n=4) **</td>
<td>(n=4) **</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>(n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public peace Engagement</td>
<td>(n=3) **</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>(n=4) **</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>(n=5) **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Gatekeeper present for some of the first session  ** Not audio recorded

All 21 participants engaged with the first dialogue group and the initial activity, then four groups (minus YOT) completed the second activity. In total, the young people generated over 528 photographs, of which three groups (YC1, YC2, and C) selected 53 for interviews and subsequent dialogue groups. Two groups (YC1 and C) went on to exhibit 25 photographs in five separate public peace engagement events, and YC2 influenced a local public engagement event.

Included below are some examples of the young people’s photographs, which they selected for interviews and dialogue groups:
Fig. 3: Examples of participant’s photography used for photo-elicitation

Maya (17, YC1)

Amita (18, YC2)
3.5.1 Data analysis

Data were coded for content and analysed for prominent themes informed by the work of Braun & Clarke (2006) as a process of thematic analysis. The process was not linear, but iterative, with constant reciprocity staged across the different tasks listed below:

1. Familiarizing yourself with the data
2. Generating initial open codes
3. Searching for themes
4. Reviewing/mapping themes
5. (Re)Defining and naming
6. Producing the report

(Adapted from Braun & Clarke, 2006, p.87)

After each session, audio recordings were labelled and stored on a password protected device. I listened to these audio recordings repeatedly to become familiar with the data and made initial notes. The recordings were then transcribed. This was followed by multiple readings. Word-by-word, line by line, open coding, and colour-keying, was used to highlight passages of text and words as both descriptive and illustrative (Braun & Clarke, 2006). An example is provided below:
NVivo software was introduced to organise and store the data. This also enabled the visualisations of axiological coding that illustrated the relational properties of early codes. See Appendix 9: NVivo Code Book. Codes were then isolated and arranged thematically into parent codes or basic themes; including patterns of word choices and frequency, and the arrangement and association of words. Basic themes were intentionally descriptive, and content driven, as part of the analysis. This was consistent with my eagerness to keep the voices of young people central, both as part of my aims, and to report a valid account of their narratives.

Once data collection was complete, I went back to reading transcripts and listening to recordings accompanied by memo writing. This formed part of a deliberate and reflexive attempt to review my connectedness and bias to the research and data. In moving away from the inferred logic, or rationale, of my previous inductive analysis, I was actively prepared to relinquish my existing certainties, and to seek new interpretations. Descriptive themes were (re)defined and (re)named by clustering together similar themes. This resulted in three global themes that progressed from the relational properties of early coding and clustering, and placed a greater emphasis on ‘theoretical inferences’ (Bryman, 2001, p274). See Appendix 10: Thematic Coding (PATs). These overarching global themes are presented below, and consist of more than deficit peace, everyday peace affirming tactics, and critical engagement and impact.

---

**Mike:**

Q1 Why have you selected this picture?

**Mary:**

Because I think to me I was going to take photos of friends and random people in the street but to me people are my friends and my family mean absolutely everything to me. And these, well my mum and my siblings are my the most important people in my life. Without them I wouldn’t know peace. I wouldn’t know stability. I wouldn’t know love. Because I can’t get that from my dad. Well I say that but you know what I mean, they are have been my rocks throughout some really difficult times. And I classify, sorry I am getting a bit emotional. I classify my mum as my best friend and so I have picked this photo because I think it, well I hope that it shows the similarities between us and the fact that just I hope that you can see in our eyes just the love and the compassion. It just makes me laugh because like my emotional face I completely caught her off guard so that’s a properly natural, she wasn’t posing for that because she almost didn’t know it was being taken. And it brings out my emotions because they just mean so much to me.

**Mike:**

Q2 What is happening in the picture?
Table 6: Global Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More than deficit peace</th>
<th>Everyday peace affirming tactics</th>
<th>Critical engagement and impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial peace concepts</td>
<td>Situated learning</td>
<td>Young people’s tactics for self-representation and advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non/deficit peace</td>
<td>Social coherence</td>
<td>Peace-limit situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahistorical peace</td>
<td>Self-initiated peace</td>
<td>Developing tactics for public engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change and peace</td>
<td>Examples of participant’s public engagement</td>
<td>Extensive contacts in the field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next section will consider how I have approached issues of rigor and trustworthiness as part of the research design and methodology.

3.6 Establishing Rigor and Trustworthiness

Although I was not immersed in the social world of the participants, I have evidenced a longitudinal and ethnographic approach, using photography and dialogue to see the research question “through the eyes” of young people. My response to (traditional) questions of internal and external validity, reliability, and objectivity, has been shaped by an interpretivist and post-critical paradigm, which seeks to establish ‘trustworthiness’ to achieve rigor in qualitative research. Heavily influenced by the work of Lincoln & Guba (1985), this process required an understanding of credibility, reproducibility, dependability, and confirmability. Importantly, each of these concepts has called for ongoing (and deepened) self-understanding and self-awareness, referred to as reflexivity; to help me identify and address issues of bias. For instance, my assumptions, social conditioning, knowledge, power, and consciousness; and how I read, relate, and act in, and on, the world (Andreotti, 2014; Galdas, 2017).

3.6.1 Credibility

Credibility questions the internal validity of the research and developed theory (Bryman, 2001) as being true to that expressed by the participants in the study. As stated earlier in this chapter, the research was designed to explore how young people understood and located peace, and their knowledge of peace, in the situatedness and praxis of their everyday life. However, it has been shown that the researcher and researched will have multiple and relative interpretations that can differ. Therefore, a deliberate effort was made to
construct the research, and to develop theory, which was conscientious about the rigour of the research process.

The research has been shown to be purposefully designed to allow high levels of engagement and ownership by participants, in ways that were transparent and collaborative, to entail fairness and inclusivity (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Mixed and creative methods such as photography as a projective technique, interviews with photo-elicitation, and group-based dialogue, actively explored and conveyed the views of participants (Ritchie & Lewis, 2004). In response to some of the issues raised in chapters 1 and 2, I remained critically aware of delineations of power in the study (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005). This included an awareness of how my role might further the marginalisation of participants by silencing, or muting, their narratives, concerns, and agency. The inclusion of generative words, group activities, participant-led photography, open questions in dialogue, etc., meant I was ‘no longer the only one in control of the fieldwork’ (Hannes & Parylo, 2014, p.257). Similarly, open-ended questions and dialogue resulted in additional questions being posed, and answered, by the participants themselves. Such practices reduced the ability for me to pre-empt and restrain the participant’s responses.

The triangulation of dialogue groups, interviews, and photo-elicitation has also helped to strengthen consistency in the data. This was supported by my time spent immersed in the data, listening to audio recordings, careful line-by-line analysis of transcripts, and detailed memo writing (Bryman, 2001; Flick, 2014; Lincoln & Denzin, 2000). I revisited the findings and interpretations against the raw data, numerous times, including cases that did not fit.

The overall design meant prolonged longitudinal contact with participants, making it easier to take observations and ideas back to them. Ongoing communication and spaces for questions, feedback, and consensus, were maintained throughout the research process, to bolster rigor and trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Also, sections of the coding and my interpretation were discussed with research supervisors to enable reflection, and to check possible discrepancies and bias. Further still, my ideas, methods, and interpretations have been discussed as ‘peer debriefings’ and ‘member checks’ (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) with my supervisors, gatekeepers, young people, practitioners, academics, and peers - including informal discussions, talks, presentations, and practice (chapter 6). This has helped me to look at my data and analysis in different ways, and from different perspectives.

3.6.2 Reproducibility

The research design was motivated and challenged by the rootedness of the data. It did not aim to determine facts that can be generalised to wider populations. Instead, it valued rich, accurate, and detailed, data that has
unique localised and situated validity. The specific contextuality of the data was also comprised of my personhood and experience. Subsequently, it is arguable whether such conditions (and data) can be replicated elsewhere outside of the study i.e. outside of the ‘time and context in which they were found to hold’ (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p.316). Alternatively, the triangulation of mixed methods (photography, photo-elicitation, interviews, dialogue groups) may have contributed to the potential reproducibility of the findings (Flick, 2014).

I have included direct quotes from the raw data, collected during interviews and dialogue groups, to illustrate young people’s knowledge and experiences (chapters 5 to 7). These quotes are frequent, and some data has been quoted at length. This was fuelled by my moral commitment to keep the words of young people close to the study, and it has added credibility. The direct quotes can also help the reader make judgements about the reproducibility of the study. In the next chapter, I will provide detailed descriptions of participants, and where the data were collected. Again, it is hoped that this can help the reader to get a sense of the potential reproducibility of the findings and discussion.

In addition, various activities outside of the research, carried out by participants and the researcher, have suggested that the findings hold very relevant meaning, and possible traction in other locations (chapter 6).

### 3.6.3 Dependability

As part of academic requirements, and research practice, I have ensured that ‘the research process is logical, traceable, and clearly documented’ (Nowell et al., 2017, p.3). This has added to the dependability of the study by outlining a systematic approach to data collection, analysis, and interpretation. Evidencing a documented trail allows the reader (and other researchers) to read my methodological, and theoretical, decision-making, and the reasons behind them. Copies of the ethical approval paperwork, data collection schedules, and examples of analysis, are cited in the text of this chapter, and listed in the appendices.

Importantly, as stated, there is an evidence-base for the replicability of the methodology (Ogunnusi, 2019), which at the time of writing this continues to inform practice with young people and practitioners outside of the research (chapter 6).

### 3.6.4 Confirmability

The fourth concept of trustworthiness is confirmability. This considers how ‘the researcher’s interpretations and findings are clearly derived from the data, requiring the researcher to demonstrate how conclusions and interpretations have been reached’ (Nowell et al., 2017, p.3). As part of confirmability, it is important to revisit the acknowledgement of bias.
As a qualitative researcher, I did not consider myself to be separate from the study. I have openly declared my bias about my biography (Galdas, 2017) and impetus for the study. As part of my transparency, it has been shown that the research holds prior knowledge and experience for me (chapter 1). Being this close to the research will have made me prone to expectations and assumptions that are not grounded in the research process (Bryman, 2001; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Flick, 2014). Therefore, I have continually identified and responded to issues of subjectivity and bias; both in, and on, my actions as a researcher (Schön, 1983). This has included discussion about my thoughts, feelings, decision-making, and the possible implications. It has constituted a critically reflexive process that has been supported by my supervisors, and accompanied by ongoing discussions with gatekeepers, young people, practitioners, academics, and peers.

Confirmability exists when credibility, transferability, and dependability, have all been achieved and strengthened by an audit trail (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). I have produced systematic documentation of the research procedure and process, evidence of research-based training, university paperwork, ethical approval paperwork, data collection schedules, raw data, examples of analysis, documented coding, contact with gatekeepers, photographs, and references to feedback. Transcripts are also available. Additionally, I have made copious notes about (my) theory and practice at each stage of the research process. When taken together, this provides an audit trail that can help the reader (and other researchers) to understand and follow my actions in the study.

3.6.5 My Role

My role was strengthened and supported by my accumulated professional experience which meant I took an active role to engage with participants. This helped me to build relationships and rapport with participants, and settle into open and non-formal dialogue. Young people proved willing to talk about their knowledge and experiences of peace with a depth that surprised the gatekeepers. Alternatively, my prior experience and familiarity meant I had to be extremely vigilant and reflexive about the nature of my interaction, especially any personal bias.

During the study, I have occupied a ‘space between’ the dichotomy of insider and outsider roles (Dwyer & Buckle, 2009; Kerstetter, 2012). Although I have some familiarity with questions of young people and peace, and interacting with young people regarding this topic, I am not a young person. Furthermore, opening dialogue required me to learn the local meaning, and community-based problem solving, as someone outside of the researched community. However, my contact with each group lasted between three to eight months, so my role shifted to that of a quasi-insider (Brown & Powell, 2012), or an external-insider (Banks, 1998).
Perceptions of my role were also mediated by other unpredictable characteristics such as gender, class, religion, and age (Kerstetter, 2012). For instance, as an adult who is Black and ethnically minoritised, issues of race and discrimination were seen by participants (and gatekeepers) in BEM communities to position me as an insider when conducting the research. Again, such processes can result in bias and assumptions based on experience (Dwyer & Buckle, 2009).

In response to the challenges raised by my role, I have remained open, questioning, flexible, critically aware of self and others, power sensitive, unsure, and able to go ‘inside’ and ‘reach out’, as part of the process of reflexivity.

3.7 Summary

This chapter has covered the philosophical arguments and the values underpinning the research, the methods used, ethical considerations and practices to example power issues, exploration of the relevant strengths and weakness of the chosen approach, with consideration of reflexivity, and detail for data analysis. This has shown the progression from the research philosophy to methodology, including the planning and design of data collection tools, and evidence for thematic analysis; as well as the steps taken to establish rigor and trustworthiness. The limitations of the study, including those presented by the research philosophy and design, will be discussed in chapter 7.

The next chapter will start to present the findings for how young people in five differing inner-city settings understood peace in the praxis of their everyday life, and how they related to their knowledge of peace as praxis.
Section 4 - More than deficit peace

4.1 Chapter outline

This is the first of three findings chapters for how 21 young people, in five differing inner-city settings, understood peace within their everyday life; and how they related to their knowledge of peace production as praxis. Qualitative data were collected through semi-structured interviews and dialogue groups, then coded and thematically analysed, guided by the conceptual framework outlined in chapter 1.

This chapter will start by outlining the stages of the research, followed by a brief (tabled) account for the gatekeeper’s local knowledge, and detail for the participants. This has been included to provide the reader with some background and context for the findings. The chapter will then discuss the first set of findings to illustrate how young people understood peace conceptually, as part of a shared narrative that moved past binaries of ‘deficit peace’. This will be presented thematically, comprised of non-deficit peace, ahistorical peace, and change and peace.

4.2 Stages of the research

From July 2015 onwards, I contacted gatekeepers in preparation for the study. The process lasted just under two and a half years between 2016-2019. Contact with participants was longitudinal, with data collection lasting from 8th Sept 2016 to 25th June 2018 with 21 young people (aged 15-24). Data were gathered on more than one occasion using mixed methods (see table 8). This involved an initial dialogue group designed to explore the participant’s first impressions of peace, followed by sessions that focused on photography and camera use. After this, participants were lent cameras to use individually on their own to photograph their visual representations of peace. This camera time lasted up to two weeks, and participants were able to upload their photographs to a password protected online storage site, email them to me or their gatekeeper directly, or give them to their gatekeeper to be printed. Participants were then asked to select four to five photographs for interviews, two of which they would share again during consecutive dialogue groups. Overall, the study involved 17 dialogue groups, three camera workshops, one street-based photography session, 528 pictures taken on cameras, 12 interviews, 29 photographs shared with the researcher and other participants, 25 photographs publicly exhibited during community exhibitions, four youth-led engagement events, and one youth influenced activity.

4.2.1 Contact with gatekeepers

Gatekeepers were contacted in preparation for access to young people and data collection (chapter 3). In the interests of transparency, the table below lists each of the gatekeepers, their settings, and a pen sketch of
participants. This information was compiled from my notes of initial gatekeeper meetings and during the research. It is included to add contextual background to the findings and demonstrate the relevance of the young people to the research question.

Table 7: Gatekeepers & Pen Sketch of Young People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Gatekeeper</th>
<th>Pen Sketch of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROUP A Youth Club (YC1)</td>
<td>Senior youth work manager &amp; Youth worker part-time</td>
<td>The youth centre was situated in an area of multiple deprivation i.e. high unemployment, low salaries, poor health, high mortality rates &amp; teenage conception rates, and an estimated 2160 children living in poverty (Leicester Ward Health Profile New Parks 2013, p.1). Gatekeepers reported seeing adults fighting in the street outside the centre and said that attendees at the youth centre were threatened and assaulted by other young people. The manager shared a recent incident in which a young person was seriously assaulted in her car as she tried to get him to safety because he owed money to young people outside the area. She was shocked that other young people did nothing to help because they thought the violence was justified, and instead stood filming the incident on their phones. Three participants identified as attendees of the centre but not in the same friendship groups. During the research, they shared experiences of dyslexia, ongoing exposure to prolonged anti-social behaviour plus theft, recent life challenging/threatening illness and bereavement, mental health as personal and family-based, issues of parental divorce, parental alcoholism, siblings who are school refusers, exclusion from secondary and higher education, racism, and one was a youth advocate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP B Youth Involvement Team (YIT)</td>
<td>Team manager &amp; Youth participation worker</td>
<td>Youth organisation situated in the centre of the city included elected members of the Young People's Council who work alongside the City Council and the police community on issues such as knife crime, equal pay, homelessness, mental health, and transport. Four participants identified who lived in different areas across the city. They were known to each other through the project and their common experience of youth voice and participation which dated back for a couple of years. Each of the participants shared concerns about their educational achievement. They did not share any additional personal information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP C Youth Club (YC2)</td>
<td>The joint head of centre &amp; Youth worker part-time</td>
<td>The youth centre was in an area of ‘higher unemployment, job insecurity and falling real-terms incomes’ (Hirsch, 2014:1). This contributed to deprivation and an estimated 2400 children living in poverty, accentuated by a larger than average population of 0-15-year olds (Leicester Ward Health Profile, 2013). The area also had problems with low adult literacy &amp; numeracy, robbery, bad diet, low life expectancy, a high turnover of residents, and the greatest ethnic diversity in the city - characterised by residents from the Indian sub-continent. The youth worker reported an “epidemic” of street-based youth violence involving British Asian Pakistani boys and African</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Somali boys, described as “youth gangs” competing territorially to sell drugs. The conflict impacted young people’s attendance at the youth centre and continued during the research. I spent time with some of the boys who used the centre for recreation and on occasions to escape direct violence, several of whom were excluded for drug related behaviour. Staff reported a general lack of response or support from the local community, police, or politicians.

Six participants identified who were known to each other through the youth centre. During the research, they shared past and ongoing experiences of living with gangs and stereotyping and discrimination from both outside and within their community. The first included brothers and fathers having drug addictions or dependency, brothers selling drugs and being injured or arrested as a consequence; their houses being raided, and siblings being imprisoned; family arguments leading to stress, illness, and parents separating. Issues of discrimination were shared as daily experiences of Islamophobia, racism, sexism, issues of disability in the family, and microaggressions at college, which in one instance had led to mental health issues.

| GROUP D Youth Offending Team (YOT) | Youth advocate support manager & Support mentor | Youth Offending Team situated in the centre of the city, working with young people aged 10 to 17 years to prevent and reduce reoffending and promote safer communities. The manager reported that participants had issues of knife-related crime and not being in employment, education or training. It was also suggested that they suffered from the stress, trauma and violence of being stabbed, and living with the threat of being attacked. This was in addition to the loss of their fathers, education, freedom, and friends. Three young people identified, two attended, who were not known to each other. They were on referral orders because they had been found/or pleaded guilty to offending, which was timetabled into a wider Asset Plus Target Pathway and planning intervention program, and as part of Intensive Supervision and Surveillance (ISS). They shared experiences of being a young offender. |
| GROUP E College (C) | Learner engagement and enrichment worker & Learning mentor | Inner-city college campus situated in the centre of the city. Six participants identified. Each receiving support due to individual issues. Two participants were known to each other as friends and others attended the same classes. Those under the age of 17 used their hours in the research as evidence towards their 36 hours of work experience to meet their module requirements. During the research participants shared that two of them were young adult carers for their mothers, one of whom was recently bereaved, has Asperger’s, and a history of moving schools due to bullying and victimisation. The other carer suffered from mental illness with experience of domestic violence. Other participants included a Looked After Child with exam phobia, a young woman who accesses Child & Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS), someone currently in cancer remission, and a young refugee who has been living independently since the age of 16. They all expressed anxiety about their formal education. |
4.2.2 Contact with young people

Details for each of the 21 participants and their group is provided in table 8 and includes how each group participated in the various stages of the methodology.

Table 8: Contact with participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups and Dates</th>
<th>Participant details and pseudonyms</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Number of participants involved &amp; photos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROUP A Youth Club (YC1) 8th Sept 2016-30th Mar 2017 with a gap between Nov and Feb.</td>
<td>Everett male white British 17 Maya female Black Caribbean/White British 17 Mary female white British 17</td>
<td>Dialogue group</td>
<td>3 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Camera workshop</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>3 &amp; 53 photos taken, 11 shared, 6 exhibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue group</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue group</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue group</td>
<td>3 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue group with handover</td>
<td>3 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prep for engagement</td>
<td>3 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>3 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP B Youth Involvement Team (YIT) 16th Feb-9th Mar 2017.</td>
<td>Fatima Female British Indian 15 Amreena Female British Indian 17 Hadiya Female British Pakistani 17 Isha Female British Indian 17</td>
<td>Dialogue group with activities</td>
<td>4 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>4 &amp; 45 photos taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP C Youth Club (YC2) 29th Sept-11th Dec 2017. The engagement happened the following year on 18th Aug.</td>
<td>Minah Female British Pakistani 17 Amita Female British Indian 18 Zainab Female British Indian 17 Afifa Female British Indian 16 Yasir male British Pakistani 17 Ahmed Male British Indian 17</td>
<td>Dialogue group</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Camera workshop</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>4 &amp; 278 photos taken, 8 shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue group</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue group</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue group with handover</td>
<td>4 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>6 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP D Youth Offending Team (YOT) 24th Jan 2018.</td>
<td>Chad male Black African 17 Amal male British Indian 17</td>
<td>Dialogue group with activities</td>
<td>2 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>2 &amp; 15 photos taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP E College (C) 15th Mar-25th June</td>
<td>Hannah female White British 24 Emma female White and Black Caribbean 17 Humaira female British Pakistani 17</td>
<td>Dialogue group</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue group</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Camera workshop</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Photos</td>
<td>4 &amp; 137 photos taken,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Initial Peace Concepts

In our first meeting, I wanted to gain a sense of the ideas about peace that young people came with. These were collected using activities (chapter 3) that asked them to write their ideas and responses on post-its and flipcharts:

Fig. 5: Example of written responses to the word peace

The responses of young people during the initial activities involved a huge and diverse range of ideas that have been tabled below:
Table 9: Responses written during initial activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peace values</th>
<th>YC 1</th>
<th>YIT</th>
<th>YC 2</th>
<th>YOT</th>
<th>CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is present for peace</td>
<td>Laughter, Joyful, Fun Enjoy, Happiness</td>
<td>Happiness x 3</td>
<td>Happiness x 2</td>
<td>Socialising</td>
<td>Happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loving the world, Love x 2</td>
<td>Love, spreading love</td>
<td>Love x 3</td>
<td>Loving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friendship x 2, Bonds</td>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harmony, Everybody together, Togetherness</td>
<td>Unity x 3, Togetherness</td>
<td>Harmony, Unity, Togetherness</td>
<td>Joining forces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equality x 3, Equity</td>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>Equality, Treating each other fairly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance, agreement, Understanding</td>
<td>Acceptance x 2, everyone accepts one another for who or what they are, Forgiveness, Satisfaction with your life</td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>Resolving, Respect, Kindness</td>
<td>Patience, respect, Kind, Giving what you don't need, helping people in need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be yourself</td>
<td>Free, Freedom, law</td>
<td>Freedom x 2, Being yourself</td>
<td>Free will</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calm, Peace, Being alone, Peace and quiet, Silence</td>
<td>Serenity, Calm, Still</td>
<td>Calm</td>
<td>Silence, Calm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meditation on peace, Play, Paint, Spiritual/ enlightenment</td>
<td>Hobbies, Sleep</td>
<td>Pacifism</td>
<td>Sleep, Pilgrimage</td>
<td>Meditation Exercise x 2, Art, Running, God, Hobbies, Cheerleading, sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### What is absent for peace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People</th>
<th>Friends x2</th>
<th>Jeremy Gillen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>War, Peace = no army, no enemies, no guns, no violence, no racism, sexism, or homophobia.</td>
<td>Banning of guns, no wars, no war, No biases, no prejudice, no discrimination. Absence of violence, peace is when there is no discrimination. Suffering is stopped.</td>
<td>Cease fire, Nonviolence, no hate, no crime x2, no racism, no discrimination, no conflicts, no war, lower death rate. Never going to be achieved 100 percent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent People</td>
<td>Trump (crossed out)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>On top of the world, melancholy, incoherence, dreamlike, float, drift</td>
<td>My mind, beauty, interest, Truce-treaty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings and implications for some initial concepts of peace will be presented thematically as non-deficit peace, a-historical peace, and change and peace. Before this, however, I want to point to how all groups communicated peace at a fundamental level.

A variable and fluid interpretation of peace emerged in the findings for all groups that was informed by, and kept coming back to, an idea of attachment and bonds e.g. ‘knowing you have someone there’ and having people to ‘relate to’ and ‘bond with’ i.e. ‘that feeling, that bond, that's peaceful’ (Isha, 17, YC2/FG 1). In chapter 5, more detail will be provided for how participants understood peace in their bonds with family members and others, which formed an emergent narrative about situated learning and role models. However, this salient idea of bonds was discussed as something more distinct. Young people spoke about how such bonds supported them ‘to share your story’, having ‘someone to talk to’, and being empathetic towards others:

> Because it lets you understand what others are like and it sort of helps your peace of mind I suppose. It could be someone who is different to someone going through the same thing. (Fatima, 15, YIT/FG1)

Fatima, 15 (YIT/FG1) explained how peace represented bonds with things that were both subjective and material:

> Fatima: I wrote friendship, I wrote bonds, so you have a bond with someone or bond with something. Unity, togetherness, no bias, no prejudice.
Researcher: Let me go back, because you said someone or something, what is something?
Fatima: it could be a holy book it could be a painting it could be something you created it could
be a poem, it could be anything.

Also, young people’s responses indicated this bond extended to relationships that are immediate and more remote. One participant explained that remote bonds represented peace in her life, saying that ‘I’ve watched so many things and thought, “you got me through this part of my life’’ (Isha, 17, YIT/FG1). This was elaborated, in the same group, as involving virtual relationships with people that participants felt connected to and bonded with on social media, such as ‘You Tubers’, ‘Bloggers’, and ‘People you follow’. These remote others were specifically valued by the YIT group as campaigners, activists, sources of information and inspiration for peace e.g. the ‘Humans of NY project’.

The notion of being connected to others was further reiterated by a participant in group C, who has Asperger’s syndrome, who said that as part of her daily peace she found it easier to relate to actors/actresses rather than have personal relationships with people:

Finding characters to relate to (…) it’s just nice that you are not alone, and you feel they represent you. I don’t really have friends because I have never really related to people. (…) I just find it easier to relate to someone that is not really there. (Hannah, 24, C/FG2)

These narratives provided an interesting account of how young people understood peace in their ability to bond with immediate, remote and fictional others. This language of bonding also contributed to how participants understood community as a sense of ‘Being together in the same place, at the same time, makes us a community’ (Mary, 17, YC/INT). The agentic nature of how such ideas were expressed and understood will be discussed in chapter 5 as part of young people’s shared narrative for peace as social coherence.

When considered collectively, these various interpretations of how young people understood peace as being embedded in various ways as bonds and attachments represented something relatively constant in the data. This was encapsulated by an idea that ‘Peace will always be there, it’s a constant thing, like how humans are constant’ (Adela, 19, C/INT). This idea of bonds, attachment, or embeddedness is not presented as a distinct theme because it has infused so many of the other more distinct findings in the data. However, it offers an important introduction to how young people understood peace in their everyday life.

The following sections will illustrate how young people moved past and complicated the idea of ‘deficit peace’, to include how their peace knowledge was contextualised as both a-historical peace, and change and peace.
4.3.1 Non/deficit peace

During the initial dialogue group, young people showed varying levels of familiarity with the concept of peace. A substantial number of participants openly expressed difficulty articulating peace:

> Words kept on getting jumbled up (...) I kept writing calm down instead of peace. (Olly, YC1/FG1)

> It was hard because I couldn’t differentiate between what I liked and what I found peace in because I think they are kind of one and the same thing. (Fatima, 15, YIT/FG1)

> Sometimes when you think of peace, you can’t think of what you want but you know what you want. So, you can’t grasp what you want, but eventually you get there. (Maya, 17, YC1)

These examples illustrated an incognisance by which participants struggled to express peace as something distinct and not conflated. Mary reflected on this and explained that her experience was skewed towards conflict:

> Instead of thinking about peace I kept on thinking about removing conflict so rather than thinking about what is peace I was thinking about, so what is conflict? I was thinking about, not what peace means to me, but what no conflict would mean to me. I was writing things down and thinking that doesn’t sound very peaceful because I am thinking of the opposite of what peace is, and yeah, I suppose in my life the absence of peace is conflict... I do struggle with that. (Mary, 17, YC1/FG1)

Mary expressed how her thinking about peace was rooted in ‘no conflict’ rather than peace, clearly starting from a deficit conceptualisation of peace. In contrast to the work of Galtung (chapter 1), conflict was not given much significance by young people as a distinct term. The word was rarely used as part of young people’s discussions of everyday life. Mary’s example went on to articulate no peace as conflict. This moves away from the idea of conflict as a synonym for violence, and is indicative of how young people complicated polarities of peace and violence that featured so much in the peace literature. Furthermore, Mary recognised her incognisance and ‘deficit peace’ concepts and evidenced how she thought her immediate environment had impacted on her thinking about peace. Such examples illustrated the impact of peace as a generative word. Even when participants struggled to express peace as something distinct and not conflated, they clearly indicated the cultural and visceral significance of peace as part of their everyday life (see table 9). Such responses are complex.

When reflecting on their wording of peace, YC2 also explained why it was challenging for them to identify the abstract concept of peace:

> Amita: There are more negatives than positives.
> Researcher: Why do you think that is?
Amita: Because you could say there is not that much peace. If there was peace you would be able to identify what makes the peace and how it occurs, but because there is not that much peace you can identify it quicker to say what is not bringing the peace.

Zainab: We can probably relate to that more (...) all of this is actually in front of you and applies to you or you have been through it and experienced it, most of it.

(Amita, 18, & Zainab, 17, YC2/FG1)

After Amita identified the prevalence of negative peace in the groups’ wording of peace, it was quickly linked to personal experience. More specifically, this was elaborated to include the participant’s lived, experiential, familiarity with negative peace. Importantly, both examples provided, from Mary and YC2, illustrated the situatedness and contextualisation of peace knowledge.

Evidence for negative peace, as a narrative of ‘deficit peace’, was common across all groups, with peace given meaning in the expressed negation, or absence, of something else. Table 9 presented data for events, actions, objects, and people. Other examples included:

- No neglect (YIT)
- No conflicts (YC2, YIT)
- No Islamophobia (YC1 & YC2)
- No killing, including Honour Killings (C, YIT, YC2)
- No crime, including knife crime (C, YIT, YC2), and Hate Crime (YC2) i.e. in three groups (YC1, YC2, YIT) the mainstream ‘media’ was understood as contributing to discrimination and ‘Hate Crime’. This was explained by Yasir (17, YC2/FG1) as ‘how the news is picking on one religious group.’
- No Drugs & No Drug Gangs (YC2)

The most prominent theme to emerge from the participant’s concept of ‘deficit peace’ was ‘discrimination’. Absence of discrimination was understood across all the groups as being necessary for peace in their everyday lives. This is exemplified by in the words of Hadiya:

I do think that peace is when there is no discrimination. And because people aren't heard and their feelings aren't heard you know when someone is, comes across racism or any kind of discrimination they don't feel at peace at all. So, if we actually got rid of that discrimination then there would be peace, and no one would have to feel the hurt they feel when they actually do receive that discrimination. (Hadiya, 17, YIT/FG1)

Discrimination, as ‘deficit peace’, was understood to contribute to other processes and structures in the participant’s everyday life. As an example, Zainab illustrated how discrimination intersected with social identities of culture and tradition and altering cultural contexts for issues of ableism:

There is actually this thing in Indian culture where its seen as a shame to have a person that is physically disabled in your family. (...) so, if there is someone in your family with a disability then you can see them be hidden away. So, like when people come, they tell the person to go upstairs and stuff like that. (Zainab, 17, YC2/INT)
My teacher in college, she goes on there is this thing now that because of the liberal western values there is a lot more acceptance for people who look different. But if you actually talk and if you are involved with people with physical disabilities its actually not true at all. (Zainab, 17, YC2/INT)

In addition to how their environments hold discrimination as ‘deficit peace’, participants were also aware of how their communities are stereotyped and discriminated against:

People think that [Inner city 1] is a bad place to live because all people hear about drugs, but it’s the same everywhere drugs and alkis are everywhere, but you know they are not everywhere here. (Maya, 17, YC1/INT)

They are probably just like I don't know, oh yeah! You have this stereotype that everyone in [Inner city 2] is kind of stupid or thick or illegally in England. (Zainab, 17, YC2/INT)

These ideas of ‘deficit peace’ held implications of a double consciousness (Du Bois, 1903), evidenced by young people in their awareness of an ‘othered’ gaze:

Yes. I just find it upsetting because it’s like you are isolating many lives from society and how will that impact on their lives. And also, it’s restricting their opportunities like they could be a lot of talent in [Inner city 2]. You are just not willing to see it. (Amita, 18, YC2/INT)

In this last example, Amita stressed how it feels to be discriminated against, as well as how discrimination contributes to wider social issues of injustice and marginalisation. Such narratives illustrated the complexities of ‘deficit peace’ as more than just a passive space. They suggested a wider concept of social justice and experiential peacelessness that recurred throughout the data.

Away from ‘deficit peace’, it was evident that young people understood peace in ways that became more critically complicated. This was described as emergent and iterative:

Laura: You said write down all the things that remind you of peace, we wen mental. [Laugh] I’m just going to do some art, one second
Hannah: See this is another thin g as well, we were writing them all down as we were going along so the more that people said the associations came from what others were saying. So, we also thought of more things as we went along with what we were saying.
(Laura, 17 & Hannah, 24, C/FG1)

It’s so weird how one word can generate like so much. (Amreena, 17, YIT/FG1).

Four of the groups concluded that there was a process by which the more we spoke about peace, the more we knew about peace. In the extracts above, both Laura and Amreena referred to their developing peace narratives. In addition, Amreena seemed quite surprised about the wealth of knowledge that was exposed when being asked about peace.
More generally, participants moved between descriptions of peace and critical interpretation:

There is peace of mind and there is physical peace. They’re two separate things. (…) and again, I think some things are on the surface peace - like when you say something that just comes to your head. And some things are a lot deeper, when you actually look behind the meaning of it; how it affects the world, and what it means to people. So, I think there is definitely different levels of peace and different types of peace. (Isha, 17, YIT/FG1).

These ideas will be revisited in chapter 6, to explore how participants problem-posed their knowledge and experiences of barriers to peace in their everyday life.

4.3.2 Ahistorical peace

When conceptualising the abstract concept of peace, participants referred to distinct aspects of peace culture and peace symbolism. As an example, during the initial dialogue groups, three participants, each in a different setting, drew the Gerald Holtom peace symbol for nuclear disarmament. When asked, none of the young people were able to identify the historical origins of the peace symbol, or talk specifically about its relevance:

Researcher: Ok. So, what have you drawn?
Laura: A peace symbol.
Researcher: And what does that represent?
Laura: (laugh) Isn't it the … I have forgotten, it was in my head. It’s like a band no? (Laura, 17, C/FG1)

I don't think it was genuine. I don't know how to explain it. I think it was just about the sign and stuff. It’s just like a fashion statement, or it’s just like a sticker or something. (Emma, 17, C/FG3)

This lack of knowledge might not be significant. However, when contextualised across the data, it formed part of a pattern. Participants in all groups referred to peace movements e.g. Jeremy Gilley’s Peace One Day Movement (YC2), Rock against Racism (YC1), and Hippies (C, YC1, YIT). Four groups identified historical and contemporary individuals associated with peace. Martin Luther King was referred to most, then Nelson Mandela, Malala Yousufzai, and Rosa Parks; followed by Banksy and Mahatma Gandhi, and lastly Emmaline Pankhurst. These people were considered relevant to peace as non-violent action, social protest, and social justice; but little detail was given about their significance. In YC2, the dialogue went on to suggest that:

Nelson Mandela, Martin Luther you hear about them, but they are not really, you weren't there. (Zainab, 17, YC2/FG1)

We don't have a Nelson Mandela or Martin Luther King in our generation. There is no one that is standing up for us. (Amita, 18, YC2/FG1)
By critically contextualising Mandela and King, YC2 offered a structural response to their significance in the participant’s everyday life. Although they were listed and shared as having relevance for peace, it seemed that these historical peace actors were too remote to contribute to the young people’s immediate environment. Additionally, Zainab and Amita alluded (in the extracts above) to a more complex idea in which the young people were critically aware that they do not exist in the past; and that the historicity of these peace figures was understood not to exist in the present. Like the earlier examples of the Gerald Holtom peace symbol there appeared to be a disconnect, and a lack of reciprocity, between participant’s understanding of peace and the cultural historicity of peace.

Mary spoke about another potential contributing factor for the ahistorical conceptualisation of peace:

> People think peace is for namby-pamby eco warriors stood outside parliament protesting against the government for whatever they’re protesting about and think they must be hippies. It’s like almost a scary thing for people to think about, because you know when you say to people you want peace, you worry about being called “lefty scum”, or whatever they call people nowadays who sort of believe in this stuff (…) I think it’s a psychological thing we are doing, if you want to create social change then you have to do it in ways that is appealing to people and it doesn’t turn people off the idea of it. (Mary, 17, YC1/FG3)

Mary was wary of the risky connotations of being associated with peace. Her worry was framed by cultures that stereotype peace and peace action. Her concern highlighted what she perceived to be, politicised animosity towards non-violent action and social protest. Her words suggested that people ‘turn off’ to this part of peace historicity. Such ideas hold significant implications for how young people may understand their knowledge of peace as being politically situated in the cultures and praxis of everyday life.

4.3.3 Change and peace

In what might be recognised as a response to ‘deficit peace’, and juxta-positioning to ahistorical peace, young people’s concepts of peace in their everyday life entailed a prominent shared narrative for how change and peace are intimately linked. There was a strong relationship between change and peace that was both allegorical and literal in the findings. Participants in four groups frequently associated peace with the physical properties of water and metaphors for the movement of water. This is captured well in the extract below in which Adela (19, C/INT) used the metaphor of water to describe peace and her experience of cancer:

> Adela: Water is a representation of peace for me because like in life you are not always going to have that calm moment. The same thing for water. As soon as something hits it, it’s not calm anymore, and you see the reflection of water here. After I left it got a little bit windy and then the wind sort of hit the water and then everything was just ... you couldn't see the reflection in the water. You had got ripples everywhere. So, it’s a bit like in general really because as soon as something hits your peace it just kind of breaks; breaks the atmosphere kind of thing, like the
mood it has. So that's how I view this picture because it’s so peaceful, but I captured just a moment of when it was peaceful.

Researcher: So how do you think the photo relates to your life or your community or where you live?

Adela: I have already said how it relates to life in general. I would have to say it kind of reminds me of before I had cancer. Because before I had to go to hospital everything seemed like it was completely going well, just like how this photo is completely still and peaceful; and it’s just tranquil and nothing has hit the water you can see a complete reflection in it.

Adela’s words illustrated the experiential changeability of peace in everyday life as the disturbance, or impact, of life changing events. Also, this was a good example of how participants used their photography to develop their thinking about peace in ways that were both objective and subjective and not necessarily expected. The expressed relationship between peace and change was also involved in how participants examined the changeability inherent in the nature of peace:

So, peace I think in my head is malleable. It can change. Peace can basically mould around a current situation and how things are changing. So, I think there is a correlation between the two.

(Isha, 17, YIT/FG1)

Isha moved past an analogy of peace and change to identify change as conceptually intrinsic to peace. In addition to this, she referred to change as something that can be accommodated by the nature of peace. Such complexity offers a useful distinction between peace as changeable, and peace as a conduit for change. In response to Isha, these ideas were extended, in ways that were consistent across the data, with the suggestion that:

I think people are afraid of change. They are afraid of change they just want to go back to the practices and traditions that they’ve always been following Amreena, they want to be comfortable. (Fatima, 17, YIT/FG1)

As part of this narrative participants spoke about the transformative nature of both thinking about peace and thinking about how we think about peace. In addition to which the concept of peace was commonly given value as being generative in itself i.e.:

Within the experiential changeability of peace in everyday life.
With ideas of change being conceptually intrinsic to peace.
With the belief that peace can be transformative.

These narratives were not linear. They occurred at various times in different settings and were expressed in different ways (chapters 4 to 6).

Narratives about the relationship between peace and change were regularly articulated across the data as the need for change ‘for’ peace. This was expressed normatively, with peace given value as something positive. These ideas are exemplified in the two extracts below. The first came about in response to something that
was said earlier in the group, regarding how humanity ‘will never get full peace’ (Yasir, 17, YC2/FG1). The second offered an example of the significance given to change as being instrumental to peace:

You are not going to get one hundred percent peace in the world because there are other things going on. But to change it a little bit, that makes a lot of difference. (Amita, 18, YC2/FG1)

Maya: A lot of things do need to change
Mary: Yeah, we can’t achieve peace without achieving some kind of change.
(Maya, 17 & Mary, 17, YC1/FG2)

The prevalence of the narrative of change and peace has direct relevance for the theories and ideas of praxis discussed in chapters 1 to 3.

4.4 Summary

This chapter has outlined the stages of the research, given context to the data collected, and started to elaborate on how young people conceptualised peace as more than just the absence, or opposite, of violence and war. The findings have shown that young people articulated and intellectualised peace across a range of conditions and values, which they understood should be present and/or missing for peace to have relevance, to occur, or to be experienced. The chapter has shown how young people have described a multifaceted and embedded peace that is cyclical and rhythmic. Alternatively, peace was given meaning by young people as something curtailed by certain events and structures in their everyday life. The findings have evidenced how young people’s peace knowledge can be faltering, incompatible, unfinished, or unworded. There was a consensus by which young people gave meaning to their initial incognisance of peace as an expression of their lived experience of negative peace. Also, the findings have also suggested that the young people did not have a close connection to (traditional) peace figures or cultures, as being relevant to the immediacy of their everyday life, or their immediate environment. Lastly, there was compelling evidence for how young people associated peace and change that included a normative belief that peace can be transformative. This fits well with the changing and changeable praxis of everyday life.

The following chapter will evidence how young people have understood peace as expressions of their peace affirming tactics (PATs), and how they have understood this knowledge of peace as praxis sited in the continuum of structure and agency in their everyday life.
Section 5 - Everyday Peace Affirming Tactics

5.1 Chapter outline

This chapter will discuss findings for three salient peace affirming tactics (PATs) i.e. situated learning, social coherence, and self-initiated peace. The chapter will use these findings to illustrate how young people understood peace as part of their lived and situated knowledge in the praxis of their everyday life.

The thematic relevance of PATs emerged from how young people gave meaning to peace as a shared narrative that was evidenced during their initial activities, and their subsequent interviews and dialogue groups. As such, the chapter will start with two examples of the young people’s photographs. These photographs were taken and selected by young people for their interviews and dialogue groups. Each of the images are presented alongside extracts of text from the young people’s photo-elicitation. These photographs provide a visual reference that will be relevant to some the following discussion about PATs. And furthermore, they help to show the reader how well the text and material data complemented each other:

Fig. 6: Examples of participant’s photography with reflection

Well this picture says enjoy the little things and its taken from the top with a flash on, zoomed into the enjoy part, so that really stands out as what I was trying to get across. (…) not enjoying something is finding something very very depressing. So to me, reducing depression equals peace. Therefore, enjoying is like being happy, enjoying the happiness. Happiness leads to peace within our self. (…) I try and make the most, and I really do this isn't a lie, I try and make the most of my time with other people. Like if I am having breakfast with my mum I am like oh this is nice this is OK. sometimes I have breakfast in the morning with my sister. I enjoy walking back from college, because from college to home that's my time to listen to music, have a nice walk, let the sun hit my face before I go home, and you know start working. That’s what enjoy little things means. So enjoy the little things is not taking everything for granted. This is what I would tell another person from this picture (Sumaira, 17, C/INT)
5.2 Everyday Peace Affirming Tactics (PATs)

Three key PATs were evidenced in the narratives of the participants i.e. situated learning, social coherence, and self-initiated peace. These PATs included young people’s accounts and problem-posing of everyday situations and encounters, including those events that disrupted what peace meant to them, which were embedded in the mundane routines and relationships of their everyday life. The findings showed that participants acted for peace tactically, and manipulated certain events as opportunities for peace. As expressed by Sumaira in the reflection above.

It is important to note that the findings for PATs demonstrated two interrelated processes. Firstly, how participants understood acquiring peace knowledge within the praxis of everyday life. And, secondly, how they made sense of peace knowledge as what they think, and do, within the praxis of everyday life.

5.2.1 Situated learning

The findings showed young people understood acquiring peace knowledge within the praxis of everyday life as situated learning, underpinned by their attachment and relationships to people around them. This formed a
shared sense of interpersonal peace that was spoken about as a narrative of family and significant others. Within this narrative young people developed ideas about learning for peace in their relationships with their family/mothers inside the home, and with youth work/services outside of the home.

**Families:** Families were spoken about in response to how young people understood peace in their everyday life, with examples given for varying family structures e.g. nuclear, extended, single-parented, and foster care, with one participant living on her own as an asylum seeker.

When young people expressed links between peace and their families it was unusual for them to mention both of their parents, and/or their carers. Adela offered one of the few accounts of learning peace that referred to two parents:

> My parents have taught me how to just stand my ground, only tolerate it when its needed to, speak out for yourself, if you know that you need to speak up, and say what you know is right. Like if something definitely is wrong and you can see that its wrong you should learn how to speak up for it, or for yourself, or for a friend, or family member. If you can see something going on that's wrong, you should speak up. That's how they taught me in mind how to bring peace to myself. (...) For myself they have taught me that if something goes wrong for me and if I was to like I don't know break down and cry about it they would teach me how to just get back up and you know bring my own peace to myself. They teach me things like, “Oh you should try and forget about it”. Although, you can't completely forget about it, you should learn to forgive it. Even when my parents aren’t around, I will remember the words growing up because they always tell me “Oh you are going to remember this when you are older, I told you so”. (Adela, 19, C/INT)

In keeping with other participants, Adela talked about learning about peace from her parents in response to conflict. She referred to speaking up for herself and others, which corresponds with the idea that if you see injustice you should challenge it. It is a concept of peace that is not passive but actively strives to achieve social justice. She then discussed being taught to ‘get back up’ and create her own peace as something personal, still a deliberate and active tactic. Adela expressed the difficulty of being told to ‘forget about’ conflict after she described a more reconciliatory and active process of forgiveness. Arguably these are different ways of achieving different kinds of peace.

Three groups (YC1, YC2, C) prioritised ‘spending time’ and ‘talking’ to their mothers as part of ‘consistent’ relationships that provided situated learning for peace e.g.:

> She [mother] is the one that when I was being bullied, she always told me not to fight back. So, I have kind of grown a tolerance, I guess. I mean I am not an aggressive person anyway, but I have grown a tolerance for people that do things like that, so I try. And I don't like things being wrong, and I think I have learnt that from her. And maybe partly the autism, Asperger’s aspect of it, but I think that the majority of the stuff that I have learnt throughout my life is from my
mum because she is just being constant and she has taught me things that I don't think I could have learnt from anyone else. (Hannah, 24, C/FG1).

My mother, just not like getting wound up about the slightest little things that might annoy you or talk to people about how you are feeling. (Laura, 17, C/FG2)

My mum is elder, so she is really wise. She teaches me peace because she has gone through a lot of stuff, so she really teaches peace. So, she teaches me all these things - how to be patient, how to stay in contact with my religion, not to be angry and have tolerance for things. For example, if I went to my mum and I was angry about something, or if I did something wrong, she would come from a place of understanding. Like she would be like, “OK why did you do this?”. Instead of telling me off. Or if I was having a breakdown, or something, she would be like “Oh Sumaira like calm down”. She is really understanding, so she is like peace for me. (Sumaira, 17, C/FG2)

The findings conveyed an array of different messages. Hannah was very self-aware, and clearly expressed the significance of her mother, and her learning for peace was articulated as being distinctly non-violent. Yet, it was unclear whether this had engendered a tolerance based in/on resilience or endurance. Alternatively, Laura focused primarily on anger, the value of communication, and emotional literacy, all of which are framed in a ‘deficit peace’ paradigm. Sumaira detailed a range of interactions in which her mother is identified as an active role model for peace, and as someone who has taught her a range of skills and tactics, such as the importance of tolerance, alongside patience, religion, managing anger, and being understanding.

Sumaira’s focus on the significance of her mother as a role model featured strongly across findings for other young people:

Throughout my life my mum has been the only consistent person I have had so I kind of turn to her when I need things and when I need help. And she has helped me through a lot of things that she has actually gone through herself and I find that admirable. (Hannah, 24, C/FG2)

My mum. I just think because of the way that she acts more now because before she found it quite difficult. She was like angry at the world, but now she is like okay with it. And like I admire her for getting over it. (Emma, 17, C/FG1)

In the cases of Emma and Hannah, the ability of their mothers to overcome difficulties was given particular significance as they occupy roles as ‘young carers’ for siblings and their mothers:

Yes, my mum is ill, so yes that means she can't work and stuff. (Emma, 17, C/FG2)

[My mum] she’s lost her independence, so you know since she was ill almost three years ago. It’s kind of changed her perspective on things and she is constantly stressed and stuff like that. And yes, I am a young carer and it’s my responsibility. (Hannah, 24, C/FG2)

On reflection, I wondered if these situated experiences of increased empathy and responsibility actually deepened the value given to the young people’s examples of peace passed on from their mothers.
As well as being the product or content of the communication, parented peace was also learnt in the process of communication e.g. Mary stated that when talking to her mum:

Eye contact is a big deal for me. Because to look someone in the eye I feel it’s a lot harder to lie to be deceitful. And I know I have got someone’s full attention, my mums’ full attention. If she is looking at me. And we are having a conversation and she is engaging with the conversation, so she is a participant rather than passive. Like sometimes I talk to her and she doesn't listen to me. So sometimes I feel then that I am not being respected. (Mary, 17, YC1/INT)

For Mary, active listening was clearly important and related to a broader narrative of ‘respect’. In turn, respect constituted one of the central tenements of how young people in all groups understood what is needed to develop and sustain social coherence, which will be discussed later in this chapter.

Family stability was identified by young people in two groups (YC1, YC2) as an immediate, and emergent, condition for peace in their daily life. As an example, following on from her earlier responses, Mary stated that:

Peace can come from strong close-knit families. That’s an integral part of peace (…) So I think to avoid conflict, I think a stable base or a close family can lead to peace. (Mary, 17, YC1/INT)

YC1 actively targeted (their) families along with other members and professionals who were active in their local community when they planned and led their public engagement about/for peace (chapter 6).

In the second group, Zainab referred to the wider social impact of the lack of stability in families:

So, say for example, in your community you have some people that are more vulnerable than others because they come from unstable backgrounds. Say they have lost someone, or they don't have, they haven't had, that grounding that maybe good parents would give you. Then those are the type of people that would usually get involved in stuff like that [gangs] because they don't have people to like guide them. (Zainab, 17, YC2/INT)

Zainab’s reference to the significance that families have for peace in her everyday life was developed further by YC2 when they spoke about the role of family (i.e. parented peace and stability) as part of their problem-posing for their collective experiences of gangs (chapter 6).

The findings for families represented part of young people’s situated learning for peace, and more accurately parented peace showed that young people learnt a range of approaches to peace. These were understood in the time spent with family, as part of the bonds (referred to in the last chapter), and more specifically as learning ways to overcome conflict. Mothers occupied a vital role based on their responses to, and during,
conflict. The family was also given a broader structure-based value as something that functions to provide stability, understood to influence peace in the young people’s wider communities.

**Religiosity and peace:** Young people provided a wealth of data for religious practice as a contributing factor to their situated learning for peace, and as a peace affirming tactic for both self and social peace. Some examples of the significance given to religion are listed below:

For some people, people who may follow religion it introduces peace for them so they kind of have a guidance to follow. Maybe it develops peace for them personally. (Amreena, 17, YIT/FG1)

I say religion, it’s like the bible isn't it? Because you are reading stuff that is trying to put you on the right path and there are people telling you to get more into peace.
Researcher: Does that help you?
Chad: Yes, it does like it’s starting to help me. (Chad, 17, YOT/FG1)

It was suggested that religion can offer guidance for peace. This was elaborated further as part of the broader narrative of self-peace:

Ahmed: Sometimes I am having a bad day and stuff like so say I go to pray, and stuff and I forget about everything.
Amita: Its soothing.
Afifa: Yes, it prevents anything bad from happening if you are there because you have got a clean mindset and a pure mindset which makes you think I can't do that because God won’t like it.
(Ahmed, 17, Afifa, 16, and Amita, 18, YC2/FG1)

If I am anxious or worried which is like most of the time, I always, because I am Muslim, I always read the Koran and that calms me down. Or if I am at work, I pray it calms me down so it’s really nice. (Sumaira, 17, C/FG2)

I do read the bible every morning before I go to college and it always makes me feel better, like what I am reading it always somehow relates to how I am feeling. And it just makes me feel good. (Emma, 17, C/FG1)

YC2 spoke in greater detail about their experience of ‘religion,’ the value of local ‘mosques’ and religious ‘pilgrimage’. This might have been due to the area having a large religious population, especially Muslims (chapter 3). It was significant that young people across each of the five groups took the notion of peace in religion as something that guided them as part of their routines in their daily lives.

The narrative of religiosity and peace also brought some dissonance as certain young people, including those following religion, expressed concern about the structural impact of religion for peace and social progress. This involved religiosity that was critically discussed as being ‘hypocritical’ (YC2), ‘closed-minded’ (YC1), ‘misused’ and ‘misquoted’; and local-global dimensions of ‘clashes in faiths and beliefs’ (YIT). Also, as part
of their dialogue, young people examined the intersectionality of patriarchy, cults, discrimination, Islamophobia, culture, terrorism, and war. Some of this will be included in chapter 6, to illustrate how the young people challenged (their own) norms about how they see themselves, others, and society. The findings also suggested a possible tension between religion as a source of active self-peace in the lives of participants, and their discomfort about speaking freely about religion outside of the research. Religiosity and peace was the only topic reported to be ‘a very touchy subject because people can get easily offended’ (Hannah, 24, C/INT).

**Professional peace:** The participants identified few people outside of families as having a significant role for their situated learning for peace. Youth workers were referred to most frequently (YC1, YC2, C), followed by teachers (YC1, YC2). Youth workers were trusted e.g. when discussing the significance of a stable family for peace, Mary went on to say that:

> For a young person that doesn't have this kind of stable background for me, it would be the youth worker would be the person I would rely on. (Mary, 17, YC1/INT)

Another example described youth workers as ‘positive people’ in the community:

Researcher: What are some of the things in your community that help peace to happen?  
Yasir: It’s having positive people around you.  
Amita: Big up the [Community Centre]  
(Yasir, 17, Amita, 18, YC2/FG1)

Associations were made between youth work(ers) and conflict resolution:

> They [youth workers] encourage people to be friends with each other there and not start fights and stuff like that. (Laura, 17, C/FG1)

Similarly, youth centres were seen as a ‘safe space’ i.e.:

> In here [youth club] you can be yourself and do what you want. You want to sit and draw, you can sit and draw. If you want to chat, you can chat. If you want to play on the Wii, you can play on the Wii. (…) This place isn’t mine, but it’s a lovely place to come, and I can call it home. (Maya, 17, YC1/FG2)

I look after my mum it’s kind of respite for a few hours, so its time away that I get to spend with people (…) and I do have friends there. I have people that I like, and we all get along because we all have something in common. And I like the people in charge of it. I think I have known them since I was about 11 or so. (Hannah, 24, C/FG1)

The young people also spoke about their experience of YOT as having direct links to peace, as:

> A chance to get you onto peace. So, it’s a chance to get you away from trouble. Otherwise, this is what happens, you end up in jail and this and that.’ (Chad, 17, YOT/FG1)
In contrast, the role of teachers, and schools, as part of young people’s situated learning for peace was very ambiguous. Schooling, schools, and classrooms were explicitly referred to as obstacles to peace by all groups except YIT. This narrative was characterised by young people having (had) difficulties with teachers, bullying, and experiences of school as a place where ‘Fights break out and that’ (Ahmed, 17, YC/FG1).

In the example below, Adela provided a good example of peace as a personal relationship, and what she thinks about the potential impact of schooling:

So that's when it changes for the child’s world. (…) If you think of peace as an imaginary friend, they have so much time to spend with you as a kid you don't have to stress about anything. And then once you hit high school in year 7 peace is there like, “oh, you have got homework to do I suppose I can't really bother you”. And then when you hit GSCEs, “oh, you have exams. I can't bother you as much as I used to either.” And, then once you hit college, “I don't think I have time to be with you anymore”. It’s a bit like it’s an imaginary friend who is getting less and less time to spend with you. So, peace has less and less time to sit with you. (Adela, 19, C/INT)

School was presented experientially as a structure that can stifle peace on an individual level. Furthermore, formal education was commonly described as the stress of exams.

Alternatively, relationships with ‘specific teachers’ were identified as contributing to peace because ‘if there was one that maybe helps you out a lot you would probably go to them’ (Zainab, 17, YC2/FG2). Certain school-based activities were also identified as situated learning for peace such as ‘When secondary school talks about life and crime using videos and CCTV which I think did impact people a lot’ (Ahmed, 17, YC/FG1). Participants in YOT spoke more generally about ‘school’ as a deterrent for peacelessness as ‘most people get into trouble when it comes to the summer holidays’ (Amal, 17, YOT/FG1).

Overall, young people’s experiences of school were shown to have conflicting relevance for peace in their lives. The contribution of professionals for situated learning was evidenced in places of informal and formal education, to include the relationships that young people had with youth workers and youth work services, and individual teachers and certain school-based activities, rather than schooling, or the school curriculum. It is difficult to determine how the settings for the data collection influenced these findings i.e. two youth centres, one youth involvement team, one mentor-based youth offending team, and a college.

5.2.2 Social coherence

The second PAT emerged thematically in the data as a shared ontological hope for social peace. This was expressed by the young people as a combination of knowledge, skills, and attitudes; and it was interpreted as a narrative about being ‘in coherence’ with others, and being okay with the difference of others. Young
people’s responses moved past ideas of friendship, or being friendly, to look at the emergent power of togetherness, and ideas of unity.

Friendship: ‘Being with’ and ‘talking to’ friends and family were identified across all groups as part of social coherence. Family has been discussed. Differentiation between ‘friends’ and ‘family’ was commonly described as being based on ‘what you tell your friends’. Although, there was some discrepancy in YC2, as to whether your closest friends were by definition family. The significance of friends entailed the nature of embeddedness referred to in chapter 4, e.g.:

I have got ‘friends’ because peace in my head is not only on your own, you can also be peaceful but in a group. As long as like you are sort of in harmony with them. (Isha, 17, YIT/FG1)

Isha’s comments highlighted the significance of peace as part of the interconnectedness within everyday life. However, the identified potential for peace seemed to be conditional based on group dynamics. In the extract below, Amreena identified friendship as a sounding board for anger, plus possible guidance to help rethink responses to conflict.

It’s important because for me they’re people who keep me at peace and if I am angry, I know I can talk to them about something and they will make me realise that there is no point in being angry about it. There is a more rational way to go about things. (Amreena, 17, YIT/FG1)

Following the initial identification of friendship in the first activity, the significance of friendships for peace was not developed by young people except for group C, who referred to their pets as friends.

Togetherness: The concept of togetherness was recurrent across all the groups as part of social coherence. It was strongly associated to how participants gave meaning to peace, as well as how they understood acts of peace in their daily lives i.e.:

As in you stand together, one, you’re one. (Minah, 17, YC2/FG1)

Peace means bringing people together like Mary says happy faces no punch ups. (Olly, 17, YC1/INT)

The significance of togetherness tended to focus on attitudes towards difference that are referred to in the words of young people as:

Important
Races, religions, ways of life, youth sub/cultures, geographic locations, professions, ages, ideas, colour, sexual orientation, beliefs, gender, ability, attitudes, beliefs
Stereotypes and oppression from both within and outside communities
Still allowing us to have something in common
Something that can be settled
Change
Something that can be forgotten

There was a consensus across the groups ‘That it’s okay to be with people that are different from you’ (Zainab, 17, YC2/INT). This represented a shared narrative based on how the young people understood peace in ‘how we [they] embrace differences and accept them and to actually be OK about it’ (Mary, 17, YC1/INT). This dialogue is rooted in a humanitarian approach in which:

It’s also important to remember that you are a person, and the person sitting next to you is also a person, and the people on TV are still people, and the people on the street are still people. (Maya, 17, YC1/INT)

Maya expressed a need to continue to see the humanity of others, progressing the idea of focusing on the ‘person’ rather than the ‘difference’. This emphasis on ‘people’ continued through her responses and is indicative of the participant’s wider shared narrative:

There were all these people, and we just set aside our differences (…) and just came together as one unit and just celebrated. And I think that represents peace. (Maya, 17, YC1/INT)

This was an attitudinal response denoting the significance of demographic difference as a choice i.e.:

Oh well, it’s an idea that people can just set aside everything. We don't have to hold on to, I mean our colour, our interests, they are what we are, but they don't define us as people. They are just a part of us, and you don't really have to hold that against somebody. (Maya, 17, YC1/INT)

The discourse of different/difference was prevalent in the language used by participants with relevance to altering how people think, and as acts that challenge processes and structures which hold onto difference as discriminatory.

Each of the five groups shared two key principles or strategies for approaching how to be okay with difference in their daily life. These were typified most widely, and frequently, as ‘equality’ and ‘respect,’ which in turn, enveloped a hierarchy of other references to ‘acceptance’ ‘tolerance’ ‘fairness’ ‘equity’ and ‘empathy’ e.g.:

I think that when you accept everyone around you and accept them for who they want to be, and what things are out of their control like who they want to have their relationships with, their race, and gender. If we accept that this is one of the key ways to gain peace within society (Amreena, 17, YIT/FG1)

As a shared narrative, young people most referred to equality as a tactic for peace:

Everyone is more peaceful when they are treating each other right like, treating each other equally and not as opposites. So, like instead of fighting against each other we are coming
together and being part of each other’s lives and not being like, “No, you are different. “Don’t come near me”. That sort of thing.’ (Laura, 17, C/FG3)

I think equality is really important, but you have got to have equity with it as well to maintain that peace. (...) So yeah, we should consider one another’s situations and then think about what type of equality we need. (Hadiya, 17, YIT/FG1)

Hadiya’s response has been abridged, however, it still illustrated the complexity of equality, as being more than attempting to treat ‘everybody the same’. These sentiments were expressed across the groups with a recognition of the difficulties presented by achieving this type of equality e.g.:

I love the idea of equality by don’t think we can ever be totally equal because I think that’s just how the world is. We will never be completely equal (Fatima, 15, YIT/FG1).

This remark by Fatima highlighted how much she values equality, but at the same time, how she perceived the nature of social reality to be conflicted.

All groups talked about respect as a second principle or strategy for togetherness as part of how they understood everyday peace:

When you show respect to someone you get along, and then there is peace that goes on between you and that other person. (Chad, 17, YOT/FG1)

This statement from Chad, exemplified the shared motion of reciprocity associated with the idea of respect that was elaborated further by other participants:

If you are respectful to them, and if you are peaceful within yourself and calm; and you are not swearing, and you are not angry towards them; and you are happy, then you will get that back. (Sumaira, 17, YC/FG2)

Being respectful is when you walk pass somebody and if they smile at you smile back, instead of snarling or something. Or, if you are sitting somewhere you are not supposed to be, security comes up to you and (...). Instead of cursing them and effing and blinding you are okay I respect you are doing your job and I will move because I didn't know I wasn't supposed to be here. (...) you are caring what someone else is doing. You are acknowledging that they are doing it. And even though it may not be something that you want to do, or something you may not understand, you still say well I understand that you want to do this and that this is your thing and I am okay with that. (Maya, 17, YC1/INT)

Personal peace (calm, not angry, happy, caring, understanding) was understood by participants to enhance the ability to be respectful (for social coherence). This is another example of the interrelated complexity of PATs as part of young people’s lived experiences.
Differentiations of togetherness were linked by participants in all groups to notions of community, and social and political ideas, such as ‘charity’, ‘pacifism’, ‘communism’, and ‘feminism’. As one example, Adela spoke about:

Giving what you don't need and also helping people in need. Those two connect (…) you should give what you don't need anymore. That’s sort of making peace with someone who doesn't have any peace. Because if they don't have a house and they are homeless they don't have food, don't have a job they are not really getting much peace if they are sleeping outside. (Adela, 19, C/FG3)

It is interesting to note that Adela referred to charity as a way of making peace conceptualised tactically as increasing the peace of others.

Participants also referred to books, films, and music to explain alternative social structures of togetherness:

Basically, it’s about everyone is at peace with each other, there is no argument. And it’s quite weird because it’s the way that people, like there is no need for money they can just walk into a shop and then come out and no one will get angry. Like it’s kind of like a, it’s the ideology of a communist society, but it works because no one gets too greedy. And like if someone is in trouble or they need a car or something then they will happily give it. And I think that's a weird concept for me to see people being so giving and peaceful. (Amreena, 17, YIT/FG1)

Amreena struggled with the idea of a ‘giving and peaceful’ social reality, as one that negates conflict, capitalism and greed. Such responses have relevance for how young people gravitated towards an ahistorical peace discussed in chapter 3. Alternatively, Amreena’s account started to explore togetherness as a form of social unity. This was the last contributing factor for how young people understand social coherence as social peace.

The participant’s ideas of unity and solidarity were rooted in relationships and derived from an emergent consensus that ‘Being together with people makes you that little bit stronger’ (Laura, 17, C/INT). This was explored as a bond of peace (chapter 3), as well as a tactic for peace, even in situations of adversity:

I think that feeling when you are about to achieve something, and you are all together, and like during the French Revolution - have you watched Les Misérables, like that (…) They know what they want and that togetherness and that feeling that bond, that's peaceful. (Fatima, 15, YIT/FG1)

All groups highlighted potential actions that can emerge from coming together e.g. ‘carnivals and celebrations’ ‘fundraisers’ and ‘protest.’ This shared narrative articulated togetherness as a deliberate social peace achieved through unity and solidarity. It was particularly apparent in the narrative of YC1 and YC2:
Yes, 100 percent, I would love to make a difference in the world, but it is very difficult. But when you have a lot of support and you have people that are willing to do it with you it becomes easier. (Amita, 18, YC2/FG1)

I would say if the community works together there would be a lot more peace than there is right now. (Minah, 17, YC/FG4)

The narrative of unity and solidarity talks directly to issues of social justice. For example:

People are complaining about the system, but people should just come together, gather together saying, “we are not OK with this”. “We need to change something”. And if there was more of that, I think the world would be a better place and it would be more peaceful. (Maya, 17, YC1/INT)

If we all stood in solidarity a bit more with the refugees or with the innocent women and children being slaughtered all over the world or with kids living in poverty. If we all just stood in solidarity and turned round and said, “no this is wrong, and we won’t accept this.” That is how we bring about change. It’s about mass support for things and one person cannot change the world on their own, they need that solidarity behind them to do it. (Mary, 17, YC1/INT)

Findings for social coherence prioritised how importance is given to difference. Young people focused on difference as diversity rather than as a need to share similar values to negate difference. A wealthy response to issues of equity, diversity, and interdependence, was operationalised as equality and respect. When moving from intra-personal to inter-personal peace, young people suggested their ability to be respectful was influenced by other factors e.g. being calm and happy. Social coherence was also narrated structurally as an expression of social justice, and the incomprehensibility of a social reality that is ‘giving and peaceful’. As a PAT, social coherence represented a distinct shift from what young people have learnt towards an expression of their aspirations and concerns about social peace in their everyday lives. Built from the practices of achieving togetherness, social coherence was expressed by young people as peace with/in identified acts of unity and solidarity, which in turn were understood to represent potential catalysts for peace as social change. It was commonly recognised that this ‘is not going to be something that is instant, everybody has to work together on it’ (Adela, 19, C/FG4).

5.2.3 Self-initiated peace

Findings for the third PAT were orientated towards a self-initiated peace, comprised of a range of self-interventions, as a condition for intra-personal and inter-personal peace. It comprised a broader prevalent but loose connection made between happiness and peace, elaborated by young people in the binaries of calm and stress; and then how they understood taking or holding space for self-peace in their everyday life.

**Happiness:** Throughout the findings being happy and happiness constituted a practical and symbolic indication of peace, as well as something that contributed to self-initiated peace for young people:
When I think of peace, I think of happiness, and I think when you are happy, it’s not always the case, but I feel that when you are happy you are at peace. So, you are not thinking about anything you are just happy, and you are in that moment and you feel peaceful. (Fatima, 15, YIT/FG1)

Peace links to happiness because if you are not happy then there is clearly something wrong and it’s not peaceful because there is something going on that's disturbing your happiness. (Amita, 18, YC2/FG1)

Ideas expressed in these examples indicated happiness as a sense of ‘deficit peace’ i.e. not thinking or lack of disturbance.

More specifically, young people spoke about doing and thinking things that brought happiness and so contributed to peace in their daily life:

I think when you are satisfied you are doing what you love you are with the ones who you love, and they love you. And you are doing what you, you are doing your hobbies and your interests, so you are participating in things that you really enjoy doing. I think that also brings peace and brings you happiness. And I think peace and happiness are really closely linked together. (Hadiyah, 17, YIT/FG1)

Unpicking these conflated ideas is difficult. Yet, Hadiyah seemed to be referring to self-initiated peace as a response (i.e. ‘being satisfied’) to several enjoyable activities that made her happy. Other young people referred to ways of thinking and feeling that contributed to their happiness as part of self-initiated peace. These included: ‘Being yourself’ or ‘Not pretending to be happy’ (Maya, 17, YC1/INT), being ‘positive’ ‘being ok with yourself and life’ (Olly, 17, YC1), and creating happiness by ‘enjoying the little things’ (Sumaria, 17, C/INT).

Calm: When talking about self-initiated peace being ‘calm’ was prioritised across all groups. It formed part of a ‘deficit peace’ narrative primarily concerned with the reduction or removal of stress e.g. ‘Being not stressed, stress free’ (Amal, 17, YOT/FG1). Or freedom from ‘suffering’, ‘worrying’, and ‘the negative energy things’ in the daily life of participants. This was expressed as an immediate tactic in response to stress e.g. ‘Peace relates to me in my own life by taking deep breaths and calm breaths, because I get stressed most of the time’ (Olly, 17, YC1/INT).

In contrast to the more general associations of happiness, being calm was actively and deliberately embedded in young people’s daily practices. At a basic level, this included ‘sleep’, which is mentioned across all groups with a consensus that, ‘When you sleep you just feel peaceful’ (Amal, 17, YOT/FG1). However, more deliberate activities were articulated across the findings, including how young people prepare for sleep:
You should light candles, make yourself feel at peace with yourself. Have milk, have nice conversations, resolve your issues with another person in the house if have them before you go to bed. Have a nice peaceful book if you want to. (…) And if you are calmer, you are more at peace before you go to sleep. That's why it represents peace. (Sumaira, 17, C/INT)

Sumaira talked about a range of strategies for her self-initiated peace in everyday life, as she worked to shape and transform her environment to achieve peace in sleep. Other activities for calm included:

Running. (…) It’s a little bit like art, it allows me to take everything and just get rid of it, and then once I have done, I feel relaxed. (Afifa, 16, YC2/FG3)

If I feel too stressed, I can look at the water and I can calm down (…) It’s just that I get that time alone to just stand there look at the lake, like actually I can do this. (Laura, 17, C/INT)

Far from being passive, these PATs were proactive tactics for natural subjective wellness and coping. They allowed young people to change/dispel how they are feeling and provided an impetus to deal with events that brought stress into their lives.

The findings showed how tactics for self-initiated peace were staged by young people in specified spaces. Nature was mentioned most frequently:

Researcher: Nature?
Minah: Yes, so to some people nature is peace, everybody feels peaceful around nature and stuff.
Researcher: Do you?
Minah: Yes, it calms me down. Apart from the smell of mud! (Minah, 17, YC2/INT)

Blue skies. I find it peaceful to just lay in some grass and look at the sky, but it just makes me feel a little bit more safe. (Laura, 17, C/INT)

An emphasis on the feel of nature was evident in the data across all groups with immediate similarities based on the perceived effect and importance of ‘Outside’ ‘Green’ ‘Natural Spaces’ with reference to ‘Countryside’ ‘Forest’ ‘Garden’ ‘Flowers’ ‘Sunsets’ ‘Earth’ ‘Wind’ ‘Blue-Sky’ ‘Blue-Water’ ‘The Sea’ ‘Beaches.’

Home was the second most frequently and widely mentioned space for self-initiated peace across all groups often spoken about in terms of place i.e. young people’s bedrooms.

This is in my house. My house is where I feel at home well obviously, but my safe place and where I can go to, to get away from the hard things. (Mary, 17, YC1/INT)

Laura: Home.
Researcher: Anywhere particular at home?
Emma: Bedroom.
Researcher: And I know it might sound obvious but why the bedroom?
Hannah: Because it’s our safe space.
Emma: Yes
Sara: Yes
Hannah: I live in that room. (Emma, 17, Hannah, 24, Laura, 17, C/FG2)

These examples included issues of self-initiated peace as being safe which was recognised as changeable e.g. ‘depends on the situation of the person’ (Emma, 17, C/INT). More significantly, the extracts started to evidence an emergent narrative for how young people across all of the groups spoke about their need to get away i.e. ‘when you are just alone at home’ (Isha, 17, YIT, FG 1). This was an implicit and salient need that incorporated how young people spoke about occupying spatial ‘safe havens’ such as home, bedrooms, youth clubs, and libraries.

**Taking/holding space:** The recurrent need for young people to ‘get away’, ‘to be alone’, or ‘take a break’, underpinned many of the activities identified as PATs for calm in the lives of young people, e.g.:

When I actually took this photo there wasn't actually much happening around me. All you could hear was just like the water kind of flowing through, a little bit of a breeze. And you can just hear just background sounds like you can hear leaves rustling, which is why I found it was a peaceful kind of scenery. This is the kind of place I would want to be when I want to find peace really. Or if I just want to take a walk just by myself. It's more like inner peace kind of thing. Like when you want to take a break from the world. (Adela, 19, C/INT)

Well, I would say I was kind of at peace drawing it to be honest. Like I was kind of in my own little world you know. So, I didn't have to worry about anything else and I think that was nice. Because I am constantly worrying about everything all the time. (Hannah, 24, C/INT)

Sometimes you just need that personal time to yourself to get through that stress to relieve it or whatever. (Amita, 18, YC2/FG3)

Well people just generally listen to music to get away from stuff, I mean music is peace; like it just takes them away to another world in their mind and they can just be themselves (Minah, 17, YC/INT).

All these examples contain an implied need to take and claim space for self-initiated peace; and that this peace is somehow removed from the normality of everyday life. In addition to this, young people referred to the active process of creating space away from their own thoughts, e.g.:

If you are doing things like distracting yourself from your thoughts, then you are doing things to help you feel peaceful. Then that's really important, like exercise. Like for me it's not about losing weight or getting toned, which does come and that's great, but it's about distracting myself from my thoughts. (Sumaira, 17, YC/FG2)

Hannah: I do this thing where I live in my headphones, so I am constantly listening to music. Researcher: And how does that relate to peace in your life?
Hannah: I think it helps me cope with how I am feeling, and I don't cope very well with emotions (…). As dark as that sounds, I think it's disassociation.
Yes, I block people out a lot. (Hannah, 24, C/FG2)

In one instance, the idea of separation for peace was even extended to include death:

OK death is a bit of weird one, but whenever I think of death usually people mourn it of course that is natural; but, in a way it's also very peaceful like it's just leaving behind the world and just peaceful. (Isha, 17, YIT/FG1)

Isha’s account was disconcerting. Yet, there is a clear indication that she understood peace as space (both conceptual and physical) that is distanced from the “busyness” of the world. A deeper reading might question the shared trend by which most young people offered such an unreflexive account of their persistent need to achieve equilibrium between stress and calm as part of their daily life.

Pets: It was interesting and unexpected how frequently some young people spoke about their relationships with pets as companions for self-initiated peace. Overall, pets were mentioned more often in the data than either friends or significant others. This included references to how ‘pets can make you feel peace’ (Adela (19, C/FG2), and included the role of pets as ‘companions’ for elderly and solitary relatives with Alzheimer’s; and as a means of generating peace for young children living with Autism.

The narrative of pets was primarily located in group C, e.g.:

Hannibal he was my first tortoise and I got him around three years ago coming up, and I kind of you know how you have a connection with like a certain animal. I think it was him, and I think I needed him at that time. And I found comfort in him. Even though he is a tortoise, he is very receptive of feelings and stuff, and he kind of, like when I am sad for instance, I have been sad recently, and he has just kind of snuggled up to me and he knows, you know? And it’s just nice to know that, to have someone that loves you unconditionally. (Hannah, 24, C/FG1)

You don't have to be the best for them to love you because they are animals. So maybe if have a pet or something, it could help you be happier and just more relaxed. I mean with people you have to impress them and stuff, and work hard, but with animals they will always love you. (...) with people you have to arrange when you meet up and stuff, and it’s always hard work when they are busy; and maybe you don't always get along with people so it’s more complicated. (Emma, 17, C/INT)

Participants in group C described their intimate relationship with animals in great depth, and with significance for other relationships in their everyday life, characterised as being ‘unconditional’, ‘consistent’, and ‘safe’. These participants openly expressed their potential vulnerability in social relationships (chapter 2) and located pets as one of their daily strategies for self-initiated peace, framed by broader questions of how, ‘Reducing depression equals peace’ (Sumaira, 17, YC2/INT). Or the impact that self-initiated peace might

Findings for self-initiated peace illustrated how young people understood the idea of ‘peace within yourself’ (Sumaira, 17, C/FG3). They disclosed and shared a range of deliberate (self-determined and self-regulatory) transformative tactics for peace in their everyday life as natural self-care, wellness and coping. These tactics were characterised as healthy ways to achieve equilibrium between stress and calm. An additional emergent theme also identified the significance of how young people took or held space for self-peace, expressed specifically as a shared need to ‘get away’ from everyday life, ‘disassociate’, or ‘get into another world.’

5.3 Summary

Three key PATs have been examined in this chapter, each of which has started to locate how young people understood peace as part of the praxis of their everyday life. These PATs have represented how young people have understood peace through their daily and historical interactions with themselves, and others, as strategies built from routine, random, opportunistic, and situated learning. The findings have shown a knowledge of peace in which young people have distinguished an understanding of peace as being experiential i.e. thought, felt, dynamic, temporal, and changeable. Furthermore, the findings for the PATs have evidenced how young people articulated and understood peace in the dialectical relationship between their material social existence (e.g. families, structures of religion, pressures of schooling), and their ability to self-determine and act. This evidence has involved how young people have understood their agency within the praxis of their everyday experiences, needs, concerns, and hopes. The findings for young people’s knowledge of peace as forming part of the praxis of their everyday life will be examined further. The next chapter will focus more on how the findings have illustrated how young people have consciously and critically engaged with their concepts of peace; in addition to how young people have made sense of their own knowledge of peace as tactics for self-representation and advocacy.
Section 6 - Critical engagement and impact

6.1 Chapter outline
As part of the purpose and design of the research, I hoped that young people would participate, make decisions, and take ownership, to lead in the research. It was also important that participants could actively voice their solutions for peace, using their own language, knowledge and power. This chapter will examine how participants consciously and critically engaged with their concepts of peace, as well as their knowledge of peace.

The findings in this chapter are heavily influenced by how participants made sense of peace in terms of critical engagement and impact, and what this revealed about the Freire informed outcomes of the duality of praxis and consciousness. The chapter will give examples of the participants’ dialogue to illustrate how they engaged with barriers to peace, and how they understood their knowledge of peace as praxis. This will include findings for the young people’s deliberate tactics for self-representation and advocacy (SRATs), which resulted in three groups moving towards small-scale activism. Each of these three groups problem-posed active solutions for peace in their communities and this will be discussed respectively as ‘Speaking back with the research’ (YC1), ‘The power of music’ (YC2), and ‘Sharing micro peace’ (C). The chapter will end with some examples of the actions I have taken during the research inside the university, and in the wider community, to showcase the viewpoint of those being researched.

6.2 Self-representation and advocacy (SRATs)
When young people (in YC1, YC2, and group C) were asked at interview how they might use their photographs to send a specific message about peace in their community, or to educate somebody about peace, the young people’s responses included:

Be yourself, have a voice, work together, help and support the people around you, make friends, appreciate people and animals, surround yourself with nice/calm things, have your own time and space, find peace in the most simple things, think about your life positively, think outside the box, think before you act, grow, discover, contribute to a stable family, and be a community.

Also, the young people wanted their photographs to help people:

To think deeper about peace, to speak up, communities working together, bringing people together, to be okay with people who are different to you, challenge violence as an answer to peace, not to fight, not to judge based on what you see, challenge stereotypes, disability, litter; and help families tackle issues of and related to gangs e.g. drug selling and using.
The final stage of the methodology encouraged young people towards public engagement as participant-led exhibition or presentation (Wang & Burris 1997; Delago, 2015). Subsequently, three of the five groups (YC1, YC2, and C) developed tactics to self-represent and act for peace using their photography and words. This comprised of the young people planning, influencing, and leading public engagement. Such actions were motivated by their knowledge, aspirations, and concerns for peace in their everyday lives.

Staging events in ways that target wider audiences requires preparation (Krieg & Roberts, 2007). This was essential and meant an assortment of potential activities were discussed with young people i.e. identifying a budget and venue, allocating roles and duties, selecting and printing photographs, framing and hanging photographs, captions and supplementary information, identifying target audiences and publicity. To support this, I developed an ‘Action Planning List Handout’ devised from PV manuals (Amos et al., 2012; Dahan et al., 2007; Orton, 2015; Palibroda, et al., 2009). This handout was introduced during the later dialogue groups with suggestions for planning, budget, aims, promoting, staging, evaluation, and possible roles. This information was also presented to gatekeepers during the initial recruitment meetings with the expressed expectation that they would be called upon to support young people if necessary. These conversations raised important questions about resources, and the possible impact and sustainability of the work.

Preparing and supporting potentially vulnerable young people to engage publicly with adults and professionals is a complex process that requires an ethical and considered approach (Alderson & Morrow, 2004). Some young people were reluctant to present their ideas and work publicly due to issues of confidence and ability (see chapter 3). To support this, the ‘Action Planning List Handout’ included alternative ideas for engagement that did not require participants to carry out face-to-face interaction. It was also imperative that both young people and gatekeepers were aware that the public engagement events might not occur as they had been planned or envisioned; but equally with a hope that the young people, if they chose to do so, would be supported to engage with an audience (Royce et al., 2006). It was also discussed in the groups that public engagement might result in participants being faced with difficulty if audiences respond in unwanted ways, especially if the young people’s voices and experiences are denied (Delgado, 2015).

Moving towards public engagement required young people to have a clear idea of what they wanted to do, why, and who with. Once this had been achieved, I summarised the group’s proposals and action plans, and checked these with the participants, before sending them, and talking them through, with the relevant gatekeepers/managers. The hope was that the host provisions would support the young people i.e. as discussed at the initial gatekeeper meeting.
Importantly, this stage of the research gave priority to the young people’s agenda, rather than the needs of the research/er (Wang et al., 2008). Built from the horizontalization of power created through dialogue, this required me to consciously let participants determine how, and if, they wanted to share their concerns, knowledge, and aspirations that had come out of the research. The transition from dialogue to public engagement forms a crucial element of PV (chapter 3), and being in the groups allowed me to experience and interpret how young people codified and problem-posed their concepts of peace, and barriers to peace. Importantly, this process affected how the groups understood and positioned their photography and ideas.

6.2.1 Barriers to Peace

Certain barriers to peace were identified across all groups (chapter 4). These emerged in the initial activities and thematically during dialogue. Using the original language, these include, but are not limited to:

**Age**
- Being a young carer.
- Restraints as a looked after child.
- Youth gangs, crime, drugs and antisocial behaviour.
- Challenges presented by adults e.g. norms, tradition, culture.
- Challenges presented by others e.g. stereotypes, discrimination, ego, selfishness, greed, judgements.

**Education/Learning**
- Bullying in school.
- Stress of education and exams, learning barriers and difficulties, falling behind because of stuff at home e.g. money problems, physical and mental illness, family breakup, divorce, arguments, estrangement, gang affiliation, drug dealing and use, alcohol, addiction.

**Health and wellbeing**
- Mental health, trauma, anxiety e.g. dark moments of stress, sadness, tension, worry, grief.
- Life-threatening/limiting illness, lack of affordable medicines and healthcare in native country.
- Self-image.
- Fear of public space e.g. forbidden places such as alleyways and parks at night, pubs, clubs, football stadiums and city centres weekends.

**Local-Global Issues**
- Militarism, warfare.
- The role of the media.
- Terrorism.
- Global warming and extinction.
- Litter

Of these barriers, the politics of war and gangs were most salient.
1. Politics of war: All groups mentioned war and its local-global implications as a barrier to peace in their everyday life. The word ‘war’ emerged in the initial activities when young people were wording peace and represented a generative word that carried strong emotional responses. In total, the five groups mentioned war with associations to Iraq, Afghanistan, Palestine, the USA, Germany, Russia, Vietnam, and Ireland (Bloody Sunday). War was also mentioned with reference to terrorism in Burma and Syria, including ISIS; Dunblane in Scotland, and Paris in France including ISIS.

Except for YOT, the groups expressed how much they struggled with war:

Why does it become acceptable as soon as you go to war with someone to murder innocent people because it’s always the innocent people who suffer? They didn’t ask to be gassed or their children to be taken away and raped (Mary, 17, YC1/FG2)

There is a lot of war going on and one country picking on another, and a lot of innocent people are dying because of that. (Yasir, 17, YC2/FG1).

The young people contested the acceptability of war by disputing the just killing and suffering of people who are described as innocent. Furthermore, participants empathised with those identified as being affected by war:

Instead of thinking what am I going to wear today? Where am I going to go? You are thinking, “Am I going to live another day?”. “Am I going to see the next birthday?”. “Is one of my parents going to be taken away suddenly?”. “What if I lost everything, even though I have nothing?”. (…) We are so lucky. (Maya, 17, YC1/FG2)

Such views are important as they suggest positionality, perhaps triggered by the emotional nature of the young people’s response.

The implications of war were clearly understood by participants as having local significance:

They [refugees from the war in Syria] are being completely degraded. They are being forced across seas. They have got to risk their lives because they can't stay in their own countries. And then to come here and be told “well no we don't want you”. How humiliating. (Maya, 17, YC1/FG2)

It prevents them [Muslims] from travelling a lot because they might be seen like as terrorists (…) Or something might happen to them, people might lash out at them. (Afifa, 16, YC2/FG3)

These are very different examples. Yet, they share a critical response to war as a barrier to peace in the young people’s everyday life. This was further expressed as a common discourse of discrimination i.e. microaggressions of xenophobia and Islamophobia that occurred on the street and in college e.g.:
Guess what happened, basically, you know like I do music in college yeah? People in one of our enrichment lessons, they, the girl was talking about issues around the world and Islam and stuff, and ISIS and stuff. And everyone started looking at me. Literally, because I am the only Asian in my class, all the rest of my class, everyone started looking at me. I was like, “what are you looking at?” Because I don't stand for shit like that. (Minah, 17, YC2/INT)

On an international level, young people were clearly uncomfortable with the idea that certain countries dominated international relations regarding war and peace:

It just makes me laugh that America and Russia they have absolutely nothing to do with Syria as a country, it’s not their country, but they are the ones that decide if there is a peace deal. They are the ones that decide if the peace deal is over if a civilian can be bombed in their own home. (Mary, 17, YC1/INT)

So Ok, what I am talking about is Donald Trump denying certain people of certain backgrounds not getting into that country. I am talking about how Syria got blown up. I am talking about how America and the British are aligning now and have already blown up Syria. (Sumaira, 17, C/INT)

Participants questioned how specific nations actively contribute to war and contested whether this was just and justifiable. Sumaira’s words (above) were indicative of how participants linked war and political figures. President Donald Trump (USA) was referred to most frequently, and by all groups. Other examples included Vladimir Putin (Russia), Kim Jong (Koran), Michael Gove, David Cameron, Tony Blair (UK), and Parkash Singh Badal (BJP).

By moving from the concept of war to the politics of war the young people revealed a shared sense of how certain politicians were understood to be duplicitous and potentially hegemonic in the legitimisation of warfare e.g.:

Hannah: I think people like Tony Blair and David Cameron liked war and conflict. They didn't want to solve the issues they wanted to add to them.
Researcher: Why?
Hannah: (...) It was kind of like what they were doing was kind of covering what they were really doing. So, like they were making it seem like they were doing good things but in reality, they weren't. (...) Like it’s hypercritical you know. It’s kind of, they kind of just cover up things and make it seem like they are good people but in reality, they are not. (Hannah, 24, C/FG1)

Significantly, the politics of war was the only barrier to peace in which participants explicitly referred to adulthood. In YC1, this was coupled with a noticeable youth lens that identified intersecting social contradictions of war, power, and age:

Mary: If young people ruled the world there would be no war.
Researcher: That’s interesting.
Mary: If we were given the power to make change. I would like to know, if you sat down a group of maybe 100 young people from across different parts of the world and asked them how
many of them thought the war in Syria was a good idea - how many of them think wars in
general are a good idea? How many of them would like to see change, would like to see peace?
I would be surprised if many of them turn round and said they didn't want peace. (Mary, 17,
YC1/FG2)

Mary clearly challenged the legitimation and purpose of war and her comments represented a critical
consensus in the group. Although YC1 moved away from ‘deficit peace’ as being the primary concern of
their public engagement, they referred to politicians and war when ‘Speaking back with the research’. This
will be revisited.

Some disparities existed for how young people critically examined the normalcy of war. The findings offered
greater detail about the historicity of war in comparison to that of peace. References were made to war being
taught in schools as part of history that included ‘Truces’ ‘Treaties’ ‘the UN’ ‘the Cold war’ ‘World War I’
‘World War II’ and ‘Hitler’ (YIT, C, YC1).

As part of the normalcy of war, two groups (YIT, YC1) connected the permeance of war with human nature:

Amreena: No war. I think it’s because we have constantly been at war. I don't know a period of
history that there hasn't been a war from a very long time. So that begs the question have we
ever been at peace in the world? That's a very deep question. [laughter] I don't know, it would
be interesting to see how. I don't think the world could function without a war, it’s a weird
concept.
Fatima: I thought that, like it’s never happened, there is always something going on.
Amreena: Yes, so has there ever been peace in one country, or has there ever been one day
when there’s been like everywhere was peaceful?
Fatima: Peace everywhere yeah?
Isha: But then it would be a bit mundane to sort of live in the world, it sounds really [all speak
at once] there wouldn't be anything for people to be passionate about or feel like right or wrong.
(…)
Isha: I guess yeah. But if everyone lived in harmony I think sooner or later something…
Fatima: There will yeah, it’s like human nature
Amreena: Yes, it’s like human nature
(Amreena, Isha, Amreena, 17, & Fatima, 15, YIT/FG1)

This flow of discussion was interesting. It demonstrated that even whilst questioning and contesting the
legitimacy of war, young people struggled with the idea of social reality being any different. The same group
(YIT) also identified war as a mechanism for various kinds of peace:

Fatima: You know like they have a revolution, or do you know there is that uprising, and would
you classify that as war, because you are fighting for your rights. But then to the opposition that
could be war because war could be created because of that. But then why they are doing that is
because they want peace. So, I guess I don't see war the opposite of peace. (…)
Isha: But peace is the outcome of that but the means to get there is still going to be some sort of
disturbance that is going to disturb the peace. So, I think the end outcome will be peace but in
order to get to that there is not always full peace.
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These ideas were elaborated to suggest that people could be ‘bonded’ and attached as ‘togetherness’ during struggle and war and this was understood to be ‘peaceful’. Also, participants in YIT recognised the relativity and pluralism of peace as an outcome of war. The problem-posing did not encourage the participants to seek to challenge, or disrupt, war as a peace-limit situation.

Regardless of their differing levels of consciousness, young people considered it important to dialogue war. Taken from a critical perspective this was understood to have direct implications for the future. On a fundamental level this was expressed as the idea that ‘When people stop talking about war, generations will forget so it has the potential to happen again’ (Hannah, 24, C/INT).

2. Gangs: Gangs were mentioned explicitly by all groups except YOT. This presented one of the sharpest contrasts in the data as YC2 offered a distinct and detailed situated experience of gangs as an immediate and pressing barrier to peace in their everyday life. Their problem-posing dialogue emerged from their collective interpretations of gang-risk e.g.:

   It’s a barrier to peace. Because things like this lead to a really dark place and it’s a dangerous thing because it takes over your life. It's associated with anger, violence, crime. (Amita, 18, YC2/INT)

The group (YC2) identified the interrelatedness of anger, violence, crime as being caused in part by drug use and drug selling (e.g. cocaine, weed, mamba) as a part of their examination of gang members and gang membership. Gangs membership was described as having certain characteristics:

   So, they are mostly male and it’s like the older generations so say I don't know like thirties, older twenties. They get the younger generation, so like the teens and younger, to run errands for them. So, like sell the drugs for them and stuff like that (…) I think they’re kind of looking for recognition or like a father figure. (Zainab, 17, YC2/INT)

The group critically moved from the individual to collective interpretations of how certain males might be susceptible to gangs, and gang pressure, due to the influence of peers and ‘older generations.’ This started to develop a theory of recruitment that illustrated ideas of fatherhood, and young men’s need for recognition:

   They [boys] are influenced by everyone around them. As well, as everyone around them, it’s the community as well because they are part of the community and this type of community has a lot of it [gangs]. (Afifa, 16, YC2/FG2)

   It’s kind of like symbolic to what happens in [YC1] so like the gang culture. Do you remember how we were saying it goes in circles, that one person goes, they take other people in like they prey on vulnerable people and then take them in. So yes, I think it kind of shows that there is decay in the younger generation by preying on the vulnerable. (Zainab, 17, YC2/INT)
The examples above show how a critical perspective of gang-risk was dialogued by young people as being reciprocally housed in the local environment. As such, the idea of gangs was structurally positioned in the social fabric of the daily lives of the young people in YC2, explicitly identified as having interrelated consequences for peace at individual and social levels.

As part of their community, gangs were understood and described as ‘toxic’ as they were seen to contribute towards social instability. This included the relationships of gang culture in which ‘looking cool’, having ‘money’ and ‘being seen’, intersected with having ‘control’ over others, and the perceived vulnerability of those being recruited into gangs.

On an individual level, the group spoke about gang-stress resulting from the impact of having siblings who were involved or at gang-risk e.g.:

I don't want to believe, like no one wants to believe it. Mum and dad came down and they are like, “what is going on?” They got my brother and sat him down, put cuffs on him (...) my mum she gets fits, seizures and stuff, and she was like a bit you know shaky, and they almost called an ambulance she was so shook. (...) Well after that, my mum was a bit quiet, a bit depressed and stuff. (Minah, 17, YC2/INT)

Well it’s obviously had a big impact because my mum and dad don't live together now that's because of what he used to do and that is him staying up late at night not coming home. My mum, she was pregnant and not having her partner there for her was kind of difficult because she couldn't do certain things. So, you know it’s affected all of us in a way, but I guess we have just got to live with it because it’s just life. (Afifa, 16, YC2/INT)

This dialogue was extended by the young people talking explicitly about the gendered nature of gang stress. Men were understood as ‘drug dealers’, ‘drug users’ and ‘Youngers’, whereas the young women occupied roles as carers and mediators:

Afifa: We know people and we know loved ones who are a part of it. It affects us more than it affects them because they don't see how it’s spoiling them. Whereas we see it from a different perspective. We see how it’s affecting everyone in the family. Now seeing that makes us feel hurt, but people say women are there to help men feel better and you know this that and the other. So, in a way we have just got to stand strong, but also show them that you know you can't be doing this … you can't be doing that. And, if they want to listen, they want to listen. That's just how it is really.

Amita: I think we are more hurt because they don't see that side. Like my brother, he is never at home because he is out doing that. Whereas I am always home, and I have to see my mum and dad argue and when he comes home there will be arguments and that's when it comes to me, continuous arguments.

(Afifa, 16 & Amita, 18, YC2/FG3)
Participants reflected on their adopted roles and started to problem-pose their experiences of gangs as peace-limiting situations in their everyday life. Yet, the young women were very pessimistic, and their narratives evidenced how they dealt with their gang-related problems individually as a response to conflict and crisis. Alternatively, the more they spoke, the findings started to show dialogic movement towards a collective positionality that revealed some of the underlying roots of their shared experience as injustice:

Zainab: In some houses old fashioned views are real still so they still think women should, women have to do the cooking, or women can't go out. But a guy can go out its fine. It doesn't matter if the guy is hanging with drug dealers or whatever, he is a guy, so it doesn't matter.
Researcher: What word would you use to describe that?
Zainab: I wrote sexism over here.
Researcher: So, you think that's sexism?
Afifa: Yeah, that does come in. Yeah, that links to religion, sexism urm what else… would you say tradition for that?
Zainab: I wouldn't say religion because there is a lot of times when people say that's what religion says, but it doesn’t, or they don’t even know what they’re doing.
(Zainab, 17, Amita, 18, & Afifa, 16, YC2/FG2)

Importantly, the group’s lived experience and knowledge of gangs as intersections of power, sexism, and religion were not homogeneous. The example above starts to capture how participants critically found structural positionality. They moved past single issues to critically reflect on their situated gendered positionality as part of how, and why, such processes constituted what is ‘normal’ in their localised contexts:

Amita: Its basically norms.
Minah: What are norms?
Amita: Norms are basically something that is accepted or considered normal in society.
(Minah, 17 & Amita, 18, YC2/FG2)

In summary, the group’s dialogue of peace demonstrated problem-posing of the peace-limit situations presented by gangs in their everyday life. This resulted in young people planning and influencing a local event. This will be discussed further in this chapter as ‘The power of music.’

The concept of peace-limit situations will be revisited in chapter 7, to further examine how young people critically (re)read and (re)worded their social worlds as critical literacy. The next section will detail how the three groups (YC1, YC2, C) developed tactics for public engagement.

6.2.2 Developing tactics for public engagement

Following on from the previous discussion, each of the three groups (YC1, YC2, C) identified shared tactics for peace as public engagement, with a focus on ripple acts, voicing, and seeking a community response.
The first of these, ripple acts, described how young people understood their knowledge of peace as praxis that added a sense of criticality to their procedural tactics and attitudes for change in everyday life. The demarcation of ripple acts as being both deliberate and opportunist was first discussed in the initial group activities and then continued to be elaborated during other contacts with young people.

Primarily, ripple acts were understood to be enactments of peace that were deliberately self and socially conscious:

\[\text{It’s important to think about what is happening around like outside of your little bubble.} \]
\[\text{(Emma, 17, C/FG4)} \]

\[\text{My message would be just think before you act, take other people’s views into perspective.} \]
\[\text{(Maya, 17, YC1/INT)} \]

Other ripple acts were differentiated as those which focused on self, and those which focused on our encounters with others e.g.:

\[\text{That you should start with yourself, you should make little changes to what you do before you look at the big things. Because them small things will lead to the big things.} \]
\[\text{(Zainab, 17, YC2/INT)} \]

\[\text{Well I guess like people are very judgemental nowadays, society is just all over the place, so I guess you know just being you, being nice you know just trying to make a difference is something big. The smallest thing can actually mean the biggest thing and it can mean the world to someone. So, I guess just do it, just being nice and doing good deeds and just showing someone you care is a lot. It tells someone a lot about you. (Afifa, 16, YC2/INT)} \]

These ideas have reiterated young people’s earlier knowledge of peace as an expression of the significance of ‘change and peace’, and continue to develop a shared consensus about what young people have understood as the important agentic nature of peace (chapter 4). This idea of ripple acts also continued to illustrate the value given to peace as something that can emanate (outwards) from individual actors (chapters 5 and 6). This is reinforced, by Afifa in the extract above, and more generally (chapters 4 to 6), as contributing to the normative value of peace as something good, which in turn can say something good about us as individuals.

The second tactic for peace as public engagement was voicing. This was premised by the young people’s assertion that using our voice is key to cultivating peace, and is necessary for peace in everyday life:

\[\text{I think so many people just deal with things instead of speaking up and saying, “I don't think this is right”. Because other people may think the same thing as you and may want to change this. Instead of just you know staying in this whatever it is, just in this negativity, and just want to be a place you don't want to be in. Just speak up and have a voice. (Maya, 17, YC1/INT)} \]
Researcher: So, to go back to the four photos that we spoke about, if you were using those to send message about peace in your community, what would you say?
Minah: Don't tell people, no don't let people tell you what to do. Be yourself and you have a voice so be heard. (Minah, 17, YC2/INT)

The power of voice was linked to ideas of action, education, protest, solidarity; and what was understood as discriminatory structural arrangements and power relations, such as ‘politics, college, life, myself, men, women, boys, girls, children’ (Zainab, 17, YC2/INT). This related to young people’s ideas of voicing as being purposefully educative:

Hmmm. How people aren't educated on lots of stuff or when you don't think about it. So, I think a lot of what I have said has in the end come back to education. (Zainab, 17, YC2/INT)

We could use it to teach others about peace because you could tell them about peace means making friends with each other and not fighting like cats and dogs (Olly, 17, YC1/FG3)

I would target this to young people to the youth, people who are my age (…), and maybe in college, maybe younger doing GCSEs. Not even to do with education if they are just going through a really hard time in their life. (Sumaria, 17, C/FG4).

A collective narrative emerged across each of the three groups for how young people understood their knowledge of peace as the critical power of their voice. This was elaborated with reference to youth voice:

I know the impact that young people have when they get together and form a coherent whole to actually make change and to impact the people that make the decisions for them, the terms of local politicians and stuff. (Mary, 17, YC1/FG3)

The media and everyone basically wants to portray young people as thugs and drug addicts, and just as people that like to cause lots of problems for themselves, and that’s not what we are. And I think it’s so important that we as young people speak out about these things because adults make assumptions about us sometimes without fully understanding what’s going on. (Maya, 17, YC1/FG2)

Researcher: So, what would you want to use your photographs for?
Amita: Just to be heard, I don't think we get heard enough, or whatever we do say is not put out there enough. (Amita, 18, YC2/FG 4)

As illustrated in the extracts above, youth voice was given value as possible counter-narratives to broader adultist ideologies. Participants clearly wanted their (youth) voices for peace to be heard as an act for change as part of the project and as having influence outside of the research:

This project is giving me an opportunity to put my input and opinion into the world. It is my chance to try and change the world. Also give me a range of perspective of the world and peace (Amita, 18, YC2/FG 3)

It’s about young people recognising and understanding what peace is. Sometimes we actually need to take a step back and think about actually what are the positive things and what sort of
things do promote peace; and sometimes those things aren’t recorded in the press and we need to make sure that those things are spoken about. (Maya, 17, YC1/FG3)

These examples were compatible with a dialogic approach that moves from individual to collective knowledge and action. This process led to the third tactic for peace as public engagement which was seeking a community response e.g.:

I’m quite excited to see the people who show up and their reactions to what we’re doing, and what they think. And to go up to people and ask them what you think about this photo and write what you think it means, recording what they said, and taking it all in. It just feels like you’ve done something. (Maya, 17, YC1/FG3).

Maya’s response was indicative of a broader awareness evidenced by how young people understood their knowledge of peace outside of the research. Participants illustrated a keen interest in the nature of their encounters with public audiences that prioritised being interactive and aimed to actively generate learning about peace and learning for peace. The groups wanted audiences to do more than just turn up. This entailed a particular consciousness regarding how young people understood the language, knowledge, and power of peace as praxis. Group C wanted to highlight the significance of ‘enjoying the little things’ in everyday life as a way to communicate the importance of activities for self-initiated peace. Public engagement was understood as a way to provoke questions of peace and encourage audiences to ‘question life’. Alternatively, in YC1, Maya, Mary, and Olly referred to the potential impact of their photographs as visual communication that might critically raise peace conscious:

Researcher: What messages do the photographs send out to other people in the community?
Olly: They can be peaceful too.
Mary: Yes it’s not just us that wants peace its other people, even though they may not consciously know it like they might not know the word and know that peace is the right word, but they know what they want.
(YC1/fg2)

It can be argued that these ideas are even more significant when contextualised in terms of the fatigue that Mary had previously expressed regarding her experiences of youth voice as a tool for change:

I used to think that the government cared what the people thought but then I signed every petition under the sun on the you know Gov.uk website and not one of them has made a difference at all. They will be elected in, but they know there isn't a massive amount the British public can do to change an opinion. Donald Trump being banned from the country that was not even considered. They don't even have to debate on issues that half a million people can stand against. (Mary, 17, YC1/INT)

Other participants had also raised similar concerns for youth voice in local politics e.g.:

Amita: Because I don't know what he is saying, but [local MP] he is not, he is not going to understand what young people want.
It was significant that the combination of ripple acts, voicing, and seeking a community response, emerged as tactics for public engagement from young people who felt excluded, misrepresented, and fatigued by their experiences as young people. Each of the groups (YC1, YC2, C) found ways to voice their concerns, aspirations, and active solutions, for peace outside of the research, by influencing local community events. This included presenting their voices “visually”, using photography and captions from their work, and through verbal interaction with audiences. YC2 offered a distinct narrative developed from their problem-posing of gangs as interpersonal and social peace. In YC1 the young people acted on their problem-posing of war, and PATs weighed more towards coherence (chapter 5). And group C shared their unreflective routines and activities for self-peace as a way for audiences to question peace in their everyday life.

The following sections will describe how the young people’s tactics for public engagement informed their planning and involvement, based on the findings collected during the final dialogue groups and evidence collected during my attendance at the events led by YC1 and group C.

### 6.2.3 Speaking back with the research

In YC1, the group shared an explicit interest in peace as change, and the participants were successful in developing and leading a public engagement event in the youth centre that hosted the project. Planning was spread across 10 sessions with support from a gatekeeper (part-time youth worker) who was familiar and present for most of the project, although not present during the data collection. I attended two of these planning meetings to feedback about ‘The Image is The Servant Event IV’ (which will be discussed towards the end of this chapter), and to hear how things had progressed and to offer support. I also ensured that written consent had been obtained for all photographed subjects before the event took place.

The event was discussed by young people as a tool for change that aimed to ‘hold an interactive event at YC1 to educate people about peace and how we can all promote peace in different ways’ - with a target audience of 50 people including adults and young people. YC1 wanted to share critical questions with other young people and adults, such as: ‘What does peace mean to us?’, ‘Why is peace important to us?’, ‘How have we included peace in our lives?’, ‘How can you use peace for change?’. These ideas were driven by a desire to challenge the politics of war, highlight the importance of relationships, and get the audience to question their assumptions about peace. It was intended that the audience would reflect on the meaning of peace and to consider what action they might take for peace. Participants hoped to influence the audience by
highlighting the need to ‘teach children about what it means to be peaceful, and what peace is, rather than letting them learn conflict throughout their lives’ (Mary, 17, YC1/FG3).

Ideas of youth voice were recognised as a means to challenge stereotypes by illustrating how as a group ‘we have all suffered violence, but we still make a decision to deal with conflict non-violently and help to create change’ (Maya, 17, YC1/FG3). YC1 were keen to exhibit their photography and pictures that had inspired them, along with short biographies to educate people about peace, and how peace could be promoted in different ways at their youth club. They were also keen to share their knowledge of peace using the messages and significance of their photography as a tool to bring their families, other young people, youth workers, and senior youth service staff together in the youth centre. It was agreed that this process should represent ‘A celebration, event, or gathering that involves the community coming together to help people understand about other people’ (Maya, 17, YC1/FG3). This was consistent with the thematic interpretation of peace as PATs in their everyday lives concerned with family stability and social coherence.

Audience engagement was important to YC1, influenced by the interactive and transformative problem-posing presented throughout the research process. Participants planned to ‘lead activities about peace’ that sought to both reflect on the meaning of peace, in addition to considering what action, or potential action, attendees could take for peace. This involved collecting written responses to the activities, presentations, and their exhibition of photography, as an indication of what attendees had learnt. Similarly, participants wanted to design the nature of the event to be experienced as peaceful, with attention given to producing a peaceful environment that allowed events that ‘flowed from one activity to the next’ (Olly, 17, YC1/FG3). The group’s plans included a list of resources to be gathered by the young people e.g. available youth centre funds, projector and screen, microphones, video camera, photo printing, mounting and hanging, publicity display and quotes. A schedule was set for the night, including a rehearsal beforehand, with designated tasks. See Appendix 11: Example of Event Plan and Outline (30.11.16).

During the public engagement, the three participants presented to 26 attendees for over three and a half hours. The audience included family, friends, and professionals in high ranking positions e.g. Operational Lead Citywide Specialist for the City Council Youth Service, Active Involvement Youth Work Manager for the City’s Young People’s Council & Young Advisors, and the Centre manager. Apart from senior staff, the audience were gathered from the local community. Therefore, public engagement was ‘community-based’ rather than ‘community-placed.’ The young people stood up in front of the audience both individually and collectively, sometimes with the gatekeeper, and led peace-themed activities, and shared anecdotes and findings from the research. The peace-themed activities included an icebreaker aimed at challenging stereotypes and building familiarity with strangers, and gathering written comments from the audience about
peace in response to asking them ‘What Does Peace what to you?’, both at the beginning and end of the presentation to see if there had been a change in the responses. Photographs of a dove, politicians, and pictures taken from current news stories, were also used to discuss the impact of images with the audience before the young people exhibited their photography.

During their presentations, the young people spoke back with the research by directly addressing senior youth workers and professionals about strategies to create wider levels of youth participation regarding peace. This included their willingness to train other young people, and raise awareness citywide about peace as evidence for how young people’s understanding of peace can present possibilities for youth work. This was followed by an interactive exhibition of the participant’s photography hung in the main hall of the youth centre with opportunities for audience feedback. The photographs and captions described the participant’s issues and concerns for their communities and presented youth-centric images of peace. Alongside their words and photographs, the young people exhibited Banksy’s picture _CND Soldiers_, and Nick Ut’s photograph _Phan Thi Kim Phúc_. The young people chose these pictures to represent their concerns about the politics of war. Most of the audience wrote comments next to the young people’s pictures, as a vehicle for reflection, empathy, and seeing reality from the perspective of others. Attendees were also asked to self-reflect in writing about what they had learnt about peace as a result of the event.

The evening ended with an informal gathering as people ate together whilst decorating tiles for a semi-permanent installation in the youth centre. At the time of writing this, the installation still stands.

Fig. 7: Photos of YC1 Exhibition/Engagement
6.2.4 The power of music

Public engagement in YC2 was driven by problem-posing gangs as a peace-limiting situation in their everyday life. The group was keen to:

What:
To promote peace by showing the effects and impact of youth gangs in Highfields

Why:
Because these gangs (groups of young boys based on weed & money):
Divide families
Scare people
Harm people and themselves (impact on self/affect others)
Attract vulnerable young people
Are related to weed and dependency on weed
Lead to people getting hurt and/or arrested
Can ruin lives
Are difficult for families to deal with and understand

How:
Present 2-sides of the effects and impact of gangs in Highfields by:
Talking to people in gangs and find out their perspective, routine, lifestyle, aspirations
Talking to people who have been in gangs to share realistic stories and inspire others
Sharing perspectives from family members and women about the impact & effects
Create a music track:
Using Leicester College?
Leicester based rappers with a high profile
Writing meaningful lyrics
Using peace as a theme
Could be a parody - [redacted] version of Big Shaq or Kurupt FM
Present photography & music at an event in YC2 in the New Year – what date is best?
Use lyrics to promote the message on social media

When:
Start meeting again in February after exams
Mike to contact group in mid-Jan, send pictures & quotes
(taken from YC2 Group 5 notes, 06.12.17)

In keeping with youth voice, the young people wanted the proposed event to be interactive and provide a platform for them to share ‘the suggestions we have to make’ (Zainab, 17, YC2/FG3), in addition to exploring what the audience’s 'definition of peace is. And what makes them feel peaceful’ (Amita, 18, YC2/FG3). The event represented an opportunity for the young people to create peace as part of their everyday life and relationships by dissuading gang membership i.e. ‘So other people from younger generations can stop getting dragged in as older ones did’ (Zainab, 17, YC2/FG3). The associated gang-risk and gang-stress were encapsulated by Zainab who said, ‘you don't know what to do because you are just feared [fearful], and it questions how you want to live your life in a certain area’ (Zainab, 17, YC2/FG3).

YC2 wanted to share their concerns about what they understood to be gaps in local youth provision, and problems with the police response, to the issue of drugs and gangs in their community. Local youth provision was understood as ‘a good thing’ with ‘positive people’ (chapter 4). Yet, participants were concerned that gang members were not influenced by the interactions they had with staff. As an example, they stated that the gatekeeper (part-time youth worker) had:

Given young people opportunities by like, in her spare time, by opening the youth wing allowing them to come here from time to time instead of them being out on the streets and doing wrong. And that's giving young people an opportunity, but it’s just like them abusing it or them not taking the opportunity with both hands. (Afifa, 16, YC2/FG4)

The participants also questioned the accessibility of the youth provision. They were unhappy that it was ‘only open twice a week’, closed at ‘night-time’, and shut during ‘half-term’ and the ‘summer holidays’. It was agreed ‘there should be more like a permanent thing’ that was ‘open’ more and offered a more ‘urgent’ response to gangs. Especially for gang members, and young men at gang-risk, to have ‘a place they can run to’ when experiencing violence. This limited provision was understood in part to be the result of the lack of resources made available to the youth centre.
In addition to their photography, music was agreed as an effective medium for the young people to share their concerns publicly and meaningfully. The group believed that music could offer a way to disseminate relatable messages ‘about life’ for peace. Furthermore, it was agreed that music could raise issues with their intended audience of other young people, using ‘parodies of songs’ that were currently popular. This was premised by the idea that ‘music has a massive influence on people in our generation definitely’ (Afifa, 16, YC2/FG4). The consensus was that music provides a medium for young people to disseminate ideas and influence change. The group decided that they would contact a music artist who could share:

Realistic stories of what actually happens and the effects (…) And people that have previously done it and have changed their lives could potentially inspire them, I think that would make a difference. (Amita, 18, YC2/FG3)

The public engagement event was also approached by YC2 as a strategy to bring people together to educate them. As an example, they wanted to:

Educate parents as well (…) I feel like there is that sexist view that you would let your sons go out because they are guys and what is going to happen to them. But you wouldn't let your daughters because I don't want her to get pregnant or whatever. (Zainab, 17, YC2/FG3).

Both I and the participants approached their gatekeeper with their ideas and plans. She was supportive of the event going ahead; however, soon after this, she left the organisation, and the project was not taken up by another member of staff. The participants did contact me to let me know that they had informed a decision to invite a popular music artist (called Lowkey) to take part in a local community-based event at YC2. He features on the publicity poster included below. This was significant as Lowkey is a hip-hop artist who performs with a strong politicised anti-war message. I understand he also facilitated motivational workshops for young people on the day.
6.2.5 Sharing micro peace

Participants in the college shared their photography and messages of peace across three campuses. Planning occurred over four sessions with support from a gatekeeper (Learner Engagement & Enrichment worker) who was familiar and present for most of the project, although not during the data collection. I attended two of these planning meetings to offer support, and to confirm that written consent had been obtained for all photographed subjects before the event took place. See Appendix 12: Example of handover/letter communication (06.06.18).

The college group were photo-driven in their approach to the event and selected images that were organised around ‘certain things that make us feel good and that brings peace to us’ (Hannah, 24, C/FG4). They wanted their photographs to provoke questions of peace and to encourage audiences to ‘question life’. This represented a more usual form of PV, wherein participants illustrated their desire to self-represent and speak back to audiences outside of the research using the voice of their images. In addition to raising questions about peace that included issues of discrimination, equality, and respect; the participants focused on the
value of their PATs for self-initiated peace. It was hoped that their body of work would be relevant to anyone who was ‘stressed’ and might help people in that position to:

Find things that make them feel happy and at peace. Like just finding things in life that make them happy and try to get away from the negative energy things. (Hannah, 24, C/FG4)

See the positive. If you are negative about life you don’t see the peace - being positive gives me a boost of confidence. (Laura, 17, C/FG4)

Their combined photography included the importance of relationships and spending time with family and pets, being outside in the beauty of nature, and pre-sleep routines as being essential for dealing with calm and stress. The young people wanted these images to encourage audiences to ‘spend time outside and actually appreciate where you are’ (Sumaria, 17, C/FG4), or to consider how to ‘enjoy the little things’, as part of PATs for self-initiated peace in everyday life (chapter 5). Similarly, a thematic interest in ‘peace with water’ across their images was discussed to symbolise ‘We should be relaxed like water and not tense all the time’ (Sumaria, 17, C/FG4). This was voiced with an emphasis on the relationship between change and peace (chapter 4), as an important message to potential audiences that self-initiated peace was changeable and shifted e.g.:

Even though sometimes it can be rough, like if there’s a storm obviously, the water keeps moving no matter what. So, don’t stop moving just because there is a storm. (Adela, 19, C/FG4).

As a response to the unpredictability of everyday life, the college group wanted their audiences to think about being safe as part of taking/creating space for peace (chapter 5). This included prompting potential audiences to:

Think about their own safe things. Like they do they have one? Do they need to make one? (Adela, 19, C/FG4)

Young people in the college were reticent to present their work, but clearly proud of their photography. This contributed to them making themselves available to answer questions with support from the gatekeeper. During their engagement events, participants explained their ideas and photographs to teaching staff, senior management, and passing students who showed an interest. After the event, the college approached me to determine if the project could continue with students who receive support from the learning mentors. This was due to what was described as successful inclusion, good attendance, and the participant’s ‘boosted confidence’.
In summary, young people in three groups demonstrated self-representation and advocacy (SRATs) that included critical engagement. The situated and varying criticality of their knowledge of peace allowed them to move between understandings of peace as being more than conceptual, to that which was critically applied and evidenced as knowledge in action (Freire, 1974).

The following section will introduce how I have taken action to showcase the participant’s viewpoint and to generate a groundswell of interest about peace.

6.3 **Researcher engagement**

Rather than conceptualising impact and engagement as something that happens following the submission of the thesis, the study has incorporated engagement as a continuous process; both inside the university, and in the wider community. Some examples of this engagement will be discussed next.
6.3.1 Inside the university

I received an ‘Engage Award’ for £2000, from De Montfort University, based on evidence given for the impact of the study. These awards are not given to many PhD. students. I then actively built on this success to raise the profile of the subject of peace in the university. This has involved me finding various ways to discuss and disseminate the purpose of the study, the impact of the methodology, and some of the findings. For example, I have:

- Introduced and co-designed an approach to the theory and practice of peace, violence and conflict studies, as part of the ‘Learning Education in Youth Work’ module with the Youth & Community Division at De Montfort University (2018-ongoing).
- Introduced ‘Peace Education’ on the BA ‘Radical Education’ module with the Education Division at De Montfort University (2016).
- Supported an activity to create a student charter for ‘100 Ideas 4 Peace’ during ‘The Gandhi Global Family Peace Festival Day’, which was organised at De Montfort University (2017).
- Presented as a speaker and panel member at the international ‘Global Leadership Empowerment and Diversity Summit’ with delegates from the global south and north, at The Venue, De Montfort University (2016)
- Delivered a filmed presentation at ‘The Image is The Servant IV’ at The Venue, De Montfort University (2017).

As an example of this work, I actively presented the purpose and ethos of the study, alongside examples of the photographs taken by participants in YC1, during a filmed presentation called ‘HONEST DAVE presents The Image Is The Servant IV (Peaceful)’ at The Venue, De Montfort University. This was a multi-media event that lasted three and a half hours, and it provided me with an excellent opportunity to share the study in a multi-disciplinary space across a wide audience.

‘HONEST DAVE presents The Image Is The Servant’ is an event that is headed up annually by Dave Soden (lecturer, Photography & Video Department, De Montfort University) for students across the performance and art courses, to join local practising artists, musicians, and performers. I met with Dave to discuss cameras for the study. This then sparked his interest in a peace-themed event. As such, the aims for the ‘HONEST DAVE presents The Image Is The Servant IV (Peaceful)’ were directly influenced by our discussion about certain key questions (listed below) that were derived from my literature review i.e.:

1. How do we make sense of peace through dialogue and photographs? And how can these words and images influence social change?
2. How do you people make sense of peace?
   — as the presence of something rather than just the absence of violence, war, or injustice
   — as something marginalised and possibly conflicted
   — as part of our relationship with self, others, and environment
   as an issue (need and right) in our lives
3. What is the power of peace?
   — as being aware of those things, places, people, ideas that represent/constitute peace in our lives
   — as making peace for ourselves and others
   — as challenging those things, places, people, ideas that hinder our need and right to peace
   — as hope
   — as being disruptive

4. How is peace socially constructed, contextualised, and produced?
   — as negative and positive
   — as actual and potential states of the world

Subsequently, Dave called for contributions from students, artists, and performers, asking them to generate abstract, metaphorical, direct, and obscure, responses to the concept of “Peaceful, from a personal, political, local or global viewpoint”. The planning included a designated space for the photography of the young people from YC1, and opportunities for them to present their work (however they wanted); as well as them being able to photograph the event. I shared this with the young people in the study, and discussed how they might potentially attend, present, photograph, etc., with offers to support their travel. Two of the young people said they had other commitments; and although another participant was interested, they were not confident enough to attend. Reflecting on this, I think having contact in the familiarity of their youth club worked well for the young people. In contrast, the strangeness and distance of the event at De Montfort University was too challenging for them. Alternatively, the gatekeeper at YC1 reported that the young people were focused on planning for their own presentation, and that this had conflicted with the ‘HONEST DAVE’ event.

The ‘HONEST DAVE presents The Image Is The Servant IV (Peaceful)’ event was attended by approximately 100 people, including the public, local schools, colleges, and De Montfort University students from dance, animation, photography and video, and performance and art. Other participants included 17 live performers, four members of the Post War Orchestra who played recycled instruments of war, 26 image and film contributors, five documenters, and four live streamers. There were also a further three exhibitions, in addition to the filmed photography of the young people in the study. Some of the details for this event are included in the publicity flier shown below in fig. 10.

I shared some of the photography and footage taken at the event with the YC1 group before they staged their own public engagement event.
As another example, ‘The Gandhi Global Family Peace Festival Day’ presented an opportunity for both students and staff to share the message of peace. In support of this event, I co-developed resources for visitors, students, and staff, to have the chance to share their ideas for creating peaceful communities throughout the day. The activity aimed to collate ‘100 Ideas 4 Peace’ that could be used to influence a Student Charter for peace; and the responses taken were put up on boards, and displayed around Hawthorn Square. I also engaged in a circled discussion on the day, with representatives from different faiths; and spoke with Martin Ballard on BBC Radio Leicester about the nature of my study. Additionally, I accompanied Padmashri SP Varma, who is the vice-president of ‘Gandhi Global Family’ (a UN accredited peace NGO), to other organisations in Leicester. These events and activities constituted an early contribution to the adoption of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by De Montfort University. The first university in England to do so.
I continue to bring my research into my course leadership and teaching with the Youth & Community Division, and Education Studies Division, at De Montfort University. The ‘Learning Education & Youth Work module’ is particularly significant as (I think) it constitutes the only professionally validated youth work course in England that professionalises issues of peace as part of teaching towards a national youth work qualification.

### 6.3.2 In the wider community

Away from De Montfort University, I have presented ideas from the research to organisations across the city including:

- Presenting to a Youth Education Programme regarding peace paradigms for intervention with young people not in employment education or training (2018).
- Presenting as a speaker about the significance of peace for health and community development at the citywide Black worker's support group Annual General Meeting (2018).
- Two presentations at the local Youth Offending Team with two groups of 15-20 case managers, mentors, and volunteers to explain the rationale and impetus for the research.
- Presenting as a speaker to a citywide Youth Council with the biggest mandate of any youth participation group in the city to explain the rationale and impetus for the research (2016).
- Contributing to an event called ‘Building Tolerance’ with Brahma Kumaris at Harmony House (2017).
- Working with the ‘Leicester City Council Positive and Peaceful Places Award’, which is an accredited scheme for schools guided and supported by the SEMH team to meet the needs of those children who have social, emotional and mental health difficulties (2019-ongoing).

Outside of Leicester, the research has informed work with:

- Helping to secure funding, design, and facilitate as part of the ‘#MinusViolencePlusPeace project’, working to alleviate issues of knife-related violence with young people identified due to their proximity to increased knife crime and youth gang-related violence in Birmingham (2018-ongoing).

I will briefly, discuss some of these in more detail.

Early in the research (Sept 2015), I contacted The Asha Centre and was invited to attend the last day of a European Intercultural Forum that was focused on developing and mainstreaming a Peace Education
competence framework. The purpose of the residential was to provide a platform to ‘bring together peace educators in the youth field to foster a dialogue and exchange about competence development in educational programmes on peace education’ (The Asha Centre, 2015, n.p.). This involved reviewing and developing proposals for a peace education competence framework such as knowledge, skills and attitudes, evaluation indicators and assessment methods, and educational guidelines. The work formed a contribution to the ‘Mainstreaming Peace Education Practitioner’s Manual’ (Besseling et al., 2014), and was aimed to respond to the needs of young people and youth organisations working with peace in the non-formal education in the youth sector. Such practice is important, as although peace education has gained more relevance in non-formal youth work over the past years, this trend has tended to be characterised by a lack of clarity regarding the ‘conceptualisation’ and ‘delimitation of themes and issues it covers’; and has also suffered from ‘diverging quality’, ‘scope’ and ‘recognition’ (Fras & Schweitzer, 2016, p.2).

In June 2016, I attended a residential co-facilitating ‘Catalyst Leadership & Capacity’ building with young people in Manduar Hub, The Gambia (2016), organised by Momodou Sallah and ‘Global Hands’, in collaboration with the National Youth Council of The Gambia, and De Montfort University. This allowed me to develop and facilitate activities grounded in grassroots community-based approaches to development, which aimed to provoke change from those most affected, based on pedagogies of disruption and resistance (Sallah, 2016). This work included critical engagement, capacity building, conflict resolution, understanding globalisation, project management, and identifying community needs and resources.

As a final example, at the time of writing this, I am consulting with ‘#MinusViolencePlusPeace’, based on the applied theory and practice that has emerged from this thesis. This has involved helping to secure funding and designing and working towards alleviating issues of knife-related violence in Birmingham (2018-ongoing). So far, the project has involved one-to-one solution-focused goal setting, and dialogue groups, with young people, open community meetings, parent groups, and school assemblies, in hot spots for knife crime. The work was identified due to young people’s proximity to increased knife crime and youth gang-related violence in their everyday life. My input has been drawn from the findings (chapters 4 to 6) and model of praxis developed in this thesis (chapter 7), that engenders a critical response to young people’s vulnerabilities of violence and conflict, and explores their knowledge, skills, and attitudes to peace in their everyday life, to promote self-advocacy as part of building safer more peaceful communities.

During my first two projects with street-involved young people, two groups of males (aged 13-14) shared experiences of being excluded from school, stabbed, mugged, bullied, and witnessing violence such as a local shooting. The boys have family members who have been arrested and served custodial sentences for fighting, drug selling and traffic offenses. During the project young people known to them were killed in
their communities, and others sentenced for violence and murder. Some of them have also been exposed to gun use and violence as part of their experiences in Pakistan and Somalia. School pastoral staff sat in on sessions and reported being struck by the dialogue with young people. A Learning Mentor supporting one group in one school said that he was impressed by how much the young people trusted me, and how much they opened up to me. As a result of both the one-to-one sessions and groupwork, it was recognised in both schools that this helped young people at risk to share their experiences, reflect and get peer feedback, and develop alternative strategies to violence. The schools have established a long-term partnership with the project. This was valuable to me as evidence for replicability of the research theory and methodology, and as an applied example for ‘non-violent, participatory learning and education processes’ (Wulf, 1974, p.x). The ‘#MinusViolencePlusPeace’ project will be revisited later in the thesis.

6.3.3   Extensive contacts in the field

The study has drawn interest from a range of youth work practitioners across the country such as:

- Jamia Sufiya (Spiritual Foundation UK)
- Derby Motion Framework, Derby
- Milton Keynes College & Prince's Trust
- Warrington Youth Café at the Warrington Peace Centre
- Bradford Youth & Community and Scholarship & Research Centre
- Peterborough Youth Service
- A Pax Christi School & Diocesan Face & Justice Commission in Lancashire, and
- The national Quaker Peace Education Programmes and Engagement projects.

Further afield, I have also connected with the Young Person Coordinator for ‘Youth Participation Wales for Peace’, the largest peace research project in Europe (2015), and ‘Beyond Skin’, who work with the Arts Dialogue Team in Ireland and Northern Ireland. In Feb 2018, I met with Leila Baz (Senior Program Officer) from ‘Legacy International’ in West Virginia, USA, who specialise in peacebuilding, social entrepreneurship, and leadership training, with community leaders, young people, professionals, and governmental and non-governmental administrators in over 110 countries on five continents. We met to discuss my involvement with their work with the ‘Jo Cox Foundation’.

Regarding scholarship, I joined the Journal of Critical Southern Studies (JCSS) editorial team, as a book reviews editor (2015). And publications informed by the research have included contributions to The SAGE Handbook of Youth Work Practice (Sallah et al., 2018), and The Journal of Dialogue Studies (Ogunnusi, 2019).
I have also actively contacted certain academics with an interest in their ontological approaches to CPE, and the possible tautological assumptions about peace education as being inherently concerned with critical structural change (Page, 2017). In Jan 2018, I was approached by Dr. Soner Polat (Kocaeli University, Turkey) regarding my ideas and input for the possible links between peace education, school, and the wider community.

When taken together, all of these activities have helped to bring the theory and practice of the study to a wider audience, and extend its impact.

6.4 Summary
This chapter has focused on how young people critically engaged with their knowledge of peace as praxis. And consequently, how their knowledge was expressed as meaningful self-representation and advocacy through public engagement events. The findings have shown how young people have used their ideas, knowledge, photography, and words, as active solutions for peace in their communities. Such findings have provided valuable knowledge for how young people act for peace; and perhaps more crucially, how they have acted in their critical knowledge in peace. The findings have also illustrated some of the complexities for how young people encounter ‘deficit peace’, and barriers to peace, in their everyday life, as more than just passive engagement. Evidence for their dialogue, and peace-limit situations, have shown how young people took a critical stance, and found positionality, about issues of culture, history, tradition, norms, etc., evidenced in the praxis of their everyday life. Importantly, this corresponds with the ‘action’ dimension of PAR, and has offered an insight into the duality of praxis and consciousness. Lastly, the work of both the young people and the researcher has demonstrated the reproducibility of narratives, theory, and practice, in the study, which has been applied in different and new settings. Each of these ideas will be discussed more in the following chapter.
Section 7 - Discussion

7.1 Chapter outline

This thesis aimed to build on previous findings to further examine how young people understand peace as part of their everyday life; and furthermore, how they related to their knowledge of peace as praxis. This included actively highlighting the viewpoint of those being researched, and a specific interest in the potential duality of praxis and consciousness as the knowledge and enactment of peace in the young people’s everyday life.

To recap, chapter 1 investigated the social construction of peace and the impetus for this study, informed by CPE and issues of social resistance and justice as a theoretical framework to investigate everyday life. Chapter 2 charted historical and theoretical studies for how children and young people have been shown to understand peace and war, culminating with an interpretive and critical approach that has centralised the viewpoint and agency of young people. Chapter 3 examined the philosophical and methodological implications for how the study was designed and influenced by participant action research (PAR), built around an original approach to photovoice (PV); and then outlined how data were collected with young people using participatory photography, photo-elicitation and dialogue. Chapters 4 to 6, structured and presented the findings thematically, to include how young people moved past ‘deficit peace’ paradigms to expound their knowledge of peace as everyday peace affirming tactics (PATs), and self-representation and advocacy for peace tactics (SRATs) both in and outside of the research.

The discussion and analysis in this chapter will revisit the findings to focus on how the aims of the research have been met, including findings, implications, and conclusions. Then the Sociology of Peace in Everyday Life (SoPiEL) will be introduced to incorporate the themes of non-deficit peace, peace affirming tactics (PATs), and self-representation & advocacy tactics (SRATs), with links to peace-limit situations. After this my original approach to PV will be considered, followed by the identified limitations and strengths of the study.

7.2 Meeting aims

The aims of the study were to:

Generate new knowledge by:
Exploring how young people understand peace in their everyday life, and how young people relate to their knowledge of peace as praxis.
Showcase the viewpoint of those being researched by:
Documenting and encouraging young people’s concerns, aspirations, and active solutions, for peace in their communities.

In response to how the research aims have been met, the study was deliberately young person-centred, and peace focused. Peace was prioritised as the primary object of study, including that which is verbal and visible, and can be audio recorded and captured in photographs. Data were collected from 21 young people (aged 15-24) based in five different inner-city settings in the Midlands, England. This successfully provided a rich and diverse response for how young people have understood and given meaning to peace as expressions of themselves, their experiences, and their environment (chapters 4 to 6).

The discussion has considered three key emergent themes in the findings. The first was characterised by how young people have understood peace as being more than ‘deficit peace’, characterised by non-binary peace, ahistorical peace, and change and peace. The second theme focused how young people understood peace as unreflexive and deliberate peace affirming tactics (PATs), consisting of how they spoke about their relationships to people around them, and how they are socialised into peace skills; and their deliberate and random tactics for peace as social coherence shaped by ideas of equality, respect, and social justice. PATs also highlighted the importance of participant’s self-initiated peace as self-regulatory and transformative; formulated as natural self-care, wellness, and coping. The third theme emerged from the participant's concerns and aspirations for peace and illustrated how young people understood their knowledge of peace as self-representation and advocacy tactics (SRATs). SRATs carried messages about the importance of taking action for peace, such as ripple acts, voicing, and seeking a community response.

In keeping with the aims to document and encourage young people’s concerns, aspirations, and active solutions, for peace in their communities, the study used an adaptation of PV, influenced by the principles of PAR. This provided an effective method to open relationships and dialogue, and actively encouraged participants to explore and express their views inside the research. As such, the findings are supported by a range of examples for young people’s photographs and words, gathered longitudinally from participatory photography and photo-elicitation, during interviews and dialogue groups. In addition, the study has successfully provided opportunities for young people to share and enact their concerns and active solutions for peace outside of the research. Examples have been given for how one group influenced a local public engagement, and two other groups exhibited their work and engaged with wider audiences to spark dialogue for peace in five different settings in their local communities. This included young people leading activities, self-advocating, speaking out, and speaking back, through their photography and words (chapter 6); which resulted in the study being granted an ‘engagement award’ for impact (chapter 6). Actively showcasing the
viewpoint of those being researched has also been evidenced as part of my role; involving numerous presentations, talks, curricula development, teaching, youth and community work, and consultancy.

The diagram below outlines the main concepts and theories that have been introduced from the findings in response to the aims of the study; illustrating how they fit together, and how they help to understand the data.

Fig. 11: A diagram of how the concepts/theories fit together

**Sociology of Peace in Everyday Life (SoPiEL)**
The construction of peace knowledge with/in the praxis of everyday life as non-deficit peace; peace affirming tactics (PATs); and self-representation & advocacy tactics (SRATs).

**Non-deficit peace**
SoPiEL opens spaces that are not prescribed by ‘conflict affected peace’.

**Peace affirming tactics (PATs)**
Sited in the continuum of structure and agency in the minutia of everyday life.

**Peace Limit Situations**
Sited in dialogue as/for critical literacy.

**Self-representation & advocacy tactics (SRATs)**
Sited in everyday life as the duality of praxis and critical consciousness.
7.3 **Introduction to the Sociology of Peace in Everyday Life (SoPiEL)**

The findings have shown that peace is not self-explanatory or self-justifying. Peace was understood by young people as an intersubjective part of everyday life that is context-specific, local, and situated. This included how young people made sense of their knowledge of peace, and what this meant for peace in the praxis of their everyday life.

Trends in the literature have positioned the phenomena of peace and young people’s conceptualisation of peace in relation to war and conflict e.g. the troubles in Northern Ireland or Columbia (chapter 2). This has included tendencies that reproduce an unquestioned inextricability of peace, war, and conflict, and constructs of war and peace that are co-determinant; predicated on the purpose and validation of peace research to replace war with peace, and to shape learning about war and violence that can help peace. Such factors have contributed a deficit approach to peace, as something resulting from, and secondary to, an existing problem i.e. war or conflict. Typically derived from Western polemologic adult concerns these ideas continue to influence how the ‘everyday’ significance of peace is studied; and underpin how young people’s knowledge and actions for peace in the everyday remains firmly entrenched, and limited to, spatial and conceptual spaces of ‘conflict-affected spaces’ and ‘peacebuilding’ (Baser & Celik, 2014; Berents, 2014; Berents & ten, 2017; Brewer et al., 2018; Dutta et al., 2016; Firchow, 2018; McEvoy-Levy, 2011; Pruitt, 2013). In contrast, this study asserts the need to examine and question what is known about the construction of peace knowledge, and more specifically how, where, and why, young people give meaning to peace.

Moving further than deficit and binary paradigms, and moving past what is known, the Sociology of Peace in Everyday Life (SoPiEL) is introduced by building on the theoretical framework outlined in chapter 1; and what this revealed about the continuum of praxis, structure, and agency in their everyday life (Freire, 1970; Sztompka, 2008). These ideas will be outlined in more detail in the following sections.

**7.3.1 How young people understand peace**

The study has generated a wealth of qualitative data for young people’s nuanced and complex responses for how they understood peace, engaged with their knowledge of peace, and how they positioned themselves regarding this knowledge. Drawing comparisons between the findings and extant literature is not straightforward due the contextuality and situatedness of the data i.e. my role and interaction with participants, their experiences and engagement with the research; and how this compares with the breadth of previous research philosophies, methodologies, data collection, analysis, varied sample groups, and research instruments. As well as difficulties presented by prior operationalisations of peace linked to ‘conflict-affected peace’ and ‘deficit peace’. Nevertheless, it is possible to see certain immediate similarities. For instance, the assortment of responses for young people’s first impressions of peace (chapter 4, table 9)
corresponded with prior research (e.g. Hakvoort, 1996; McEvoy, 2000; Hall, 1993; Hakvoort, 1996). This has been illustrated below in table 10 using the early categorisations developed from the work of Hakvoort & Oppenheimer (1993) to organise the data:

Table 10: Comparisons to early concepts of peace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early concepts of peace</th>
<th>Participant’s responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Missing</td>
<td>This is hard.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Nature</td>
<td>Nature, wind, cat, sea, birds, tigers, forest, sky, night, sunsets, flowers, lake, park, beaches, animals, blue sky.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Religion</td>
<td>God, pilgrimage, Bible, Quran, mosque.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a: Positive emotions (individual)</td>
<td>Laughter, joyful, fun, enjoy, happiness, friendships, togetherness, harmony, bonds, on top of the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b: Positive emotions (global)</td>
<td>Loving the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a: Negation of war (individual)</td>
<td>Socialising, giving what you don't need, helping people in need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b: Negation of war (global)</td>
<td>World peace, united nations, pacifism, no enemies, no violence, only spreading love, no trump, truce-treaty, cease fire, nonviolence. Calm, being alone, peace and quiet, silence, still.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Disarmament</td>
<td>No army, no guns, peace symbol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a: Human attitudes</td>
<td>Tolerance agreement, understanding, acceptance, forgiveness, satisfaction with your life, respect, kindness, patience, unity, no racism, no sexism, no homophobia, no prejudice, no discrimination, no hate, no crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b: Absence of human attitudes</td>
<td>Absence of the above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: Universal rights</td>
<td>Be yourself, free, freedom and law, protesting, suffering is stopped.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Although this is not ‘missing’ data such responses may be a factor for missing data. (Adapted from Hakvoort and Oppenheimer, 1993)

Such typifications are highly subjective and problematic to typify in ways that are tight or mutually exclusive. Examples for some of the young people’s responses do not seem to fit:
Likewise, certain trends presented in the data (chapters 4 to 6) can be seen to have relevance for the broad and somewhat unwieldy themes of ‘self’, ‘family’ and ‘society’ that are discussed in earlier qualitative work, such as that of Juhasz & Palmer (1991), who emphasise interpersonal interactions and the emotional significance of the young people’s responses. Again, the operationalisation of peace, methodology, and analysis, makes it difficult to draw satisfactory comparisons.

The study has shown that young people’s knowledge has particular situatedness generated by the context of those involved and their interactions, such as the language used, movement of meaning, and how concepts and ideas have appeared at separate times and different paces for individuals and groups. For instance, some participants expressed that engaging with the word peace was ‘difficult’ or ‘hard to do’, and then went on to identify the iterative nature of their peace knowledge (chapter 4). In another example, ‘friends’ were identified early on in the research as having value for peace, yet the concepts of friendship (with people) and the role of friends did not feature significantly across the subsequent data (chapter 5). I question whether young people’s experience of their friendships was so deeply entrenched in their day-to-day lives that it sits ‘unnamed’ as normal (Ani, 1994). Reducing the complexity of the data, and stripping it of context, simplifies and even obscures its relevance. So for instance, rather than being interpreted as ‘passive’, ‘empty’, or free from stimuli and activity (Ålvik, 1968; Cooper, 1965; Mercer, 1974), how participants understood peace as ‘calm’, ‘silence’, ‘being alone’, and ‘still’, was shown to have vital importance as part of SoPiEL regarding how young people understood and enacted self-initiated peace in their everyday life (chapter 5, PATs).

Broader indications of contextual differences were evidenced in the narratives across each of the five group settings (chapters 4 to 6). Three groups, based in the youth centres (YC1, YC2) and the youth involvement team (YIT) emphasised the visceral nature of peace, the social potential of ‘acceptance’, and the importance of ‘freedom’, including freedom from. This was replicated across the groups, but in the college group (C) greater emphasis was given to personal routines for self-initiated peace. YIT were unique in their dialogue for the tensions presented about the apparent normalcy and need of militarism and war thinking. The young men attending the youth offending team (YOT) spoke about the influence of religion, comparatively more so than other settings. However, YC2, as a group of Black female Asian Muslims, engaged in more depth about the personal, local, national, and global implications of their religion concerning their experiences of being othered, microaggressions, discrimination and intersectionality. YC1 emphasised youth voice, and the
narratives of YC1 and YC2 both carried distinct messages about ‘change’ and ‘community’; with greater emphasis given to the community by YC2 e.g., ‘I would say if the community work together there would be a lot more peace than there is right now’ (Amita, 18, YC2/ INT).

Young people’s experiences as groups, and within their groups, also provided multi-layered and detailed accounts of their contextual differences. In group C, participants shared the label and experience of being ‘mentored’. They spoke about their common, shared and distinct experiences and challenges as ‘young carers’, being ‘looked after’, as ‘unaccompanied asylum seekers’, having Asperger’s, living in one parent and troubled families, issues with mental health, and living with a life-threatening illness. This situatedness manifested a dialogue about pets (chapter 4) that was not present elsewhere in the data:

I think my relationship with him is important [tortoise]. I had a lot of love to give but no one to give it to. And I feel better for giving it to a tortoise to be honest, because like I say he can’t hurt me (…). It is more fulfilling for me in general than giving it to a person. Because people can hurt you and I have had a lot of people hurt me. (Hannah, 24, C/INT)

In contrast, the young people in YC2 spoke with the same depth and detail about the challenges of living in families, immediate environments, and local cultures that perpetuated gangs:

I think there is something scary about not anything happening (…). It’s going to be a cycle and people younger than us will be involved in that [gangs] as well. Like I have a little brother and it’s kind of scary to know that if he hangs around the wrong people like that which is like a potential thing then he might walk in those same shoes. (Zainab, 17, YC2/FG2)

Although gangs were mentioned and discussed by all of the groups, this particular narrative of gang-risk and gang-stress was distinct to YC2 and established a barrier to peace with reference to how it left the young people ‘feeling hurt’, ‘scared’, ‘angry’; and their family members being ‘a bit depressed and stuff’.

In contrast, each of the five groups was shown to communicate peace in terms of attachment i.e. ‘knowing you have someone there’ and having people to ‘relate to’ and ‘bond with’. The importance of attachments and bonds was extended to include objects, animals, and particular spaces. For example, Emma (17, C/FG3) stated:

I have learnt that peace can be shown through many different ways whether it’s through family members and pets, through little creatures and scenery, or through bold lettering on posters and drawings. Peace can come in many different shapes and sizes just like people.

In summary, how young people understood peace, and how they understood this knowledge, was highly contextualised, intersubjective, pluralist, socially embedded, and unfinished. The findings include evidence for young people’s voluntarism and contextually cued thinking, attitudes, relationships, learning, choices, and responses to the places they co-inhabit, and their wider environment (Berents, 2014; McEvoy, 2000;
Pruitt, 2013). Crucially, this fits well with SoPiEL as a lens informed by praxis, structure and agency (Freire, 1970; Sztompka, 2008), and adds to an understanding of social existence as the ‘embeddedness of human beings in the relationships with other human beings’ (Sztompka, 2008, p.30).

The significance of SoPiEL, as a theoretical framework, is illustrated further in the typologies below, to help understand and interpret commonalities for how young people have given meaning to peace as being: deeply experiential, placed, non-reductionist, visceral, observable, temporal, routine, culturally significant, and praxis. The inherent nature of praxis as both “being” and “becoming” means this framework contains ideas that are interrelated and overlapping, and they are not intended to be exhaustive. Each of the areas will be briefly discussed below and will inform analysis in later sections of this chapter.

**Deeply experiential:** Young people documented and examined their ideas and knowledge of peace as something lived and deeply experiential. They spoke about peace in themselves and their social practices, including their relationships with people close to them, connected to them, and around them; and their concerns and hopes. There are many divergent examples of how the experiential meaning of peace was intricately woven into the circumstances of young people’s lives. For instance, Adela (19, C/INT) who examined peace using the analogy of water as having relevance for her experience of cancer (chapter 4), and Chad (17, YOT/FG1), who spoke about peace in relation to his bible and ‘reading stuff that is trying to put you on the right path’. Further examples demonstrate how young people tactically interact with their wider environment to negotiate peace as part of their day-to-day experiences. For instance, the findings have shown how Laura (17, C/FG1) found particular spaces, and interacted with water, as a way to navigate her experiences at college:

> College is, it can be hectic at times, but if I feel too stressed I can look at the water and I can calm down; rather than go and sit in the library with no earphones and stressing so much about assignments and homework and revision and exams all those things. It’s just that I get that time alone to just stand there look at the lake like actually, I can do this.

Chad and Laura’s quotes have particular relevance for how young people have evidenced self-initiated peace as part of the key theme of their peace affirming tactics (chapter 5, PATs), which will be revisited in this chapter.

**Non-reductionist:** In chapter 4, the findings illustrated how some young people struggled during their initial engagement with the word peace, stating that it was ‘difficult’ and ‘hard’ to word peace for themselves (chapter 4). They also grappled with what was appreciated to be the relative, pluralist, incomplete, and conflicted nature of peace. This might correspond with findings in previous studies in which young people state that peace is generally not understood (McEvoy, 2000). However, as one of the participants stated:
In my head, I see it like a Ven diagram [laughter] so it would be different for one person and different for another person. But there is a part that meets up in the middle. (Hadiya, 17, YIT/FG1).

Young people’s understanding of peace was known as being different to/from violence. Peace was expressed as a generative word, and young people’s responses were intersubjective, imaginative, and creative. The findings also demonstrated that young people came to understand that the process of talking about their knowledge of peace was generative and iterative, which meant the more they spoke about peace the more they realised they knew about peace. This was shown in the findings as they moved between meanings of peace that were descriptive, interpretive, and emergently critical.

Young people’s understanding of peace was also expressed across differing rudimentary binaries of peace, violence and conflict:

Violence = status quo
Absence of violence = peace
Absence of conflict = peace
Absence of peace = conflict
Peace = change and conflict
Peace = a sense of justice

These responses were complex, especially as they did not necessarily occur as variations on the same spectrum. Young people also identified war as a mechanism for various kinds of peace i.e. peace as the consequence of war, and peace as the bonds and attachments experienced during war.

Fluidity and variability in the findings have shown that peace and violence were not reduced to being symmetrical or linear (Lourenço, 1999); and as specific terms, they were not shown to increase or decrease simultaneously. However, young people did express their experience of peace and violence as relative and coexisting at the same time and place (chapter 4). Participant’s responses for negative peace were consistent with existing typologies of ‘what to avoid’ (Rinehart, 1995) in order to bring about peace e.g. the ‘absence of war’, ‘no army’, ‘no danger’, ‘no honour killings’, ‘no hate, no crime’, etc. (chapter 4). Such concepts were quickly understood and typically (re)expressed as being more than just the absence of direct violence. For instance, the theme of peace as social coherence (chapter 5) talked directly to ideas of positive peace as the negation of direct, structural, and cultural violence (Galtung, 1969, 2000). Issues of peace and violence were also presented by conflict in their everyday life; wherein interpretations of peace were located as an antithesis to direct and structural violence e.g. discrimination and youth violence in gangs (chapter 6). These conflicts also contained tensions between the historicity of peace and ahistorical peace; and the recurring
significance of change and peace as a measure of peace (chapter 4). With the latter informed by existing, and often emergent, normative beliefs that peace knowledge and action could/should challenge and disrupt violence (negative peace), and promote structures of peace (positive peace) (Galtung, 1969, 2000). In contrast, the absence of peace was not reduced to degrees of violence.

Perhaps most importantly, when given context, each of the issues raised for young people’s knowledge of peace was non-reductionist, and had different meanings for those involved, and entailed dynamic and changeable ideas (chapter 4).

**Visceral:** In keeping with prior research the findings have shown how particular feelings were associated with peace such as ‘joyful’, ‘fun’, ‘enjoyment’, ‘happiness’ (Juhasz & Palmer, 1991). Participants also spoke about the need for people to ‘open their hearts’ as an emotional act e.g. ‘I think loving makes you feel like peaceful’ (Rachel, 17, C/FG 1). More specifically, young people’s tactics for peace were intrinsically and explicitly linked to the act of generating these same feelings for themselves as self-initiated peace, and for others as social coherence (chapter 5).

But more than this, young people’s relationship with the knowledge and power of peace was visceral. They associated what was ‘good’ about peace as being intrinsically linked to personal bonds and social togetherness as something that was naturally ‘right.’ Further still, peace was articulated as something that feels good at a fundamental level, with themselves, others, life, and nature. Again, this reaffirms SoPiEL as emerging in and emanating from, the interconnectedness of human existence.

The generative words that young people voiced during their initial activities (chapter 4), and young people’s responses to their personal and environmental barriers to peace (chapter 6), carried strong emotional responses e.g. peace as unity, acceptance, religion; and barriers to peace as discrimination, war, and the role of adults (Baser & Celik, 2014). Similarly, these generative words influenced generative themes for each of the three groups who spoke about their PATs and SRATs. For instance, YC2 expressed a consensus about gangs, which was symbolically embodied in the language of actor-based and structure-based ‘corruption’ and ‘decay’ (chapter 6).

Interestingly, participants also explored the significance of emotion for how they operationalised peace visually in their photography and verbally during the research:

I have selected “We Happy Few”, because I just love the feeling from it. I was just standing there and then I just got this vibe and I was like I just have to take a picture of this. So, I did,
and I just like the fact that so many people from different backgrounds have come together. (Maya, 17, YC1/INT)

Researcher: So, thinking about all of these pictures, do you think there are any commonalities, are there any common themes?
Millie: My emotions, I don't think it's in all of them, actually that's a lie it is in all of them isn't it. You see I don't speak about my emotions that often so it’s one of those things that you have kind of you have opened up a door by doing this. So, my, how I feel in regard to certain things I think is a common factor in these. And you have made me share viewpoints that I never thought I would actually think of. (Hannah (24, C/INT)

Observable: Young people clearly understood peace as something made visible through their photography. They took over 528 photographs as representations of peace in their everyday life such as pictures of events, social interactions, people, places, pets, objects, words, buildings, and spaces. Examples have been provided in chapter 3. Participants then chose 53 photographs to share and discuss during interviews and subsequent dialogue groups.

The findings have evidenced that much of how young people spoke about peace in everyday life was observable in private and public spheres. For instance, the significance of respect, as one of the key factors for social coherence (i.e. PATs, chapter 5), was described as a series of visible actions:

Being respectful is when you walk past somebody and if they smile at you instead of snarling or something. Or, if someone asks you if you are sitting somewhere you are not supposed to be, security comes up to you and are, “Oh, would you mind moving from here? You are not allowed to be here”. Instead of cursing them, and effing and blinding, you are, okay I respect you are doing your job. (Maya, 17, YC1/FG2)

Additionally, participants were aware that their photographs conveyed values and messages with various levels of meaning. For instance, Hannah (24, C/FG3) took a picture of a dissected lamb’s heart that was given meaning for peace in her explanation that ‘I don't think you can take it on face value. I think that you need to have it explained first and grasp the concept of what I am trying to say before you can essentially judge what I have done.’ Along with the colours and symmetry of this image, which Hannah considered to be aesthetically pleasing, it was this message that she wanted to send using the photograph. Such ideas were consistent throughout the findings and substantiate a critical discourse about the significance of meaning given to peace dependent on who is looking, and the knowledge and experience that supports their gaze (Richmond, 2006).

The visual significance of the participant’s peace photography was shown to influence their decisions for self-representation & advocacy tactics (SRATs). Consistent with PV methodology (Wang & Burris, 1997), they shared their messages and the implications of their photographs during public engagements with wider audiences. Further still, young people wanted their public engagements to replicate some of their research
experience, by actively using their photographs and written words to encourage their audiences to “look” at peace critically, and ‘from a different standpoint’ (Souza & Andreotti, 2009, p.82).

**Temporal:** The study has demonstrated the temporality of peace for young people in their everyday life. This was made apparent in the initial activities when young people articulated close associations between the concepts of peace and change, the changeable nature of peace, and change as an inherent part of peace (chapter 4). For instance, Laura (17, C/INT) who described her experience of peace as resembling ‘the movement of the waves.’

Young people’s knowledge of peace was also shown to have relevance in their lived past, present and future. Such ideas are encapsulated in the extract below. It is edited from a longer passage about a photograph of a local street that Maya (17, YC1/INT) used to demonstrate the nuanced and convoluted concepts of peace in familiar and public spaces:

A peaceful neighbourhood with no murder, or war, or terrorist attacks; but, I wonder what struggles people have, or how peaceful they are (...) I have been walking down here since as long as I can remember because I have lived here all my life. (...) and I just think of all the happy times I have had walking with a friend or with my parents or just bumping into a random stranger and just exchanging glances or smiling. (...) But at the same time, it just comes to life and there is just all this movement and all this energy and all these different vibes. And you don't know what is going to happen when you are walking down there. Is someone going to show up? Is one of those bad things going to happen again? Is something good going to happen, you never know. (...) Its where you go, who you see, and who you meet that matters. You can walk past that one person and they can like change your life forever. Or you can just walk past them, and nothing happens, and you would go on living that peaceful life not knowing.

This extract is one example of the temporal nature given to peace by young people as part of the intricacy of SoPiEL. Maya’s account of a street as a representation of peace encompassed memories, reflexivity, change, difference, chance, smiles, arguments, fights, unpredictability, local/global dimensions, police and gangs. Additionally, it suggested a fragility of peace, as an arbitrary experience that co-exists in the past, present and immediate future. Maya concluded by saying that ‘Anyone can disturb that peace. But at the same time nothing could happen, we could just go on being peaceful.’ Such accounts are evidenced throughout the data and disrupt prescribed narratives by stressing the significance of a multifaceted peace that is unpromised and unpredictable (chapter 4).

**Places and spaces:** Young people positioned and placed their peace knowledge in accordance with certain spaces (Berents & McEvoy-Levy, 2015). The findings have shown distinctions between Nature-Natural-Green space and the City-Industrial-Urban, with comments such as ‘sometimes man-made things can bring
negativity and conflict’ (Sumaria, 17, C/FG2). Furthermore, all groups were evidently concerned with how the environment can hold properties or conditions for peace:

Researcher: So, when we put all of your pictures together what are the common themes of your images?
Sumaria: They are all in the home, they are all to do with the environment, they are all to do with what you surround yourself with, that's the common theme. (YC2/INT)

The significance of ‘place’ was emphasised in young people’s interpretations of peace as self-initiated peace (chapter 5, PATs). References included nature and how it feels and looks, being near water and how it feels and looks, and home/bedroom and being safe. Other places of safety included youth clubs and libraries. As an example, the extract below is taken from Mary’s explanation of why she photographed herself doing a meditative pose in a library to represent peace in her everyday life:

So, the place is a library, I spent a lot of my childhood in libraries because I went through a few phases where I didn't have any friends. Obviously, straight after my parents split up it was very difficult for me to make friends while I was so preoccupied with what was going on at home. (…) I pretty much lived in there the whole time we lived there. Because there was never any judgement. I could go and look at whatever books I wanted. There was never any rush because it’s not like a bookshop where you have to buy the book, so there was no rush to buy it and get out. So, I think its solitude as well because I get a lot of, I get a lot of peace from being alone which I think I have told you before. And so, it was solitude and just the serenity of being sat with a good book you can lose yourself in it and you can really just forget about everything. (Mary, 17, YC1/INT)

Likewise, young people also described ‘space’ in their actions to take and create space for self-initiated peace, such as spending time in designated spaces away from other people (chapter 5).

Alternatively, young people specified certain localities as contested spaces i.e. containing the threat of violence (Harland, 2009a). This included football stadiums, dark alleyways, pubs, nightclubs, the city centre after dark; and local territories where gangs were known/thought to congregate. Contentions were also raised about how certain spaces were labelled as peaceful (McEvoy-Levy, 2012). For instance, links were made between real and perceived threats to peace in public spaces, and how and when some (female) Muslim participants were expected to access certain places; especially those deemed to be ‘forbidden’, or unsuitable by their parents and religious figures in their local community. The two groups based in youth centres (YC1, YC2) argued against the (outsider) labelling of their communities as being discriminative. They also contested how negative peace labels were used by people both inside and outside of their local communities to describe certain areas as being peaceful because acts of violence were not observable:

It means that just because you don't see what’s not happening in front of you it doesn't mean it's not going on. So, if you don't see violence, crime, drugs, that doesn't mean it’s not going on, it’s
still happening. This picture gives the illusion that there is peace but there isn't. (Amita, 18, YC2/INT)

When taken together, Amita’s critical comment above, and Maya’s earlier account of the temporality of peace, actively question how peace is communicated. In both examples, the absence of violence was not used as an indicator of (negative) peace. Instead, it was challenged and resisted by young people, based on their local geographical knowledge and experience. This offers a counter-narrative that asserts peace cannot simply be conceptually anchored in space and location (Mac Ginty, 2015). Furthermore, the findings have shown how Amita argued that such social practices are illusionary and misleading.

The significance of place, and space, in particular, are very relevant for how young people have evidenced self-initiated peace (chapter 5, PATs). This will be revisited in this chapter.

Peace as routines: The findings have shown that young people’s understanding of peace calls attention to mundane and taken-for-granted acts and routines in their everyday life. These social practices have been demarcated as being potentially transformative, deliberate, and randomly staged, as peace praxis in the ordinariness of the everyday. Peace routines have been presented thematically in the findings as evidence for young people’s tactics for self-initiated peace (chapter 5, PATs). These are characterised as self-determined and pro-active practices for micro-peace as self-regulation and self-care, including the re-appropriation of cohabited space for young people to “get away”, both in and from everyday life (Berents & McEvoy-Levy, 2015). Alternatively, ripple acts were also evidenced as social practices and routines that were understood to have emergent power and relevance for a broader social peace in ways that moved between intrapersonal and inter-personal relations by stressing the importance of the enactment of peace knowledge. This has been presented thematically in the findings as evidence for young people’s self-representation and advocacy tactics (chapter 6, SRATs). Both of these themes and their implications will be discussed later in this chapter.

Peace as cultural significance: During the initial activities certain participants openly expressed difficulty articulating peace as something distinct and not conflated (chapter 4). Importantly, young people reflected on this incognisance by locating their knowledge in their experience. In chapter 4, examples were given for how Mary (17, YC1/FG1) and Amita (18, YC2/FG1) examined how their knowledge of peace was rooted in their thinking and immediate environment, and how this was identified as being skewed towards conflict. Amita identified ‘deficit peace’ knowledge (i.e. as something that results from, and is secondary to, an existing problem) as a consequence of the group’s collective familiarity with the lack of peace in their everyday life:

If there was peace you would be able to identify what makes the peace and how it occurs, but because there is not that much peace you can identify it quicker to say what is not bringing the peace. (Amita (18, YC2/FG1)
The group went on to engage in dialogue about the lack of role models for peace in their local communities, which quickly focused on their familiarity with (groups of) people who presented barriers to peace as part of their everyday life.

When thinking about the historical-cultural significance of peace, the young people have been shown to evidence a disconnect in several ways. The peace symbol was referred to by all groups except one (i.e. YOT). Yet the participants did not know the origins of the symbol. Similarly, September 21st was recognised as the International Day peace in one group (YC2), however none of the participants had been involved or celebrated the day. Links were made by participants in all of the groups to people who were historically involved with peace, especially as civil resistance e.g. Nelson Mandela, Martin Luther King, Mahatma Gandhi, Rosa Parks, Emmeline Pankhurst. And peace was discussed explicitly (although hesitantly) in terms of socio-political structures such as communism, feminism, and pacifism. Young people also referred to ‘Hippies’ and the ‘Peace Movement’ but with less enthusiasm, and stated how (these) cultures of peace were understood to be both stereotyped and risky (chapter 4).

In addition, the findings have also suggested that the significance of historical peace actors, movements and symbols were too outdated, and remote, to contribute to the young people’s immediate environment, and so did not convey contemporary or meaningful codes of protest (Ziemann, 2008). It was concluded that adults were not ‘standing up for’ young people regarding issues of peace (chapter 4). These ideas can be critically located as part of the focus on localism in CPE and peacebuilding (Bajaj, 2019; Richmond & Mac Ginty, 2013), to seek new narratives between young people and peace culture/structures. Crucially, the cultural significance of peace as ahistorical (chapter 4) has indicated the need for a greater understanding of how local history and experiences can impact young people’s encounters with external peace cultures (Firchow, 2018). However, in contrast, young people tended to be surprised by their depth of peace knowledge.

The findings have clearly shown how they identified their local and situated knowledge and social practices of peace as something valued as good, and those who act for peace as doing something good. This included the cultural significance of peace of situated learning, social coherence and self-initiated peace (chapter 5, PATs); and ripple acts, voicing, and seeking a response from people outside of the research, as a possible culture of peace as/and change (chapter 6, SRATs).

**Peace as praxis:** The situatedness of participants and their responses has provided a range of different experiences, as well as the interconnectivity presented by their intersubjective and material social existence. Such ideas have reiterated SoPiEL as the dynamism of everyday peace negotiated in and across both micro
and macro levels, and as being both context-specific and agentic. Within this, young people have provided a measure of peace concerned with praxis in everyday life, which has adhered to the conviction that ‘the world is changeable, malleable, at least up to a certain point’ (Galtung, 1996, p.10). Such findings have included how young people expressed their knowledge of peace as being embedded in both the micro and macro dimensions of everyday life:

So, there’s global peace and then there is peace with yourself. So, like when you are at peace of mind, when you actually happy with who you are and like what you are doing with your life.
(Fatima, 15, YIT/FG1)

For three groups this was examined in conjunction with the positioning of their peace knowledge (by themselves and through dialogue) as a nexus of peace and change, the changeable nature of peace, and change as an inherent part of peace (chapter 4). This was shown in the findings as critical peace thinking, initially described as moving from reactive ‘surface peace’ towards something that was ‘a lot deeper, when you actually look behind the meaning of it; how it affects the world’ (Isha, 17, YIT/FG1). How young people’s knowledge of peace became more critically complicated as they spoke about ‘different’ and ‘deeper’ levels of peace has been evidenced in the findings.

Significantly, young people navigated the dialectical relationship between their material social existence and their own ability to self-determine and act. Rather than a distinct or salient narrative of conflict, this has been presented thematically in the findings as PATs and SRATs which have been interpreted as being twofold. Firstly, how young people have understood acquiring peace knowledge within the praxis of everyday life. And, then secondly, how they have interpreted peace as what they think, and do, within the praxis of everyday life (chapters 5 and 6). The significance of PATs and SRATs will be examined next in this chapter. Suffice to say, both PATs and SRATs have demonstrated how young people recognised ‘the social-individual praxis’ of everyday life (Sztompka, 2008, p.3). This was expressed as part of a shared consensus that ‘we can’t achieve peace without achieving some kind of change’ (Maya, 17, YC1/FG2).

Peace knowledge as praxis has been evidenced as conscious and unreflexive, agency, and resistance; in the language, knowledge, and power, of young people’s decision making and actions (chapters 5 and 6). This rich qualitative data adds to earlier studies to contribute knowledge for how young people have understood their ability to judge and manoeuvre in their everyday routines, relationships, and issues that have affected them (Berents, 2014, Berents & McEvoy-Levy, 2015; McEvoy, 2000). The emergent narrative for how young people understood their knowledge of peace as praxis, and how they acted in their knowledge of peace, will be examined later in this chapter; with reference to how young people’s spoke about their tactics for peace as public engagement.
In conclusion, the overarching framework for SoPiEL has offered a useful lens for the lived knowledge of peace to explore and interpret some of the commonalities presented by how young people have understood peace and disrupted their knowledge of peace. Crucially, SoPiEL also deepens what we know about how young people’s experience of peace in everyday life is dynamic and continuously shifting (Berents & ten Have, 2017). This has been developed further in the findings with reference to two emergent themes in the data i.e. PATs and SRATs.

7.3.2 Peace affirming tactics (PATs)

How young people understood peace as PATs was evidenced as being both opportunistic and cyclical, characterised as learning, attitudes, and deep-rooted practical know-how and know-when for certain habits and behaviour. Three clear and well-developed PATS emerged in the data (chapter 5). The first was situated learning comprising of how participants spoke about their attachment and relationships to people around them, and how they were socialised into peace skills. Social coherence was the second PAT, which consisted of deliberate and random tactics for a broader social peace as practices for equality, respect, and social justice. And lastly, self-initiated peace was evidenced as self-regulatory and transformative tactics for natural self-care, wellness and coping. Generally, these PATs focused on individual action.

**Situated Learning:** As with prior studies, the data has shown the significance given by young people to school, social media, religion, political environment and culture as part of their situated learning about/for peace (Baser & Celik, 2014; Berents, 2014; McEvoy, 2000; Pruitt, 2008, 2013). The findings also demonstrated that young people understood being socialised into peace skills, with family support often cited as being essential; mainly in terms of how they viewed their parents (especially mothers) as role models for peace; and the nature of communication and interaction that existed between young people and their parents. The importance of these experiences was interpreted as learning that was both intentional and by proxy, often framed as a response to conflict (Ålvik, 1968). Specific qualities of this learning had relevance for the young people’s PATs and SRATS. Examples included ‘eye contact’, ‘active listening’, dealing with anger healthily, being introduced to habitual routines and practices, to ‘speak up for yourself” and others, how to be ‘patience’, ‘growing tolerance’, being ‘understanding’, how to form and maintain ‘bonds’, keeping people ‘close’, and ‘standing together’ during adversity, not to get ‘wound up by small things’, and non-violent responses to conflict.

As part of this situated learning, a singular and consistent concept of ‘stable families’ was evidenced in the findings, understood by young people as having immediate and emergent properties for peace. For example, responding to two photographs she had taken of family members, Mary (17, YC1/INT) identified that ‘peace
can come from strong close-knit families, that’s an integral part of peace.’ Such ideas were presented across the data and reiterated relationship and connectedness as integral to young people’s knowledge of peace.

Factors that enabled families to bond and become stable together (e.g. ‘loyalty’, ‘respect’, ‘compassion’, ‘tolerance’) were also understood by young people to contribute to peace in the local community. See Appendix 13: Mary Close-Knit Families (Memo). Importantly, these actions and processes were reimagined by young people as public operations (De Certeau, 1984) for how elements of private family relationships can translate into public action for peace to challenge and disturb power. So, for example, continuing with Mary, a comparison was made between togetherness and standing together in private and public spaces:

    Researcher: How do you think the photograph relates to your life or your community, however you perceive your community?
    Morgan: I feel like I am repeating myself because a lot of this is the same as the first photo. But you know it relates in that having a family, being together as a family is a very important thing. And if not as a family, as a group, as a close-knit group of people that you can trust. (…) So, I think this and the united front thing as well because I think it’s about standing together sometimes in solidarity and actually saying “you know we are all in this together”. Which I think if you relate that back to the Paris attacks which were obviously horrendous but the way that everyone came together to condemn what had happened that’s the sort of thing we can transfer. So, it’s standing in solidarity with people especially at this time, Muslims who are being discriminated against for absolutely no reason just for walking down the street with a head covering. And it’s about standing back and saying, “actually no that’s not alright”, and being prepared to stand in solidarity with that person against narrow mindedness, against racism and just idiocy, bigotry. (Mary, 17, YC1/INT)

Taken from my notes, fig. 12 below offers a diagrammatic view of the movement, interrelatedness, and transferability of young people’s peace thinking and behaviour. It illustrates the social capital of peace as bonds and interactions between individuals, families and communities, with implications for the relationship between private grouped family relationships and collective public action. This included the distinct and overlapping concepts of private space (e.g. ‘family’ and ‘outlook’) and public space (e.g. ‘togetherness’ and ‘difference’). The language used in the diagram below is consistent with (coded) key words in the data and examples for the cases in bold have been explored in chapters 4 to 6.
Away from family, the findings have shown a distinct lack of identified role models for peace in the lives of the young people. Friends were identified as having importance with limited detail. Specific teachers were also mentioned, however, the difficulties of the participant’s student-teacher relations and schooling all held to contradictory implications for peace (chapter 5).

Conversely, the role of youth workers and youth clubs were mentioned across all groups as contributors towards promoting peace and lessening conflict. It has been shown that youth workers were described as positive people who encouraged learning, friendship, and non-violence between young people; and youth clubs were described as safe spaces in which young people could get respite, be themselves, socialise, and make choices to get involved in activities. Young people also referred to the value of their relationships in youth clubs and having good relationships with other young people they have something ‘in common’ with (chapter 5). This has supported literature on youth work that values peace, such as Harland (2009) and McEvoy-Levy (2007) (chapters 1 and 2). Such ideas are also consistent with the theory and practice of youth
work (NYA, 2020), which has an ethical and moral duty to respond to the everyday life of young people, in non-violent ways, and promote the emotional wellbeing of young people (Ogunnusi, 2006, Wright & Ord, 2015). Given the scarcity of literature about youth work and peace in England, this is something that needs to be prioritised.

Alternatively, the findings have also highlighted young people’s concerns in one area (YC2) that street-based issues of drugs and gangs (chapter 6) were not being dealt with effectively or urgently enough; and that those young people at risk were not influenced by their interactions with youth work staff. The group also questioned how local youth provision had not been accessible enough to meet the needs of those most vulnerable to gangs and gang-risk. It was clearly stated that there should be more ‘permanent’ provision, which offered a more ‘urgent’ response, by being ‘open’ more frequently during the week and the night, as well as during school breaks and holidays. Participants were aware that some of their concerns were explained in part by the lack of resources made available to youth services (Coburn, 2012; Davies, 2013, 2015). This has significance for the importance of increased investment, mentorship and leadership in youth programmes (McEvoy-Levy, 2007; Pruitt, 2013).

Social coherence: The second PAT evidenced in the findings was concerned with how young people discussed and distinguished peace as a shared ontological concern and hope in their everyday life. This narrative for social coherence shifted away from what young people identified as their learning for peace; and moved towards their hopes and concerns for a consequential social peace with a heavy emphasis on individual agency. This was shown primarily as tactics for sustaining togetherness, the perceived consequences of how we respond to difference, and unity as a commitment to social justice (chapter 5).

The narrative for peace as social coherence was evidently rooted in young people’s shared ideas and tactics for respect and equality, aimed at being ‘in coherence with each other’ (Maya, 17, YC1/INT). This was replicated across the data, and articulated as a hierarchy of references to ‘fairness’, ‘tolerance’, ‘acceptance of others’, ‘understanding’, ‘trust’, ‘cooperation’, ‘human rights’, ‘equality’, ‘equity’, ‘freedom’, ‘social justice’. Such ideas are comparable and compatible with what is generally understood as conditions of positive peace (Galtung, 1969, 1990), and the type of knowledge, skills and attitudes that are valued by peace education (Navarro-Castro & Nario-Galace, 2010). As such, these results do not differ from those found in qualitative and quantitative research as a normative positionality for peace (e.g. Dutta et al., 2016; Hakvoort & Oppenheimer, 1993).

The findings for peace as social coherence were keenly aware of socio-cultural and physical difference in individuals and groups, including stated factors such as ethnicity, race, gender, age, sexuality, occupation,
As a tactic in everyday life, the evidence has shown how young people stressed the need to ‘be okay with difference’. This was communicated as individual choice and attitudes e.g. ‘they are what we are, but they don't define us as people’ (Maya, 17, YC1). For two groups (YC1, YC2) this dialogue included the relativity and alterity of difference within their changing experience and intersectionality, and so offered another important indication for how participants reflected on how their own (re)wording their world, moving beyond ‘stereotypy’ responses (Sarrica & Wachelke, 2010).

As part of this dialogue, young people identified actor-based and structure-based practices, rooted in age, culture, religion, and tradition, which they understood as ‘closed-mindedness’, ‘lack of willingness to change’, and being ‘afraid of change’. The social reproduction of these self-concepts and ‘outlooks’ was understood by young people to reduce the likelihood of ‘being okay with difference’. For instance:

They [closed minded people] are stuck in these old ideals. For example, women belong in the kitchen. If we still had that mentality today, we wouldn't have half the things we have now. (…) You have got to change your outlook on things if you want to survive you know.

(Mary, 17, YC1/INT)

This was further stated as forming part of broader attitudes that hindered change:

I think people are afraid of change. There are afraid of change, they just want to go back to the practices and traditions that they’ve always been following. (Amreena, 17, YIT/FG1)

Structure-based messages were also seen to reinforce the problem of difference and otherness as social injustice (chapter 5). For instance, when sharing a photograph of a family member who is disabled in a dialogue group, Zainab (17, YC2/FG3) stated that:

There is diversity, that’s the word. Actually what I wanted to get through on that picture is that there is a stigma with physical disabilities, and I feel like it’s such a taboo thing that whenever someone brings it up its like shut up, that's like the thing you get. Because my teacher in college, she goes on there is this thing now that because of the liberal Western values there is a lot more acceptance for people who look different. But if you actually talk and if you are involved with people with physical disabilities its actually not true at all.

In contrast, actor-based situated learning and self-initiated peace (e.g. ‘being calm’, ‘not angry’, and being ‘honest’ about how ‘happy’ and ‘fulfilled’ we are in life) were considered important factors that could strengthen and enhance the ability of individuals to encounter difference with ‘respect’ and ‘equality’.

Such examples have highlighted how young people in the study have contested structural and situated tensions of peace as something that exists simultaneously across the micro and macro dimensions of everyday life. These sentiments are consistent with the assertion of SoPiEL that the knowledge and power of
peace should start from people’s lived realities i.e. rather than the Liberal language and instruments of institutionalised agencies and structures (Bajaj, 2018). Furthermore, Zainab’s decision to break the taboo, and resist dominant normalising narratives of her teacher, is just one example of how young people evidenced their PATs as opportunities to challenge the hegemony of ‘operational spaces’ in everyday life (De Certeau, 1984). It was also evidenced that young people recognised that such resistance for social coherence was achievable ‘up to a point’, and required a lot of ‘effort’ that was ‘not going to be easy’.

The findings for social coherence have also shown that young people spoke about being ‘in coherence’ as ‘togetherness’ and ‘coming together’. There was a shared consensus by which participants valued peace in the actions and possible outcomes of unity and solidarity (chapter 5). This was premised by the idea that ‘Being together with people makes you that little bit stronger’ (Laura, 17, C/INT); and all groups highlighted potential actions that can emerge from coming together. For example, brief mention was given to ideas such as charity, ‘pacifism’, ‘communism’ and ‘feminism’. Yet, in the absence of peace knowledge as historical protest (Ziemann, 2008) the participants spoke about collective public acts that were known to them as potential catalysts for peace derived from social change for issues of social justice e.g. ‘carnivals and celebrations’, ‘fundraisers’ and ‘protest’.

In summary, the findings for social coherence have importance for what young people understood as a normative ontological potential for/of peace that was located and enacted in everyday life. As a salient narrative for peace, it is less flimsy (Richmond, 2006) than the assertion of ideas without action, and fits well with SoPiEL. The findings have shown how young people questioned the importance of how we respond to difference as learnt attitudes and choices that occur in how we relate to ourselves, as well as during our interactions with others. They emphasised individual awareness and responsibility for respect and equality, and the capacity of day-to-day activities to generate a sense of unity, to routinely disrupt and purposefully protest constructs of discrimination, inequality and injustice. The implications of such tactics move past ‘merely accepting difference and plurality’ (Souza & Andreotti, 2009, p.75), or the forging/forcing colour blind interactions that ignore or look past difference. Possibly, when situated within the critical localism and hybridity of SoPiEL, as ways of being and becoming in everyday life; the idea of countering and deconstructing the impact of social difference and othering might appear less paralyzing, and so ‘less impossible to achieve’ (Stallworth-Clark, 2006, p.5). Especially when compared to imposed and decontextualised external peace narratives (Firchow, 2018).

**Self-initiated peace:** The third PAT was shown to emerge as a shared understanding of peace as ‘peace within yourself’ (chapter 5). This provided an important explanation for how participants have learnt to understand and respond to the interdependency of regulating stress and building calm and resilience. It
resonates with Galtung’s (1985) theorisation of individual peace as a psychological state of equilibrium that is easily disturbed by conflict and inherent (direct/indirect) violence in the environment. Yet, rather than being dependent on, or determined by, the environment, self-initiated peace was emphasised as self-determined and self-regulatory practices with or without other people e.g. ‘peace relates to everything and everyone, but it doesn’t mean our peace has to rely on other people or other things’ (Adela, 19, C/INT).

The findings have demonstrated a range of activities and routines dialogue by young people as representing transformative tactics for their own peace. These PATs included being in nature, taking walks, exercise, sport, running, art, meditation, being alone, practicing their faith, sleeping and preparing for sleep, and the therapeutic nature of spending time with pets (chapter 5). Some of these have already been discussed as part of the framework for SoPiEL earlier in this chapter. As another example, when reflecting on her photograph (in chapter 5, fig. 6) Sumaira (17, C/INT) offered an earnest account of how she actively understood peace by deliberately enjoying ‘little things’ in her everyday life. This involved having breakfast with her mum or sister, walking back from college whilst listening to music, and the sunshine on her face before she started studying at home. To discuss each of these routines, activities, and practices is beyond the scope of this thesis, but what has been successfully demonstrated is how young people continually manipulate and negotiate events as tactical opportunities (De Certeau, 1984) for peace.

It should be mentioned that the significance given to pets as self-initiated peace was unexpected and indicates possible future research. Evidence for why pets were photographed as representations of peace in young people’s everyday life has been examined in chapter 5, and can be summarised as the safe and secure nature of attachment which was reported by participants as being unconditional and uncomplicated. This was shown to be contextualised and complicated by how young people understood their marginalisation, vulnerability, and risk.

Findings for self-initiated peace was also shown to illustrate a spatialised understanding of micro peace concerned with where the specified activities are located and who with. This was characterised by how young people encountered and held space in the home, in nature, in the sanctuary of the library, with water, etc. (chapter 5). Taken collectively, these practices of self-initiated peace articulated an important binary between what was described as the positive presence of calm and the participant’s practical means to deescalate and ‘get through stress’. The extracts below have been included to highlight the complexity given to such routines by young people, and such events can really illustrate the characteristics of SoPiEL:

Researcher: So why have you selected this picture?
Sumaira: I selected this picture because some people, me mostly, I connect peace to sense of smells, like for example when you go to sleep if you are surrounded by chaos, if your room is in
a mess, or if you have dark wallpaper or a dark wardrobe, then in your mind when you go to sleep you are going to feel more corrupt because your body responds to the surroundings. Therefore, if your surroundings are corrupt then your body is corrupt and not at peace. So, I took this picture of a candle because it releases a vanilla smell which can be calming and then put you at peace. (Sumaira, 17, C/INT).

In response to being asked what she meant by ‘corrupt’ Sumaira responded that:

Sumaira: For example, corrupt can be an environment or people. Like if you had an argument with someone in the evening time, when you are about to go to sleep then your mind is going to be occupied with that. And not with, “Okay, I am tired, I need to go to sleep. I need to get some rest. I have got a busy day tomorrow”. You are going to be thinking about what this person has done to you, and how it’s made you feel, which kind of leads to arguments with yourself maybe. So that's corrupt and that's not at peace. (Sumaira, 17, C/INT).

An explicit and implied sub-narrative was evidenced as having emerged in the data for self-initiated peace, which suggested a fundamental need expressed by young people to ‘get away’, ‘disassociate’ and ‘get into another world’. For instance:

Researcher: And what is important about that in terms of peace?
Emma: Just so you can have like a time out from everything that is happening and just be there by yourself. (Emma, 17, C/INT)

This need to claim space for self-initiated peace was not explored further by young people, other than the idea that peace can exist away from the normality, or busyness, and pressures of everyday life, including their thoughts (chapter 5). To continue with this idea, music was spoken about by young people as a representation of peace as offering a potentially peaceful (and enjoyable) experience that could be had alone or with others. It was also associated with peace due to its content and power to disseminate certain messages of peace. However, music was given a particular value as an opportunity to be somewhere else. Furthermore, like many of the peace routines, young people talked about listening to music as a tactic that not only enabled them to occupy a different space; but it also meant they could actively ‘block people out’ from the space that they were occupying. Such findings have continued to evidence and reaffirm the importance of music for young people as ‘alternative modes of engaging in dialogue’ (Pruitt, 2008, p.17), particularly as a form of claiming and disrupting space in everyday life (De Certeau, 1984; Pruitt, 2013).

Rather than being theorised as passive, or reduced to the polemology of the ‘weak’ (De Certeau, 1984), such findings have added to prior research, by identifying something intrinsically persistent and meaningful about young people’s descriptions of peace as getting away and being alone (Hall, 1993; McEvoy, 2000). It reminds me of Boulding’s assertion that the immediacy of the present, including peace-limiting situations, can result in a ‘temporal exhaustion’ i.e. everyday life can leave young people ‘mentally out of breath all the time from dealing with the present’ (1978, p.7).
Statistics produced by the National Health Service (2018) in Britain have suggested that one in eight children and young people in the UK are affected by mental health problems which include stress-related problems. More recently, in August 2019, *The Good Childhood Report*, produced in collaboration with the University of York, stated that nearly a quarter of a million 10 to 15-year olds are unhappy with their lives. Specific literature about mental health and peace and conflict is outside of the scope of this research. However, the fundamental need for self-initiated peace is significant for young people as part of their social existence in everyday life.

As stated in chapter 5, a deeper reading might question the shared trend by which most young people offered overwhelmingly non-critical and unreflective accounts of self-initiated peace. Except for the college group, who spoke about their mental health, and the psychological impact of formal examinations, participants rarely examined their various routines, activities, and ardent need for respite, as part of their self-initiated peace. Or indeed why the need existed for them to regularly detach and numb themselves from their daily social existence. Developed from the stages of consciousness outlined in chapter 1, such findings were interpreted as being representative of naïve consciousness (Freire, 1974).

When each of the three PATs is considered together within the framework of SoPiEL, they provide a tableau of young people’s expertise to purposefully and randomly traverse present and potential issues of peace. As evidence for SoPiEL, the PATs are experientially placed, opportunist, routine, and contextually significant. And each one has demonstrated young people’s vocation as beings of praxis and creativity in their everyday life. This data has added to what is known about how young people understand peace; including their learning, vision, and tactics to negotiate, occupy, and re-appropriate spaces of everyday peace (Berents, 2014; Pruitt, 2013). The data has also provided new insights for how young people regulate and build peace for, and within, themselves; and how they understand their learning, attitudes, and aspirations for peace as holding emergent properties for a broader social ontological peace.

It is incredibly significant that PATs have offered an analysis of the inter/relationships between subjective and structural environments; and yet young people look to themselves for answers as individual action orientated towards self and social peace. This notion of self-dependence for peace was evidenced in the study for my MA, and as a young person’s quote presented in the work of Juhasz & Palmer (1991); and so, might indicate a significant cultural trend. Further still, this might have significance for the possible implications for young people’s experiences of an ahistorical culture of peace. Or correspond with what young people have identified as the lack of role models for peace in their lives.
7.3.3  Self-representation and advocacy tactics (SRATs)

The move from individual to collective problem-posing as knowledge in action (Freire, 1974) has been presented thematically in the findings for young people’s SRATs, including ripple acts, voicing, and seeking a community response. These SRATs have been evidenced as influenced by how three groups of young people (YC1, YC2, C) made sense of peace through their participatory photography, dialogue, and varying levels of public engagement (chapter 6). In comparison to PATs, the formation of SRATs has been shown as emerging from how young people have understood their knowledge of peace as praxis and critical transformative agency. Taken collectively these findings have represented a transition that spans chapters 4 to 6.

It is important to note that at the start of the study, and throughout, participants were actively encouraged to self-represent in their generative (re)readering and (re)wording of peace. In their first impressions of peace this exposed young people’s understanding of peace as part of their relational sense of ‘self’ and ‘people around us’; and helped them to complicate their procedural knowledge (or incognisance) of peace. Subsequently, they spoke about change and ‘thinking deeper’ and moving beyond ‘surface peace’ (chapter 4). Participatory photography then enabled individuals to (re)operationalise peace, after which interviews, and group dialogue, required them to (re)examine and further complicate their visualisations and readings of peace with others. Due to the nature of the study (and the purpose of dialogue), this was orientated towards developing tactics for public engagement.

**Ripple acts:** Built from opportunistic and deliberate small acts, such as ‘random acts of kindness’ (Maya, 17, YC1/INT); and ‘smiling’ in public, ‘sharing food’, and ‘opening a door for someone that shows peace’ (Chad, 17, YOT/FG1); ripple acts have evidenced how young people initially engaged with self-representation as part of their ideas of change and peace (chapter 6). These ideas were close to and intersected with evidence for PATs i.e. young people’s vision, values, and suggested tactics for individual awareness and responsibility for respect and equality. However, ripple acts have been thematically distinguished by their stated purpose to generate self and social awareness as a direct action for peace, and as having the potential to emanate outwards for wider tangible influence. As an example, the significance of ripple acts was prioritised by Zainab (17, YC2/INT) in chapter 6, who said that when she said that ‘you should start with yourself, you should make little changes to what you do before you look at the big things. Because them small things will lead to the big things.’

More specifically, ripple acts were shown across the data to be understood as the value given to critical curiosity in the day-to-day life of young people i.e. by ‘thinking’ outside of their ‘little bubble’; ‘not taking things for granted’, stopping ‘to take in what’s around you’; and looking past ‘face value’ to ‘investigate
what is going on’. Such ideas were presented by young people as a tactical response to their knowledge of peace i.e. as ways of being closer to peace; and ‘to take a step back and think about actually what are the positive things and what sort of things do promote peace’ (Maya, 17, YC1/FG3).

While seemingly quite basic, ripple acts have successfully evidenced young people’s engagement and commitment to peace, built from their operationalisation and dialogue of peace, as a way of deepening their understanding of themselves and their experiences. Such practices were aimed at a more ‘liberated state of consciousness’ (Shudak & Avoseh, 2015, p.467) and represented an important foundation for the type of critical literacy needed for their SRATs. These ideas are encapsulated in Mary’s (17, YC1) reflection on the project:

I was really interested to explore what peace means for myself because I started thinking about it and thinking I don’t actually know what peace is. I’ve grown up with all these wars around me and all this conflict in my life and I’d like to know what does peace mean to me. I think it was about exploring more about myself as well, and it’s helped me to be really open and honest about stuff that has been going on in my life, and I think that was really useful as well.

Voicing: Participants emphasised that people should ‘speak up and have a voice’ (Maya, 17, YC1/INT), and ‘you have a voice so be heard’ (Minah, 17, YC2/INT). This was influenced by their shared belief, particularly in YC1 and YC2, that the act of voicing was key to cultivating peace in themselves and for others (chapter 6).

As evidence for critical transitivity, participants recognised the power of using their voice as an enactment of peace, and as a specific instrument for peace as change, that moved from individual to collective positionality and structural thinking (Chonody, 2013). As such, voicing was critically positioned as an important political act with a small ‘p’ (Fish, et al., 2018) regarding peace, as ‘action’, ‘education’, ‘protest’, and ‘solidarity’ to counter structural arrangements and power relations inherent in the young people’s everyday life. For instance, in response to the peace-limit situation presented by local gangs, it was shown that young people in YC2 wanted to use their voice to influence and deter other young people:

Researcher: And how do you think we can use this to send a message?
Aamena: I think we can use this to send a message, because you can stop the younger generation who are influenced by the older generation, to say like this is not the route that you should be taking. And that you shouldn't get involved in such things because it just ruins your life and there is no positive outcome from it. (Amita, 18, YC2/FG2)

In addition, they spoke about ‘getting people who are part of a gang and speaking up’ (Afifa, 16, YC2/FG2), going to speak in schools, and that:
We should educate parents as well, because like you were saying they will talk to that guy's parents and he has done nothing. And I feel like there is that sexist view that you would let your sons go out because they are guys and what is going to happen to them. But you wouldn't let your daughters.’ (Zainab, 17, YC2/FG2)

Furthermore, the YC2 group wanted to use their collective voice by sharing their photography and music to communicate their hopes and concerns, which they hoped would galvanise their audiences into action (Pruitt, 2008).

The tactic of voicing has demonstrated a counter-narrative to the adult/ist under-representation and misrepresentation of young people (chapter 1). The findings have illustrated how young people looked through the revelation of an adult gaze that judged and labelled the social reality of their co-habited peace, them as young people, and their communities (chapter 4). This gaze was quickly understood as hegemonic and reframed in the consensus that ‘who understands us best than us’ (Afifa, 16, YC2/FG 4).

The significance of youth voice was overtly evidenced as the enactment of peace as knowledge, power, and resistance (Yilmaz, 2018). As an example, in the extract below young people in YC1 spoke about the significance of their voice using photography; whilst also articulating how they understood their knowledge of peace in relation to aged based ideologies:

Researcher: What do you think the photographs tell us about your shared experiences of peace in your lives and community?
Maya: Well it gives a window into our past lives as well as our minds and what we think.
Mary: I think it shows from the pictures taken we are quite capable of understanding and recognising peace.
Maya: Everyone thinks that millennials have materialistic needs like, “oh they all live to be on their phone or their laptop”, or it has to be “designer”. But you don't have to just keep in a box. It’s like we are not all like that (…) not glued to the screen.
Olly: Some of us.
Mary: These photos aren’t about materialistic things that bring us peace, they are about shared experiences and moments in time. And I think they are all deeply personal. They all say something different, but they all mean exactly the same thing.
(Maya, Mary, & Olly, 17, YC1/FG3)

Such findings are important as they have offered an insight into how young people see themselves as protagonists for peace (Del Felice & Wisler, 2007) by reflecting on their knowledge of peace as praxis. This has supported and adds to what is known about how young people (re)read and (re)word peace in ways that seek to actively disrupt existing narratives and structures (Berents & McEvoy-Levy, 2015; Pruitt, 2018).

**Seeking a community response:** The last thematic tactic for young people’s SRATs has captured their motivation for speaking out and speaking back with the research as deliberate tactics for small-scale activism (Fish et al., 2018). Shaped by their knowledge, aspirations, and concerns for peace in their everyday lives;
the findings have shown why, and how, three of the five groups (YC1, YC2, C) planned, influenced, and/or led public engagement events (chapter 6). In PV, this is commonly expressed as a transition from explaining and exploring their social world to self-representation by which participants use their photography to take ownership of participant-led exhibitions (Delago, 2015; Wang & Burris 1997).

The findings in chapter 6 have offered detailed accounts for each of the aims, plans, and activities for the public engagement events. However, it is worth reiterating that each of the groups actively shared and demonstrated a collective critical interest in seeking a community response i.e. they wanted audiences to do more than just turn up - which in itself could be understood as an expression of power. Instead, it has been evidenced that young people wanted to raise awareness and influence audiences; and they were concerned that their encounters with audiences should be interactive and impactful with a focus on peace. This included using the public engagements to disrupt how the positive things associated with peace were rarely acknowledged and to actively promote the ‘need to make sure that those things are spoken about’ (Maya, 17, YC1/FG2).

The young people’s keen interest in the nature of encountering audiences outside of the research has provided an important insight into how their understanding of their peace knowledge entailed a particular consciousness. Critical transitivity was evidenced as how young people wanted to extend the dialogue to spark awareness and challenge potential audiences, using their words, ideas, and images of peace. For instance:

Researcher: What messages do the photographs send out to other people in the community?
Olly: They can be peaceful too.
Mary: Yes it’s not just us that wants peace its other people, even though they may not consciously know it, like they might not know the word and know that peace is the right word, but they know what they want.
(Olly & Mary, 17, YC1/FG2)

The findings have also shown consistency across each of the three groups for how young people understood their self-representation as a form of advocacy. Again, this has been detailed in chapter 6. As a further example, these ideas are presented in the photograph below. It depicts comments collected from YC2 during their planning for their public engagement events. These comments were written as a response to being asked why they wanted to be part of the project.
Alternatively, the young people’s situatedness, as well as their different levels of collective critical literacy, have offered useful insights that complicate potentially totalising narratives (Giroux, 1992; Schugurensky, 1998; Zembylas, 2018). For instance, in chapter 6, young people in group C have been shown to problem pose peace in their everyday life, but this did not reveal a shared narrative for critical reflection or action that addressed their concerns structurally. Yet, the same group enacted their peace knowledge in the hopes of generating dialogue by touring their work across three college campuses and making themselves available to answer questions and explain their ideas and photographs to teaching staff, senior management, and passing students who showed an interest. These events carried additional significance for young people who were described by gatekeepers (and themselves) as being marginalised, vulnerable and at-risk; and who can be
theorised as having lived in cultures of silence (Freire, 1970); who actively moved from the margins to evidence their SRATs as ripple acts, voicing, and seeking a community response.

The findings for SRATs have offered an important account for how ‘young people’, ‘peace’, and ‘young people’s narratives of peace’, can be understood as part of a framework for SoPiEL. This has both reiterated and enriched what is known about young people’s tactical agency for peace i.e. to live in ways that are peaceful or contribute to peace (Berents & McEvoy-Levy, 2015; Pruitt, 2018). Furthermore, sited in the continuum of structure and agency in everyday life, the findings for SRATs have detailed how ordinary people undertake tactical responses to social structures that seek to control our actions (Certeau, 1984) by their choice to adopt ‘a stance of intervention’ (Freire, 1974a, p.141). Such findings enhance what is known about how young people see themselves as protagonists for peace when they reflect and act on their knowledge of peace (Carlson, et al., 2006; Dutta et al., 2016). This also supports and adds to extant literature on how young people (re)read and (re)word and (re)enact peace in ways that actively disrupt existing narratives and structures (Berents & McEvoy-Levy, 2015, Berents, 2014, 2018).

Importantly, the evidence for young people’s SRATs corresponds with the ‘action’ dimension of PAR by illustrating how young people have encountered peace as more than just passive engagement (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005). Coordinated as an adaptation of PV, influenced by the principles of PAR, the study has demonstrated how 14 young people in three groups critically participated in their knowledge of peace as praxis. And consequently, how their knowledge was expressed outside of the research through public engagement events in which they used their ideas, knowledge, photography, and words, to self-represent and act for peace. One group influenced a local public engagement, and two other groups exhibited and shared their concerns and aspirations for peace in five different settings. Furthermore, it has been shown that as part of my role I have actively showcased the viewpoint of those being researched (chapter 6). Taken collectively, such findings have provided important evidence for meaningful impact and engagement with young people that can offer new possibilities for practice i.e. as further research, and the type of youth work that is interested in peace. These ideas will be discussed further as part of the original theory-driven approach to PV that was used in this study, with a particular focus on dialogue and the concept of peace-limit situations.

7.4 An original approach to Photovoice

In terms of engagement and impact, PV asserts a direct interest in the concept of SRATs (Wang et al., 2008). By actively eliciting the viewpoint of those being researched, in addition to giving control/ownership to young people, the principles of PV were used successfully in this study to respond to the research questions through the eyes and words of young people. This has been evidenced across the key areas of findings.
(chapters 4 to 6). The process was strengthened by a participatory mixed methodology, implemented within a PAR framework, that actively encouraged young people to express their experiences and effectively “speak” through a range of methodologies (Liebenberg, 2018; Oggunusi, 2019). This comprised an original approach to PV with its roots in Freire, differentiated from other PhDs. that have only minimally used participatory approaches, or lack evidence for their theoretical framework for PV as PAR.

I assert that, in its purest form, PV is theoretically rooted in dialogue as the co-production of the type of consciousness that problematises and acts in the world (Wang et al., 2008). This necessitates an approach to PV in which dialogue is understood as an explicit process, rather than being assumed; and requires reflexivity and deliberate clarity about the value of dialogue, and the knowledge created through dialogue in PV (Cahill, et al., 2008; Carlson et al., 2017; Farley et al., 2017). Furthermore, it suggests quite unequivocally that dialogue will characterise the ‘depth in the interpretation of problems’ (Freire, 1974a, p.14) that can be reached in PV. During the study, there was a close fit between dialogue and PV to open safe and power-sensitive spaces for young people to talk, deepen and problem pose their knowledge for peace. Evidence for this will be discussed next with a focus on the emergent significance of dialogue and peace-limit situations

**Dialogue:** Particular significance was given to dialogue groups within PV (chapter 3); and PV proved to be a useful container for dialogue (Senge 1994). I have written about these ideas as part of my contribution to *The Journal of Dialogue Society* (2019). The findings have shown how participants worded their social reality and critically confronted issues of peace in their everyday life as a consequence of their critical literacy. As examples, young people were shown to question the ordinary, take positions about their common knowledge and experiences; and reach their own conclusions about peace, in their agency and collective action for social change at a local level (chapter 6). Furthermore, the findings have clearly illustrated a fluidity and shift between knowledge for action (e.g. wording peace with images), and knowledge in action (e.g. peace praxis and self-representations).

Dialogue brings a particular significance to the research space that is grown and cannot be imposed or contrived (chapter 3). Therefore, the depth of dialogue remained unpredictable and required a continuous reflexive commitment by me (and young people) to horizontalise and balance power dynamics in the groups. Emphasis was successfully given to young people as valid producers of knowledge, and as ‘experts’ of their social worlds (Young, 1999). And I self-regulated a position of humility, whilst at the same being constantly vigilant regarding opportunities ‘to deepen the analysis’ (Freire, 1971, p.62) i.e. by asking questions, rather than providing, or shaping answers. The process was bolstered by trust and respect, which in turn was strengthened by the longitudinal nature of my engagement and contact. As part of this process, it was
necessary to check in with the groups and manage strong and challenging personalities (Shaw et al., 2011); including gatekeepers who became too enthused and verbally filled the research space. Such instances were important as they stressed the importance of ownership and control of the co-habited space(s) in PV (Wang et al., 1998); and they also indicated how such spaces can become uneasy when ideas, identities, and power, alter and shift.

During the dialogue, young people occupied space and time together and socially interacted. The adapted SHOWeD schedule enabled them to complicate, discard, ignore, and challenge their knowledge about peace in the taken-for-grantedness of everyday language and understanding of everyday life (Glass, 2001). The repetition and replication of questions in and across meetings deepened and saturated responses; providing opportunities for participants to share individual and collective meaning as they explained, told stories, and listened. Their confidence and critical engagement increased and there were instances in which young people ‘broke the frame’ of their assumptions and expectations (Harper, 2002).

Both in and outside the research, group dialogue was described by participants as bringing them closer to the experience of peace (chapter 6); often in ways that were not evident elsewhere in their lives. For example, Hannah (24, C), stated that she had shared more in the research groups than anywhere else in her life, except with her mother. In addition, Hannah said that the peace dialogue had provided a language for her to express her emotions, and that this was usually ‘hard’ and ‘tricky’ for her to do as part of her difficulty in social relationships, and in communicating, which she attributed to her Asperger’s.

In addition to how young people were offered genuine opportunities to take part and share their knowledge and actions for peace, the study has shown how dialogue exposed a language of power and praxis that moved from engagement to the intention to act (Carlson, et al., 2006). Formulating prescriptive patterns for such events is problematic, however, it has been done (Dutta et al., 2016; Rogers & Ramsbotham, 1999; Snauwaert, 2011). The following table has been taken from my notes and illustrates a basic attempt to understand some distinctions for how young people spoke about peace during their dialogue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-Of-For Peace</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In peace</td>
<td>Making space for peace</td>
<td>Intra/inter/relations and immediate and remote boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of peace</td>
<td>Co-production of knowledge of peace</td>
<td>Increased breadth and depth of knowing and reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For peace</td>
<td>Individual and collaborative action for peace</td>
<td>Messages and action for the actualisation ‘of’ peace and ‘in’ peace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next section will examine the importance of peace-limit situations in SoPiEL as being instrumental for critical transitivity.

**Peace-limit situations:** Findings for peace-limit situations have been introduced in chapter 6 and form part of the praxis of SoPiEL, synergising limit situations (Freire, 1970) and peace consciousness (Galtung, 1986) (chapter 1). It has been shown that young people identified deep-rooted tensions ‘in’, ‘of’, and ‘for’ peace. This has included an implicit narrative of conflict as part of everyday life that both fits and complicates how the word conflict is used by young people as more than a synonym for violence. As part of the findings for PATs and SRATs, peace-limit situations were understood by young people as being bi-directional and structured into their everyday life e.g. race, gender, sexuality, class, politics, militarism, economics, and culture (Galtung, 1990). In the findings, young people have responded critically, by collectively questioning established structure, ‘culture’, ‘traditions’, and ‘anything that’s like not normal’ (Amita, 18, YC2/FG1), in conjunction with varying levels of critical introspection about their shared self-concepts and beliefs. It was in this dialogue that peace-limit situations have been shown to form part of critical transitivity, informed by how young people have understood their ability for local small-scale activism (Fish, et al., 2018) in everyday structures and material forces (chapter 6). The following discussion will revisit ‘the politics of war’ (chapter 6) to consider one example of a peace-limit situation in more depth, as an examination of the duality of praxis and consciousness (chapter 1).

During the first group meeting, war was shown to be an emotionally generative word, linked to perceptions of injustice (Chatterton et al., 2007). This reflected a trend by which young people spoke about war as having local-global relevance in their everyday life. An initial narrative emerged for how the young people were critical of politicians and leaders in positions of power who were deemed to cause ‘warfare’ and ‘warmingongering’ (Baser & Celik, 2014; Berents, 2014; Juhasz & Palmer, 1991). This was expressed as being morally ‘wrong’ and ‘bad’, especially when framed as an expression of human rights. For example:

> So, okay what I am talking about is Donald Trump denying certain people of certain backgrounds not getting into that country. I am talking about how Syria got blown up. I am talking about how America and the British are aligning now and have already blown up Syria (Sumaria, 17, C/INT)

The findings have shown young people stated that politicians where ‘role models’ who ‘should know better’; and they expressed frustration and distrust for politicians as self-serving (Baser & Celik, 2014; Berents, 2014; Juhasz & Palmer, 1991). Such responses remained quite emotive and reductionist (Shudak & Avoseh, 2015), and without additional dialogue, this narrative represented semi-transitivity; a consciousness that reduces the accountability of war to the single issue of leadership. This has suggested that young people objectified war as a peace-limit problem that enabled some positionality. Yet, the social construct of war was
shown to be primarily reduced to being someone else’s responsibility (Freire, 1974). Such discourses can potentially ignore the structural roots and causes of violence and war (Cook, 2008), and by doing so fail to disrupt the status quo.

Using another example, having spoken about the morality of war, the YIT group reached a consensus about how the absence of war represented something ‘weird’ or unattainable in everyday life. They also questioned the ‘function’ of war, and spoke about war-thinking as being so normal that it was described as ‘mundane’. This represented evidence for a distinct non-reflexive narrative about the normalcy of warfare and war thinking. Such dialogue may be indicative of magical consciousness (Freire, 1974), as it positions war as being inevitable and essential in ways that are beyond our control. It can also be argued that such thinking perpetuates hegemonic codes and assumptions about how human beings are hardwired for violence and warfare (Dunn, 2005; UNESCO, 1986).

A third more critically emergent narrative was also illustrated in the findings for how young people articulated issues of the structural causes of war (Mercer, 1974) by clearly challenging the legitimation and purpose of war, and proceeding to (re)make sense of their own knowledge and agency. For example, young people critically questioned who controls the decisions regarding who gets involved in armed conflicts that occur elsewhere in the world; and a consensus emerged that such processes were inherently discriminatory, oppressive, hegemonic, and adultist. This included young people critically unpicking and exposing what was understood to be the duplicity involved in how certain prime ministers and senior politicians seemed to ‘like conflict’ (chapter 6) for their own purposes. Collective narratives were ‘voiced’ by young people about their experiences (and perceived threat) of ‘stereotyping’, ‘discrimination’, ‘Islamophobia’, and micro-aggressions, which were understood to have emerged in everyday life as a consequence of war. For instance, ‘Because of ISIS people are saying that the whole religion is bad, and you know you see that when people look at you in a weird sense. You see that it’s affecting you as well’ (Minah, 17, YC/FG 3).

Lastly, as critical introspection (‘ripple acts’) some young people (re)examined their experiences and assumptions, such as Mary (17, YC1/FG1) who commented that ‘I don’t know if I know peace because all I’ve ever known is war and conflict’. Such ideas were crucial to emerging critical transitivity in the YC1 group, which provided both consensus and impetus for action. It has been shown how YC1 understood and enacted their peace knowledge (chapter 6); and alongside their images and words relating to peace, they included two additional photographs described by Maya (17, YC1) as a possible deterrent for war sympathisers i.e. ‘What I wanted to convey with that is this is what can happen if we don’t accept peace in our lives, and we think it’s acceptable to cause unrest and disharmony in other countries.’
It has also been evidenced throughout the data that young people’s knowledge of war included current-historical and local-global warzones, terrorism, protracted conflicts, truces and treaties. This knowledge existed in sharp contrast to their ahistorical knowledge of peace culture (chapter 6). As such, these findings have supported some of the discrepancies identified in earlier research regarding young people’s relationship to the knowledge of peace discussed in chapter 2 (e.g. Myers-Bowman et al., 2005; Özer, et al, 2018; Walker et al., 2003). Young people’s familiarity with war and war thinking has been understood as a barrier to peace(building) (Baser & Celik, 2014).

The concept of peace-limit situations has helped to deconstruct and add specificity to the crucial process of ‘contextualizing’ in PV (Wang et al., 2008, p.80). These findings complicate assumptions about how critical literacy or critical transitivity is somehow inherent in PV when young people act collectively and share their photography with public adult audiences. By doing so, the study has offered clarity that is often missing in the literature, for how young people interrogate micro and macro social contradictions in the ontology of their everyday life.

To bring this section to a close I have included another diagram (fig. 18) from my notes. It assembles some of the ideas from across the findings, and more specifically the key theme of SRATs, to describe a cycle of praxis for SoPiEL. This model has developed and informed my engagement as a continuous process both inside and outside of the research that has included mentoring, consultancy, teaching, and youth and community development work (chapter 6).

Fig. 18: Key stages of praxis
Some of the additional complexities presented by the theory and practice of PV will be discussed in the next section as part of the limitations and strengths of the study.

7.5 Benefits and limitations of the study

The methodological novelty presented by this study has had both limitations and benefits.

There were practical issues presented by gaining access to young people, which proved to be difficult. This was unanticipated, and was caused primarily by a dependency on gatekeepers for access to young people. I was aware that building trust and respect with the groups might be a lengthy process (Shaw et al., 2011), but I had assumed that gatekeepers would find it easier to identify, recruit, and support, participants for the initial group. In the 14 months before, and during the research, I contacted over 26 gatekeepers and associated organisations, directly and via email, with an introductory message and publicity. Time was spent with 15 gatekeepers through initial preliminary meetings, presentations, attending a youth work residential, giving talks, and walking the “patch”. From this activity, eight projects were planned, of which five went ahead. Other projects did not materialise due to low levels of recruitment, gatekeeper illness, and difficulties presented by the restructuring of local statutory youth services and provision. Recruitment was further complicated by school exams, school holidays, and young people aged 16-18 who were described by gatekeepers as having “moved on”.

Once young people had been recruited, most of the participants were female. As expected, the research process was both lengthy and demanding, and it resulted in each project lasting between three to eight months. In total six young people, who made up the YOT and YIT groups, did not participate in all stages of the work, as they did not progress past the initial dialogue group. This issue of retention could be indicative of the research design (e.g. mixed-gender groups), or a lack of interest. It is widely acknowledged that retention in projects can be difficult, and some established researchers use financial incentives, but this can be problematic (Zutlevics, 2016). As expected, the lengthy contact with the groups, and variety of methodologies, generated a huge amount of rich qualitative data, that required organising, transcribing, and analysing. Transcribing and analysing this amount of rich qualitative data is notoriously time-consuming (Boyce & Neale, 2006; Flick, 2014).

It is also important to acknowledge some of the limits to PAR presented by the study. For instance, the research topic was given to participants, as was the use of photography, and dialogue, as methods for them to make sense of peace and to collect data. Alternatively, a great effort was taken to avoid existing hypotheses, and the imposition of adult-led concerns (and assumptions) during the time spent and collecting data with
young people. The use of participant-led participatory photography, and group dialogue, successfully opened spaces for young people to (re)conceptualise the research question; and provided flexibility for young people to actively develop the research problem, and their response to it.

Overall, the findings reflected how well PV, as a participatory methodology, fitted with the conduct of the study. Based on my observations, and young people’s feedback, who were asked to evaluate throughout the research, it is clear that collaboration genuinely occurred from start to end, with varying degrees of ownership and participation within major decisions of the research (Shaw et al., 2011). Young people collaborated in the collection of data through respondent-led photo-elicitation taking ownership i.e. providing data, and then controlling what data they generated, selected, interpreted, and analysed as part of the individual SHOWeD research schedule and their shared dialogue. Participants were also asked to comment on the analysis and findings of data, and they took a lead to disseminate, talkback, and voice/advocate their perspectives on their work, experience, and the visual data they collected.

The use of participant-led photography was spoken about positively by participants. Young people took and selected their photographs, from which they then made decisions about which ones to include in the research process and how. This intentionally allowed them to control the use of their images in the research (chapter 3) and provided something tangible for participants to take away from the research. Young people said photography was familiar to them as they regularly took pictures on their mobile phones and uploaded them to Snapchat and Instagram. Moreover, it was suggested that photographs had unique properties as visual data and as forms of communication. For example, it was said that ‘Fantastic photos can tell the story for themselves’ (Maya, 17, YC1), and that ‘Images can touch people’ (Emma, 17, C).

As the research progressed young people remained overtly attached to their photographs. This connection helped to generate interest and prompted dialogue, as well as encouraging a freeness about their experiences and ideas, which ranged from the intimate, and very personal, to photographs of their local environment, and public events. The young people’s responses tended to be explanatory and critical rather than just descriptive; and ‘When certain participants struggled to articulate the complexity of their experiences and ideas, their images helped them to structure, articulate, and often deepen their production of knowledge’ (Ogunnusi, 2019, p.33).

The participative nature of the research meant that young people were seen to value each other’s experiences. Participants reported how they ‘Enjoyed the group work and being able to speak to each other about all of our different views on young people and peace’ (Adela, 19, C). Furthermore, the photographs offered young people an authentic and exciting medium for how they wanted their data to be communicated publicly, and
to showcase themselves and their ideas. Young people were generally keen to use their photography to interact with audiences. Having attended each of the group’s public exhibitions, it was also evident that the properties of visual data helped to attract and engage wider audiences.

In addition to generating new knowledge, and a moral obligation to keep true to the needs and views of young people, it was important to me that the study enabled participants to (re)word and (re)know peace as part of their social existence - especially as they had recognised trends by which they were ignored or misrepresented as ‘youths’. It was encouraging then that, as the study progressed, the young people expressed themselves, their concerns, aspirations, and solutions for peace, in accordance with the aims of the research. This was evidenced during their dialogue, self-representation, and public engagement. Two groups of participants used their photography and words to engage, advocate, and make themselves available, to public audiences; and a third group influenced a public event. Such measures have been evidenced as being indicative of a critical literacy that motivated young people to act in their knowledge of peace ‘to help shape a better future’ (Maya, 17, YC1). For two groups this was explicitly expressed as a gesture towards social change in their immediate environment, and represented their collective hope to disrupt the consciousness of their audiences i.e. by opening dialogue about what is known, or assumed about peace (chapter 6). As such, in the spirit of PAR, the study moved from researcher-led activities towards youth-led, and youth-involved actions and solutions to issues of peace in the everyday life of young people.

Like many previous PV studies, the research did not demonstrate a shift in power from one group to another or move the participants into the type of thick agency that might result from sustained positions of local decision-making (Wang et al., 2008). An effort was made to emphasise the importance of supporting participants to share and continue their work i.e. at the start of the project, before, and during gatekeeper meetings, and throughout the process (Liebenberg, 2018; Wang, 1999). However, staged and enacted within asymmetrical power relations, the young people’s actions for public engagement, and potential follow up, were shaped by the adults around them. Consequently, some groups failed to materialise (chapter 4), and others such as YC2 were unable to take direct action to exhibit their work. Alternatively, each of the three groups of young people who completed the research “spoke back” with the research (Cahill et al., 2008); and although the YC2 group did not directly engage with a specified audience outside of the study, their action was clearly ‘a political statement’ about their reality (Wang & Burris, 1997), and what they perceived to be barriers to peace in their everyday life.

Despite certain limitations, the study has clearly added to what is known about how young people understand peace. Furthermore, it has successfully evidenced how young people take action to cultivate peace in their
lives and communities (chapters 5 to 6). Participants reported positively about their experience, and the study has extended into other projects and social action outside of the research (chapters 6 and 7).

Consistent with prior PV studies, young people and gatekeepers spoke about how the project had evidenced empowerment as increased knowledge and skills (Blackman & Fairey 2007; Chonody et al., 2013; Palibroda et al., 2009; McIntyre, 2000; Strack et al., 2004; Suffla, 2014). This included changes in self and social perception resulting from the young people challenging their assumptions; voicing, being heard and self-advocacy both in and outside the project; increased self-confidence, including the skills of group work, collaboration, decision making and problem-solving; and critical thinking and critical analysis, such as making links between personal and the political. Additionally, participants reported developing a sense of belonging (Palibroda et al., 2009) in their groups, and making friendships that extended outside of the research (Budig, et al., 2018). Like Stark et al., (2004), I believe that the collaborative nature of PV assisted participants to develop a greater:

Sense of responsibility and purpose in a society that should contribute to increasing their social competency. Participating youth were empowered through their newfound awareness that their thoughts and opinions do matter. (Strack et al., 2004, p.56)

Evidence for a thicker, more structural, agency has also emerged. As an example, after the young people’s self-representations and advocacy tactics (SRATs) at YC1 with their families, other young people, and stakeholders in the statutory youth service, the Operational Lead Citywide Specialist for the City Council Youth Service has invited me to sit on the board for a “Month of Peace”. This is an event being planned with young people from the Youth Service and citywide Young People’s Council to provide themed activities across the city. It has been prompted by a pending display of the “Knife Angel”, made from over 100,000 knives in response to the problem of knife crime, violence, and aggression in our society. I am aware that the explicit use of peace language has emerged because of the Operational Lead’s involvement with the study. Paradoxically, the “Month of Peace” is operating from a ‘deficit peace’ paradigm that aims to challenge violence and promote non-violence. Whilst there is immense value in such work, I am currently conflicted about how such events can critically reframe our knowledge of peace.

As stated in chapter 6, I have actively incorporated engagement and impact as a continuous process. This has included how the research and scholarship have influenced and engaged with organisations and young people in the university, and more widely through researcher-led presentations and youth and community development (chapter 6). As previously stated, in recognition of its impact, the study was granted an engagement award from De Montfort University. My consultancy work with ‘#MinusViolencePlusPeace’ has formed part of a community development response to hot spots for knife crime in Birmingham, helping to draw down funding with a range of successful outcomes. This work has explored young people’s
knowledge, skills and attitudes to peace in their everyday life, in addition to promoting young people’s self-advocacy as part of building safer more peaceful communities (Ogunnusi, 2019). My work has opened dialogue as ‘praxis in-of-for peace’ (table 11) that has continued to evidence the key stages of young people’s critical literacy (outlined in fig. 18). The participants have said they experienced this dialogue as an authentic response to addressing some of the issues they faced. For instance, “We talk about real stuff and what would happen. Not just saying sorry and walking away”. Without judgement they felt able to share sides of themselves that are often misunderstood or ignored. Crucially, when asked to map peace in their lives, the young men stated that they knew peace in the group as something that was immediate i.e. “right now, discussing our feelings and being allowed to express ourselves”. Further still, the young men said that this peace was not familiar elsewhere in their lives. All of the participants said they wanted the sessions to continue, and expressed a desire to have more opportunities to reflect as part of their learning. The young men stated explicitly that they felt they needed to have access to someone in school who they trusted to talk to about their lives, their behaviour at school, and other issues affecting their schooling and achievement. Evidence from this work has been used to draw down further funding from the Home Office and enabled provision in more schools. Additionally, I am currently modelling a dialogic approach by mentoring staff involved in #MinusViolencePlusPeace.

The concluding chapter will outline what the study has offered as a contribution to original knowledge, and discuss some of the implications for practice; and then make recommendations for practice and further research.
Section 8 - Conclusion

It is commonly understood that young people have a right (and a need) to learn peace, and to live peacefully (UNESCO, 2002). This study has offered an ethnographic response to how 21 young people (aged 15-24), based in five different inner-city settings in the Midlands in England, have made sense of peace, and how they have understood their knowledge of peace as praxis, in their everyday life. As PV, implemented within a PAR framework, the study has successfully elicited the viewpoint of those being researched through their own eyes and words; and it has also evidenced how young people acted towards solutions for peace in their communities.

The previous chapter outlined how the study has responded to the aims of the research and analysed what this offers as a contribution to knowledge. The findings have focused on a Sociology of Peace in Everyday Life (SoPiEL) assembled from three thematic findings to include the significance of dialogue and praxis - evidenced in, and from, the methodology used in the study. This final chapter will provide a summary of the original contribution to knowledge to offer the reader a chance to review some of the arguments that have been presented in the study. The chapter will then discuss some of the insights and learning for practice, and then make recommendations for further study.

8.1 Summary of original contribution to knowledge

How young people conceptualise peace has been studied academically since the 1960s (Ålvik, 1968; Cooper, 1965). This thesis has contributed to an emerging interpretivist and naturalistic approach, and is the first of its kind in England to evidence and interpret how peace is understood and located in relation to its circumstances and contexts of use in young people’s everyday life. The findings were not vague and impersonal like much of the earlier post-positivist studies, nor have they been stripped from the validity of their contextualised meaning.

Unlike most of the previous literature, the study has not prioritised deficit epistemologies of peace that are validated in ‘conflict-affected spaces’. There is a recognition that Galtung’s (1978, 2000) theorisation of conflict is far broader than being a synonym for violence. His work speaks to our fundamental needs and nature as human beings, to include deeply rooted personal and social conflict, in addition to how the knowledge and empathic practice of working with conflict can be a ‘midwife’ for actor-based and structure-based transformation (Horton & Freire, 1990). However, the thesis has purposefully moved away from adult concerns (Berents & McEvoy-Levy, 2015) prescribed by how young people understand peace in geographical and conceptual spaces of conflict i.e. conflict settings, armed conflict, conflict zones, protracted
conflict, post-conflict, and political and state-sponsored conflict (Berents, 2014, 2018; Brewer et al., 2018; Firchow, 2018). The stubborn adherence to, and fascination with, ‘conflict-affected peace’, have forged theoretical associations between ‘everyday peace’ and ‘everyday peacebuilding’, and continue to contribute inconsistences for the significance and study of peace i.e. for, and to, all young people. On one level this calls for more reflexivity and criticality; but more than this, it exposes the tensions presented by ‘conflict-affected peace’, and the subsequent definition and prioritisation of ‘conflict-affected youth’ i.e. how young people are selected with a view towards the impact and legacy of conflict in their lives. This argument is not been presented as an attempt to debunk existing theory, but rather to open spaces that ‘extend’ it (Bajaj, 2019; Cremin, 2015).

In addition, the study has raised questions about how peace is operationalised, centralised, and organised, around prearranged contexts of conflict and violence (Freire & Lopes, 2008; Stallworth-Clark, 2006); and furthermore, why peace is rarely investigated independently (Gleditsch, et al., 2014). The thesis offers a critical appraisal of the polemologic vestiges of peace (and conflict) to interrupt narratives of unquestioned binaries, and prescribed equations, and conflations, of peace and violence as being inextricably linked and co-determined. Such questions query how the historical relevance of peace research remains so closely structured around dominant and encoded narratives of violence that peace is rarely allowed to be seen i.e. as more than a partial or consequential construct. When it comes to the study of peace, the discourse of critical localism, and CPE, have shown that that ‘battles’ over concepts are never simply academic (Mac Ginty, 2015; McCandless & Karbo, 2011; Zembylas, 2018).

As a response, the study has posited a fresh theoretical interpretation for how peace is known to young people by introducing a framework for the Sociology of Peace in Everyday Life (SoPiEL). The construct of SoPiEL has been influenced by critical peace education (CPE), the work of Sztompka (2008), and Freire (1974); and has been shown to reveal something new and useful for research that rejects reductionist and partial descriptions of peace. As such, SoPiEL is well positioned to add to a post-critical discourse that aims to disrupt paradigmatic orders, such as narratives that (consciously and unconsciously) rank conflict and violence over peace; or push instrumental trajectories that universalise, or homogenise, peace knowledge and action (Bajaj 2019). Rather than offering any universal truths, SoPiEL has provided a means to interpret how young people have understood peace and their knowledge of peace in everyday life. More specifically, SoPiEL has offered a valuable theoretical framework to explore how young people have given meaning to peace as being: deeply experiential, placed, non-reductionist, visceral, observable, temporal, routine, culturally significant, and praxis. As stated throughout the thesis, the inherent nature of social reality as both ‘being’ and ‘becoming’ (Freire, 1970; Sztompka, 2008) means that these typologies remain dynamic, overlapping, interrelated, and unfinished. For example, the study has shown how young people have evolved,
complicated, discarded, ignored, challenged, contradicted, and changed, how, where, and why, they have given meaning to peace.

Consistent with interpretive inquiry, and the contextualised situatedness of young people, the study has offered a distinct ‘youth’ perspective of/for peace. This is incredibly important as being different from that of adults, to elaborate what is known about how young people respond to being asked directly about peace (as a distinct object of study) in their everyday life (Dutta, et al, 2016; Juhasz & Palmer, 1991). As such, the study has responded to an acknowledged gap in the literature regarding the need to value, represent, and rethink, peace in ways that are specific and relevant to the voices of young people. This has meant that the study has relevance for, and has added to, extant literature on young people as protagonists for peace and ‘everyday peace’ (Ardizzone, 2003; Berents & McEvoy-Levy, 2015; Del Felice & Wisler, 2007); and what this means for the sociology of peacebuilding (e.g. Berents, 2014; Berents & ten, 2017; Brewer, et al., 2018; Dutta et al., 2016; Firchow, 2018). For example, the study has complemented prior findings for young people’s deliberate and unreflexive tactical responses to peace in their day-to-day lives, particularly as a form of claiming and disrupting space (e.g. Berents, 2014; Berents & ten, 2017; McEvoy/McEvoy-Levy, 2000, 2001; Pruitt, 2013). This has included how young people have understood their marginalisation, vulnerability and risk; and how they have expressed and enacted their concerns and hopes for peace as social practices. Plus, how young people have responded critically through their language, knowledge, and power, as tactical agency for peace in social structures that seek to control their actions.

Additionally, the study has provided a rich range of findings for new detail and localised depth regarding how young people have understood peace, and how they have understood their knowledge of peace as praxis in their everyday life. Random examples include how young people have spoken about the lack of role models of/for peace outside of the family and youth work. And how young people have overwhelmingly looked to themselves to ‘be’ and ‘do’ peace, as self-regulation, and social change, which was underpinned by a keen sense of responsibility and social justice.

More specifically, the study has offered three key findings. The first was characterised by how young people have understood peace as being more than ‘deficit peace’ with factors such as non-binary peace, ahistorical peace, and change and peace. The second focused how young people understood peace as unreflexive and deliberate peace affirming tactics (PATs), consisting of how they spoke about their relationships to people around them, and how they are socialised into peace skills; and their deliberate and random tactics for peace as social coherence shaped by ideas of equality, respect, and social justice. PATs also highlighted the importance of participant’s self-initiated peace as self-regulatory and transformative; formulated as natural self-care, wellness and coping. The third theme emerged from the participant’s concerns and aspirations for
peace, and illustrated how young people understood their knowledge of peace as self-representation and advocacy tactics (SRATs). This carried messages about the importance of taking action for peace, such as ripple acts, voicing, and seeking a community response. SRATs also demonstrated how young people critically confronted their issues of peace as critical literacy in the taken-for-granted-ness of their everyday language, and their everyday understanding of everyday life.

Each of these themes has been analysed and discussed in previous chapters. Suffice to say, that young people’s knowledge and agency of peace has evidenced salient similarities and paradoxes. For instance, the study has shown how young people have acted in their knowledge of peace as local activism; yet this was given meaning as being ahistorical, as young people remained detached (and even wary) of traditional peace culture; or the relevance of historical peace for contemporary resistance and protest. As another example, young people’s knowledge and enactment of peace was consistently evidenced as a ‘bond’ that was understood to be fundamentally embedded in the social existence of everyday life. Crucially, such narratives convey a ‘permanence’ of peace that is often missed in the focus and findings for peace as a secondary phenomenon (Lourenço, 1996). This has reiterated the complexity of how peace is constructed, and communicated, within the context of peacebuilding in everyday spaces, and everyday life (Berents & McEvoy-Levy, 2015).

To conclude, the study has direct implications for peace research, practice, and learning. It has offered a fresh look at how questions of young people and peace are studied and interpreted (McEvoy-Levy, 2011), and provides new evidence, new ideas, and new questions, for extant literature. Furthermore, the study has highlighted the need to reconsider totalising narratives of ‘conflict-affected peace’ and ‘deficit peace’, and asserted the need to challenge what is known, and how we give meaning to, young people’s knowledge and enactment of as peace in the continuum of structure and agency in everyday life.

Finally, in keeping with a post-critical approach (Ahenakew, 2016; Andreotti, 2016), it is important to acknowledge the limits of the contribution to knowledge offered in this thesis. As discussed earlier in chapter 1, social constructs of reality and knowledge both ‘exist’ and ‘become’ as unfinished and incomplete (Sztompka, 2008). As such, in keeping with the subjectivity of the data, my positionality, and the context of the research, I accept what is inevitably missing from my work, by actively moving away from instrumentalism and certainty towards a more contingent and humbler paradigm that remains open, inclusive, and critically curious.

The next section will offer a summary of practice related outcomes.
8.2 Summary of youth work outcomes

Overall, the findings have shown that youth workers were cited as positive role models who contributed towards peace, less conflict, and learning for conflict resolution, in the everyday life of young people. Youth work was further understood to encourage friendship and non-violence between young people, in safe spaces; in which young people could be themselves, socialise, and make choices to get involved in activities with other young people. In contrast, a consensus was reached in one group that a more ‘permanent’, ‘urgent’, effective, and better resourced response was needed from local youth work provision to engage with young people in situations of violence i.e. due to gangs and gang-risk. And furthermore, young people in all of the groups claimed that they needed more role models for peace in their everyday life. This has significance for the importance of increased investment and leadership in youth programmes that value peace (McEvoy-Levy, 2007; Pruitt, 2013); and has supported extant literature on the complexities of youth work that values peace (Del Felice & Wisler, 2007; Grattan & Morgan, 2007; Harland, 2009, 2011). The theory and practice of youth work in England supports the need (and morally principled duty) to respond to young people in their everyday life, in ways that are non-violent, and promote their emotional wellbeing (NYA, 2020; Wright & Ord, 2015). Given the scarcity of literature about youth work and peace in England, this is something that needs to be prioritised.

The study has also documented how and why young people acted in their knowledge of peace to evidence their self-representation and advocacy tactics (SRATs). These tactics were shown to have actively shaped how young people conceived, influenced, and led public community-based engagement events, with support from their host organisations i.e. in a youth club, on three different college campuses, and during a community open day that was organised in partnership with a youth provision. As with previous PV projects, these public events were given meaning by young people as a catalyst for action and change (Cahill et al., 2008). Young people wanted to show and share their representations, knowledge, and experiences of peace; including what peace meant to them, why it was important, and how it existed in their everyday life. Yet, more so, young people reported that they wanted their photographs, words, and interaction, to provoke questions of peace by encouraging audiences to question their own assumptions about peace, and life; and by asking them to consider what action they might take for peace.

Between them, the three groups of young people stood up and made themselves available in front of public audiences comprised of their families, friends, senior members of staff, youth workers, and strangers. These events have provided evidence for how young people:

- Facilitated a visit from a popular music artist who led a peace-related workshop.
- Stood in front of audiences both individually and collectively, sometimes with a gatekeeper.
- Spoke to senior staff and professionals about their experiences of peace, and advocated for the importance of peace to young people, and how young people might contribute to solutions for peace in their communities.
- Led peace-themed activities, shared findings from the research; and gathered comments from the audience about peace, and their learning pre and post the activities and events.
- Exhibited their photography, and made themselves available to answer questions, and explain their ideas and photographs.
- Facilitated an activity that resulted in a semi-permanent installation at one of the youth clubs.

Such outcomes have direct significance for youth work that is interested in offering critical and creative responses that are embedded in the everyday life of young people, and aimed at self-advocacy and empowerment (Cooper, 2018; Hurley & Treacy, 1993).

As frequently evidenced in PV, the young people and gatekeepers spoke about numerous significant changes that had occurred as a result of the study. These changes included increased knowledge and skills, changes in self and social perception, increased self-confidence, group work skills, critical thinking, increased sense of responsibility and belonging, etc., (Blackman & Fairey 2007; Chonody et al., 2013; Palibroda et al., 2009; McIntyre, 2000; Strack et al., 2004; Suffla, 2014). Such skills and attributes are consistently presented in the curricula and aims of youth work (NYA, 2020); and demonstrate how the study has impacted tangible outcomes for informal, educative, participative, and empowering, practice with young people that values peace.

The novel methodology employed in the study has successfully added to what is known about opening spaces for dialogue with young people to question peace (Dutta et al., 2016; Ogunnusi, 2019; Rogers & Ramsbotham, 1999; Snauwaert, 2011). The study has also offered a fresh look at the possibility of critical literacy and consciousness as part of dialogue in PV (Cahill, et al., 2008; Carlson et al., 2017; Farley et al., 2017), including those who are deemed to be marginalised and at risk. This was theory-driven, and has confirmed the assertion that in its purest form, PV is theoretically rooted in dialogue; as the co-production of the type of consciousness that problematises and acts in the world (Wang et al., 2008). Therefore, the study has continued to challenge the idea that critical literacy somehow occurs naturally in PV when young people are handed cameras (Pauwels, 2015); or that critical transitivity is achieved simply because young people come together to share their photography in public events with adult audiences. More specifically, the concept of ‘peace-limit situations’ has been introduced in the study, to help deconstruct and add specificity to the crucial process of ‘contextualizing’ as part of dialogue in PV (Wang et al., 2008, p.80).
The method of praxis used in this study has also developed and informed my engagement outside of the research, towards a progressive and applied strategy for youth work that openly values peace. This work has successfully influenced youth and community work practice in schools in Birmingham with pupils at risk of violence and gangs. In one school, this has resulted in the permanent introduction of ‘positive peace dialogue groups’ that are structured into the school day. These groups are led by a mentor from the inclusion team who came and observed my practice in the dialogue groups.

At the time of writing this, I have started working with members of staff responsible for the ‘Leicester City Council Positive and Peaceful Places Award’, who have shown an interest in a similar approach to that used in the study, as part of a response to the needs of pupils with identified social, emotional, and mental health difficulties. I continue to introduce the theory and methodology of the study as part of my freelance work with the Youth & Community Division at De Montfort University. And, I have recently been approached by Abbee McLatchie, the Director of Youth Work for the National Youth Agency (NYA), who has expressed an explicit interest in finding ways to disseminate my work and findings to mainstream the discourse of peace and young people in England and Wales.

The examples of theory and practice presented in this section have contributed new spaces to question how youth work (in England and elsewhere) values peace, and how such discourses can be mainstreamed further as part of critical peace education (CPE). In conclusion, the study has offered an innovative PAR project with wider implications for practitioners, policymakers, and research. It is ground-breaking in its attempt to bring CPE, youth work, and public engagement together; and shows great potential for replicability, including engaging with significantly vulnerable communities (such as young people who are marginalised or at risk of violence).

The final sections will offer some recommendations for practice and future research, and then finish with a reflective statement.

8.3 Recommendations

8.3.1 Implications for practice
The study has a range of implications for the theory and practice of youth work, especially as it has evidenced an applied reproducibility that has been carried to, and gained traction across, different and new settings. Some of the more immediate questions for practice involve how youth work can strengthen, and understand, young people’s experiences of peace in their everyday life. For example:
How youth work can engage with critical and interpretative discourses, such as SoPiEL, to understand and reveal young people’s knowledge and enactment of peace, including critical peace literacy and peace activism.

How youth work (training, curricula and practice) in England (statutory and otherwise) can build a body of literature for how young people engage with, and respond to, questions of peace, including critical peace literacy and peace activism.

How youth work in England can mainstream the right (and need) for young people to engage with, and respond to, questions of peace, including critical peace literacy and peace activism. This reiterates the need to reframe and counter ‘conflict-affected peace’, and to critically examine how youth work understands itself to be peaceful (Ogunnusi, 2006).

Such work might include revisiting the literature and practice of Northern Ireland, which shares commonality with the theory and practice of youth work in England, as part of a systematic review of the wider trend in Europe and elsewhere; to build professional coalitions and inform future service provision in England e.g. Peace Bag for EuroMed Youth (UNOY & Fundación Catalunya Voluntària, 2010); Mainstreaming Peace Education Practitioner’s Manual (Besseling et al., 2014), and SALTO-YOUTH training. This leads to another implication of the study that suggests a need to examine:

- How SoPiEL can be used to inform tangential practice such as international youth work, global youth work, humanitarian youth work, and critical peace education.

8.3.2 Future study

The study has identified certain recommendations for further research based on the discussion of findings. These include:

- Continuing to critically question and reconsider what is known about how young people understand peace, and their knowledge of peace, to critically engage with the dominance and hybridity of ‘conflict-affected peace’ and ‘deficit peace’.
- Continuing to develop SoPiEL as a framework for peace knowledge and praxis, along with the corresponding concepts of PATs and SRATS.
- Future study should be extended to sites that are not concerned with the Western state and society. Although, not as a default position that reverts back to unquestioned contexts of ‘conflict-affected peace’.

More specifically, the study has raised additional questions about:
How the critical localism and hybridity of SoPiEL can be used to counter and deconstruct ‘social difference’ and ‘othering’. And how this might be less paralysing than imposed and decontextualised peace narratives.

The significance of young people’s self-initiated peace as being self-determined, self-dependent, or self-reliant, i.e. as a possible cultural trend with implications for young people’s experiences of an ahistorical culture of peace. In accordance with what young people have identified as the lack of role models for peace in their lives. And how this relates to the dichotomy of peace presented by critical localism (Mac Ginty, 2015) and external peace cultures (Firchow, 2018).

The significance presented by each, a selection, or one, of the young people’s self-initiated peace routines. For example, young people’s relationship with their pets, and how this might relate to peace with links to self and social isolation.

How to thicken young people’s agency as part of their SRATs i.e. with a view to praxis (‘in-of-for’) peace in everyday life, and with reference to the key stages of praxis identified in the study.

There were also other findings raised in the data that are of interest to me. For instance, the gendered narrative of peace as ‘forbidden places’, ‘ghosts’, and ‘Jinns’. And the unreflective narratives of ‘knife mapping’ used by young people to verbally navigate their local communities.
Reflective Statement

The study has left me with much to reflect on. It has deepened my belief that our knowledge of peace needs to be studied more, promoted more, and critically reframed. This means wrenching ourselves away from what we have been conditioned and taught to think, and what we think we know, in order to shape critical approaches that offer more for peace than attempted antidotes for violence.

Yet, as I write this, the killing of George Floyd, in the United States of America, has prompted a lot of activity in my life and around me. Therefore, having found a language to reappraise and conceptually disrupt peace, I am also keen to examine the socio-cultural (re)construction and ties of how peace occupies everyday life, or is made absent and invisible; and what this might mean for paradigms of militarism, such as Whiteness, capitalism/exploitation, imperialism, and neo-colonialism. The study has taught me that peace does not necessarily offer something consistent, complete, comprehensive, consequential, secondary, or conflict-affected. Rather it can be all of these things, and none of these things. However, each of these things can lead to (and reinforce) realist and paradigmatically ordered thinking about the significance given to peace knowledge and agency.

Research should be about improving society, and the young people connected to the study have been an inspiration; they have offered me radical hope. However, I have been left questioning how my role could have done more to support those young people in the study as social actors in the community. And further still, what this means for decolonising how we understand voices of ‘young people’ and ‘peace’ in terms of how each of them have meaning ‘from a space outside that in which they were constructed as ‘oppressed’ and given a voice?’ (Souza & Andreotti, 2009, p.9). I am open, restless, and willing, for where this leads me next.

So, maybe more for my benefit than that of the reader, I will end with a final quote. It comes from my notes, taken during a meeting with a young person, in preparation for her keynote speech to the UN as a member of youth parliament. When reflecting back on our conversation she stated that:

When I heard about peace, I thought that’s something you would do in primary school. It didn’t make much sense to be honest. Now I see that it’s part of everything we do. It’s really interesting and I want to know more. It’s about young people being heard and being taken seriously. It’s about youth platforms where it’s easy to connect. It’s about being able to talk without thinking you won’t be invited back. It’s important that we talk about peace. (Aayatpreet, 17, British Indian)
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Research Schedule

Interview
Before beginning, is it okay with you for me to record this interview? Thank you for agreeing to continue your participation in the Research Project.

First, I will give you a few minutes to look through your pictures so you can pick out 4 or 5 that are significant to you. Next, we will take a look at each of your pictures individually, and I will ask you the same set of questions for each picture.

Each photograph
Q1 Why have you selected this picture?
Q2 What is happening in the picture? (if not answered)
Q3 How does this photo represent what peace means to you?
Q4 How do you think the photograph relates to your life or your community; however, you perceive your community?
Q5 How does the photograph represent an obstacle or something that promotes peace? (If not answered)
Q6 Why, or how, do these types of situations exist? And do you think it’s important that they do? (If not answered)

All photographs
Q7 If you were using all of these photos to send a message about peace in your community. What would your message be? (how would you use this picture to tell somebody or educate somebody about peace?)
Q8 Are there some photos that you didn’t take that you would have liked to have taken?
Q9 Anything else you would like to say or add? (about the photos, why they are significant to you, or about the conversation we’ve had?)

Thank you for taking part. We will meet on [date] as a group [explain].

Group Interview
Q2 What is happening in the picture? (if not answered)
Q3 How does this photo represent what peace means to you?
Q4 How do you think the photograph relates to your life or your community; however, you perceive your community?
Q5 How does the photograph represent an obstacle or something that promotes peace? (If not answered)
Q6 Why, or how, do these types of situations exist? And do you think it’s important that they do? (If not answered)
Q7 If you were using all of these photos to send a message about peace in your community. What would your message be? (how would you use this picture to tell somebody or educate somebody about peace?)
Appendix 2: Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET
You are being invited to participate in a research study that I am doing to work towards a PhD. qualification at De Montfort University in Leicester. The purpose of this study is to learn more about what young people know about peace, and to promote young people’s solutions for peace in our communities. This will involve your commitment to participate in audio recorded groups and interviews; and taking photographs, and sharing your work.

Before you decide whether to take part it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. This information sheet tells you a bit about the project and your rights as a participant. Please take time to read it carefully and discuss it with friends and relatives if you wish to. You can contact me if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Thank you for reading this.

What is the study about?
The purpose of this study is to learn more about what young people know about peace, and how peace relates to other issues in their lives. The project also aims to promote young people’s concerns and aspirations about peace, and encourage young people to become actively involved in exploring solutions for peace in our communities.

What does the study involve?
The study will document and share your experiences through photography and discussion. As a participant, you will be encouraged to make decisions about how the research is carried out. You will take photographs that have meaning for you. These pictures are then shared back and discussed to explain their significance. Your photographs and discussion will later shape a public exhibition to showcase your photography.

The project includes one workshop and three focus groups (2.5hrs each), and an interview (1hr each), based at your youth club, organisation, etc. These will be audio recorded. You will be expected to take photographs for during the project, and later help to facilitate a community exhibit and dialogue.

Why have I been chosen?
The research will collaborate with five groups of five young people from different locations in Leicester, England. You have been chosen because you are either a young person (or a youth worker).

**Do I have to take part?**

It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you do decide to take part, you will be given this information sheet to keep and be asked to sign a consent form to say that you understand the research project. If you decide to take part, you are still free to withdraw from the study at any time without giving a reason.

**What are the possible benefits of taking part?**

— You will have a chance to express your views which can make a difference.
— You will gain hands-on skills as part of a research project.
— You will train in photographic skills.
— You will learn how to plan and manage public showcases of your work, and keep your photographs.
— You will have an opportunity to be an advocate for yourself, and other young people, to create more peaceful communities.

**Will my taking part in this study be kept confidential?**

The research will only collect information about you that is necessary for carrying out the study. All information which is collected about you during the course of the research will be kept on a password protected database and is strictly confidential - accessible only by me and my supervisors from De Montfort University. Confidentiality cannot be guaranteed if I think I have heard something that may relate to protecting you or others. However, I will always talk to you before telling anyone else. All efforts will be used to maintain confidentiality and anonymity of all photographers when results are shared with broader audiences using coded pseudonyms to protect identities. Alternatively, some participants may wish to remain identifiable as a part of the research process and outcomes. I will discuss how safe participants feel about being associated with their data and/or potential actions that emerge from the research. Your photographs will be your property. You will be given a consent form to grant permission for the images to be included in professional manuscripts and you can select any images that you do not want to be used.

**I am interested in taking part, what do I do next?**

If you are interested, these are my contact details. Feel free to get in touch if you want to chat, email, or text about any aspect of the research:
What if something goes wrong? / Who can I complain to?
This study has been reviewed and approved by De Montfort University, Faculty of Health and Life Sciences Research Ethics Committee. If you have a complaint regarding anything to do with this study, you can initially approach the lead investigator. If this achieves no satisfactory outcome, you should then contact the Administrator for the Faculty Research Ethics Committee, Research & Commercial Office, Faculty of Health & Life Sciences, 1.25 Edith Murphy House, De Montfort University, The Gateway, Leicester, LE1 9BH or hlsfro@dmu.ac.uk

Thank you for volunteering to take part in the study
PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Title of project: Young People Peace & Change
Name of researcher: Mike Ogunnusi

Please initial all boxes if you agree

I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet [V4:22.09.2017] for the
above study. I have had the opportunity to consider the information, ask questions and
have had these answered satisfactorily.

1. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw
   at any time without giving any reason. If this occurs, I am free to choose between
destroying my contributions to the study or releasing them for use without my
participation.

3. I agree that non identifiable quotes may be published in articles or used in
   conference presentations.

4. I understand that I will sign a Consent, Copyright and Model Release Form
   [v1:27.08.2015] to agree to my photographs being published in articles or used in
   conference presentations.

5. I agree to the interview and groups being digitally audio recorded.

6. I understand that data collected during the study may be looked at by a
   supervisor from De Montfort University. I give permission for the supervisor to
   have access to my data.

7. I agree to take part in this study

__________________________  ________________  _____________
Print name of participant   Date     Signature

__________________________  ________________  _____________
Print name of person taking consent   Date     Signature
Appendix 3: Consent Form for People Who May Appear in Photographs

Consent Form for People Who May Appear in Photographs

Introduction
The ‘Young People, Peace & Change Project’ (De Montfort University) is investigating what young people think about peace as part of their lives and communities using photography and social research. The goal of these projects is to encourage young people to become actively involved with changing their communities. The photographs will be discussed with other young people, and possibly shown in a community exhibition to spark interest and raise awareness from a youth perspective.

What is involved?
Your participation will take less than 5 minutes. During this time, the photographer may take pictures that contain images of you. Your name or any other identifying information will not be known or listed with the photographs.

Your willingness to be photographed is voluntary and you may decline.

By signing this consent form, I agree to voluntarily have my photograph taken. I also understand and agree that unless otherwise notified in writing, De Montfort University assumes that permission is granted to use the photograph(s) for public exhibits, presentations, publications and/or other purposes.

Thanks for your time and help!

Print Your Name: ___________________ Parent/Guardian Name (if necessary): ________________

Signature: ___________________ Date: _______________

Please contact Mike Ogunnusi with any additional questions (0116) 207 8740 / 07792073590 or Email: mogunnusi@dmu.ac.uk. Address: Young People, Peace & Youth Work Research Project, Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, De Montfort University, Hawthorn Building, Leicester LE1 9BH
Appendix 4: Consent, Copyright and Model Release Form

CONSENT, COPYRIGHT and MODEL RELEASE FORM

1. COPYRIGHT

I ………………………………………………………. [insert name] understand that I retain copyright of my photographs but give permission for Michael Ogunnusi to retain copies of the images listed/shown on the attached sheet for usage as consented to in the list below. I understand that my images will be credited shown as below when used:
© ……………………………………… / Michael Ogunnusi

2. CONSENT

CONSENT CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am happy for Michael Ogunnusi to use my Photographs in the following ways:</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In publications or other reports such as a thesis report submitted by Michael Ogunnusi towards a PhD which will be assessed by De Montfort University.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On their websites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In training materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At public exhibitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editorial (newspapers and magazines), Web &amp; Broadcasting use - local, national and international</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Sponsor and Funder reports, websites &amp; publications.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you want these photographs to be credited with your real name? YES / NO
If no, please specify alternative name to be used

........................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................
3. MODEL RELEASE

I am happy for Michael Ogunnusi to retain copies of photos by fellow participants or project staff that feature me, for usage as consented to in the list above.  YES / NO

PLEASE FILL IN YOUR FULL CONTACT DETAILS BELOW:

Photographer’s full name:

Photographer’s Address:

Postcode:

Mobile:

Email:

__________________________

Signed:

Date:

Signature:

Name:

Date:

If you would like to withdraw from this agreement please contact Mike Ogunnusi by letter (Young People, Peace & youth Work Research Project, Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, De Montfort University, Hawthorn Building, Leicester LE1 9BH) or email mogunnusi@dmu.ac.uk and we will stop using your images from the date that notification is received but this cannot apply to images already in use as they cannot be withdrawn.
Appendix 5: Ethical Approval

27th January 2016

Michael Ogunnusi
13 Queen Street
Barwell
Leicester
LE9 8EA

Dear Michael

Re: Ethics application – Youth work and young people as local peace builders (DMU Ref: 1681)

I am writing regarding your application for ethical approval for a research project titled to the above project. This project has been reviewed in accordance with the Operational Procedures for De Montfort University Faculty of Health and Life Sciences Research Ethics Committee. These procedures are available from the Faculty Research and Commercial Office upon your request.

I am pleased to inform you that ethical approval has been granted by Chair’s Action for your application. This will be reported at the next Faculty Research Committee.

Should there be any amendments to the research methods or persons involved with this project you must notify the Chair of the Faculty Research Ethics Committee immediately in writing. Serious or adverse events related to the conduct of the study need to be reported immediately to your Supervisor and the Chair of this Committee.

The Faculty Research Ethics Committee should be notified by e-mail to hlsfro@du.ac.uk when your research project has been completed.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Professor Martin Grootveld
Chair
Faculty Research Ethics Committee
Faculty of Health & Life Sciences
De Montfort University

Email: hlsfro@du.ac.uk
Appendix 6: Safety and Respect Handout

Stay safe! Make sure you are “safe” when you take the picture. For example:

✓ Stand on a solid surface.
✓ Look before you step into or cross a street.
✓ Be aware of things around you, like traffic.
✓ If you want to take a picture of something that is in a place that your parents and carers would rather you not go to, ask them (or your youth worker).

Ask permission. Always ask permission before taking people’s photos for this project. Ask them to sign a photo consent form.

If people can be recognized in a photo, ask permission before showing their picture outside your group.

Be respectful. Be polite, and if certain people don’t their photo taken, respect their feelings.

Be prepared. Be ready to explain about the project to family, friends, or strangers, if they ask what you are doing. A simple explanation is: “I am part of a youth project in school finding out what young people think about peace as part of our lives and communities. We are taking photographs and talking about them with other people in our group. Do I have your permission to take your photo? Thank you.”

When permission is not necessary. In a public place like a park, you can take someone’s photo without permission, if they are far away and can’t be recognized in the picture.

Respect the lives and safety of others. When you take photos for your project, think of people’s safety first, and be respectful of their lives. For example:

✓ If your friend is diabetic and the doctor told them not to eat sweets, avoid taking a picture of them eating cake.
✓ If your friend doesn’t have a driver’s license, avoid taking a picture of them driving a car down the street.

Keep your camera safe. Only give your camera to a family member or a friend to take a picture of you doing something with them or by yourself.
Appendix 7: Photo Record Handout

**Photo Record**

Photographer Name: 

Date: 

Photograph Number: 

Subject Consent Form Completed: 

**About Your Photograph**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Why have you Selected this picture?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>What Happened or is Happening in the picture?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>How do you think the photograph relates to your Own life, your community, where you live?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>How does this photo represent What peace means to you (in terms of ideas, people, places and things)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Why, or how do these types of situations Exist?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>What would you like to Do? if you were using all of these photos to send a message about peace in your community. What would your message be?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 8: Participant codes

#### Prior Study (2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ancestry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trey</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Black/ Mixed Ancestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jody</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>White British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finn</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>White British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>White British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>White British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>White British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brianna</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Black/ Mixed Ancestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>White British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylie</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>White British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>White British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>White British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Black/ Mixed Ancestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robyn</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>White British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Black/ Mixed Ancestry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Main Study (2020)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ancestry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amita</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>British Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zainab</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>British Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasir</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>British Pakistani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minah</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>British Pakistani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afifa</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>British Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>British Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>White &amp; Black Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>White British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>White British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Black African</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumaria</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>British Pakistani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adela</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Other Asian/Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olly</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>White British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maya</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>White &amp; Black Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>White British</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amal</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>British Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Black African</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amreena</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>British Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isha</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>British Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadiya</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>British Pakistani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatima</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>British Indian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 9: NVivo codebook demonstrating 10 basic themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Theme (conceptual process)</th>
<th>Description/issues discussed</th>
<th>Code (content driven)</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult Services and peace</strong></td>
<td>Professional services &amp; local resources as actors for peace</td>
<td>~education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~professional-s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~teachers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~youth worker-club-centre</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~GP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barriers to peace</strong></td>
<td>personal, social, environmental challenges to peace</td>
<td>~gang-s</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~drugs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~vulnerability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~peer press</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~gender</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~influence-d</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~corrupt-ion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~generation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~tradition</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~money</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~violence</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~bullied-ing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~fight-s-ing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~force</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~gun-s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~knife-ves</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contexts of peace</td>
<td>The local context of peace &amp; Local-global interconnectedness including political and social systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~war</td>
<td>10 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~politics-ians</td>
<td>10 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~discrimination</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~disability</td>
<td>3 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~micro aggressions</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~race-ism</td>
<td>9 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~sexism-gender</td>
<td>9 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~stereotype-s</td>
<td>8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~place</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~alleyways</td>
<td>3 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~ghosts</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~litter &amp; graffiti</td>
<td>7 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~college</td>
<td>11 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~home</td>
<td>15 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~library</td>
<td>4 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~school</td>
<td>11 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~community</td>
<td>7 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Inter-national</td>
<td>13 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Leicester</td>
<td>11 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Leicester</td>
<td>7 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Leicester</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~parks</td>
<td>8 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~society</td>
<td>5 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~world</td>
<td>14 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family and peace</th>
<th>How peace is understood through family and interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>with family members</td>
<td>~family-ies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~parents</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~mum-mother</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~dad</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~brother</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~grandma</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~discipline</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~protection</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Friendship and peace | The role of friends for peace as companions, people and pets |
| ~animals-cat-dog-pet | 8 | 15 |
| ~friend-s-hip | 15 | 34 |

| Knowledging Peace | Expressed mutual and contested concepts of peace |
| ~conceptualising | 12 | 33 |
| ~conflict | 11 | 20 |
| ~illusionary | 4 | 5 |
| ~symbol | 7 | 7 |
| ~absence of violence | 2 | 7 |
| ~bad | 20 | 69 |
| ~good | 18 | 76 |
| ~love | 11 | 30 |

<p>| Messages and Change for and about peace | Agency for personal, social, environmental peace as actual and potential |
| ~action | 9 | 11 |
| ~education | 2 | 2 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count1</th>
<th>Count2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~disability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~litter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for peace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~music</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~thinking deeper</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~together-difference</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~protest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~speak out-up</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~youth voice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~solidarity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resilience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~social</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~protect</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~non-response</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~people around us</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~family</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~friends</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~gangs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~politicians</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~self</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~calm</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~routine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~home</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>space</td>
<td>~own</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~pets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~positive-open</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion and peace</td>
<td>Personal peace as Stress and Calm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mindset</td>
<td>Peace as religious practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change</td>
<td>Peace as wellbeing, self-care and self-led activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~accept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interstate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~no-n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~voicing emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~outside-park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace as religious practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~beliefs</td>
<td>7 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~cults</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~gender</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Islamophobia</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~practice</td>
<td>8 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~tradition</td>
<td>8 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace as wellbeing, self-care and self-led activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~alone-respite</td>
<td>13 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~art</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~calm</td>
<td>11 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~disturbance</td>
<td>7 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~happy-ness</td>
<td>19 47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~music</td>
<td>11 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~nature-outside</td>
<td>7 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~positivity</td>
<td>8 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~sleep</td>
<td>6 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~sports-activity</td>
<td>5 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~stress worry</td>
<td>15 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Peace as Together and Difference</td>
<td>~water</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social attitudes and behaviours relating to actual and potential peace as social difference and social togetherness e.g. values, feelings, action or inaction</td>
<td>~accept-ance-ing</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~autonomy-freedom-judgement</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~bond</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~difference-ent</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~equality</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~respect</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~together-ness</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 10: Thematic Coding PATs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code: Peace-limit-situations (grouped)</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terms Frequency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Risk: Gangs, Drugs, Peer Pressure, Impact, Gender, Vulnerability, Money</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Roles: Family, Mother, Parents, Dad, Brother, Grandma</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War &amp; Politicians: Global, International, War &amp; Politicians</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination: Tradition, Sexism &amp; Gender, Racism, Stereotypes, Disability, Micro-Aggressions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services: School, College, Education, Teachers, Professionals, GP</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Peace: Negative, Symbolic, Illusionary</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social World: Society, City, Local Community</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Violence: Violence, Fighting, Knives, Bullying, Guns, Force</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns About Area: Litter &amp; Graffiti, Alleyways, Ghosts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 11: Example of Event Plan and Outline (30.11.16)

Name: ‘Young People’s Perspectives of Peace’
Target audience: 50 people (family, friends, other young people & Sam)
Where & When: New Parks Youth centre, Feb half-term (Feb 18th- 26th), 3-6pm
Aims: To hold an interactive event to educate people about peace and how we can all promote peace in different ways.

Resources:
- Funds of £65 + any monies raised through fundraising (Clare, Mary, Maya, Olly)
- Venue (Clare)
- Projector & screen (Clare)
- Microphones (Clare)
- Video Camera (Clare)
- Photo printing (Clare)
- Photo mounting on wallpaper & photo hanging from ceiling (Maya)
- Publicity fliers (Maya)
- Publicity contact other youth groups (Mary)
- Compile guest list (Mary)
- Publicity website & Facebook (Clare)
- Food (Olly)
- Seating
- Comments Book?

Exhibition:
- Curators (Mary & Maya in smart casual clothes)
- Speakers to talk about - What does Peace mean to us? Why is Peace important to us? How have we incorporated Peace into our lives? How can you use Peace for change? (Mary & Maya)
- Q&A (Mary & Maya)
- Display 8 A3 prints of photos (do these need editing?)
- Display 4 A3 prints of photos & pictures that have inspired us
- Display quotes from the project
- Display short bibliographies or stories about Mary, Maya, Olly (For example, how we have all suffered violence, but we still make a decision to deal with conflict non-violently and help to create change)
- Sculpting
- Seating
- Food that represents different cultures in & Peace Teacakes (catering by Olly in chef uniform)
- Event to be filmed (?)
- Comments Book to allow the audience to write down how they found the exhibition and what they learnt?
Appendix 12: Example of handover/letter communication (06.06.18)

Email Hi Ayolah, Jenny

See attached document for the themes identified by the participants, and some of their comments about the messages they would like to send to the audience.

They want to add their voice to the presentation, maybe state what they would like to change as a result of their exhibition, and get feedback from the audience. I've attached an 'Exhibition Prep sheet.'

Here's a link to their photographs -
https://drive.google.com/open?id=1ZHICfPhZtsmXZILvVoqzlcjRm_NPHNo
Obviously, this link must only be shared with the girls’ permission. They know and have agreed to me sending it to you. Perhaps the college photography dept can help with printing/framing? I can print up to A4 size, however the students have indicated they want something bigger.

I'm happy to come along for the final rehearsal and the exhibition/event, although I don't want to be called on to speak as it shifts the emphasis away from it being experienced/validated as something that is led by the students from a youth perspective.

It would be really nice to end the project with an evaluation to assess the impact, maybe somewhere the girls would like to eat? Can you mention this too?

Are you happy for me to mention and acknowledge you as part of publications, websites, editorials, etc.?

Any questions, queries, please do get in touch. I will contact you again in two weeks.
Again, thank you for your time and for all your help with the project.

Kind regards
Mike
Appendix 13: Mary Close Knit Families (Memo)

People Private

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Love</th>
<th>Home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support network</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People that make us feel peaceful</td>
<td></td>
<td>Safe place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Strong close knit families”

Bond

- Loyalty
  - family members
  - community
- Respect

Standing together

- time
- understanding

Solidarity

- democracy
- community

Differences (social cultural)
### Appendix 14: Table of Studies with Children and Young People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Source</th>
<th>Country, Age Range</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinklage, R. &amp; Ziller, R. (1989). Explicating conflict through photo-communication.</td>
<td>Germany &amp; USA ages 8-10</td>
<td>Interviews (photo-focused) Participant photography of war/peace.</td>
<td>Interpersonal relationships. nature. People. negation of war. photo communication i.e. auto-photography to measure self-concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juhasz, A. &amp; Palmer, L. (1991). Adolescent Perspectives on Ways of Thinking and Believing That Promote Peace, Adolescence, 26(104),8-49.</td>
<td>Australia, Canada, USA ages 13-14</td>
<td>Questionnaires and ‘Peace in the Family” writing (1) their concepts of peace (where, when and how, and what contributed to or disturbed their feelings about peacefulness); (2) ways in which their families function to promote and maintain peace at home and elsewhere; and (3) changes that would make their lives more peaceful.</td>
<td>Positive feelings (joy, happiness, caused by calm, tranquil environment). Interpersonal Relationships &amp; skills (communication and problem solving, Cooperation, Sharing, Caring, harmony, respect of difference). Negative peace - no fighting, no violence, no war, no hatred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Description</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Countries</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>Key Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Location/Subject</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Findings/Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berents, H. (2014)</td>
<td>Colombia Ages 10-17</td>
<td>Interviews, PO Peace building/education</td>
<td>Everyday choices, the sites they inhabit e.g. home, school, the community centre, relationships with family, friends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>