Challenges and perspectives of Peace Education in schools: The role of music

Alberto Cabedo-Mas

University Jaume I of Castellón, Spain

Abstract

This article addresses some of the major issues of Peace Education in schools and relates music and music education to this field of knowledge. Music can be a tool to contribute to building peace. Throughout history, music and musical practices have been used to enhance relationships; learning and sharing music has been used to transform realities in diverse ways. In this regard, the article aims to review major concerns of Peace Education in relation to music in schools, to encourage teachers to promote musical practices aimed at transforming societies and to offer examples of different projects that have made use of music education to contribute to peacebuilding.

Key words: Music, Peace Education, school curriculum, intercultural understanding, community.

Australian Journal of Music Education 2015:1, 76-86

Introduction

In the last decades, concerns about how can music education contribute to students' comprehensive training have arisen in some educational contexts. In many countries, educational policies have recently reviewed the place and role of the arts and music in the curriculum. Therefore, schools have often undertaken efforts to adapt music and arts education to social realities and needs. Educational authorities determine certain cross-curricular priorities that need to be addressed throughout schooling to enable the development of students' general competences. These priorities are context-based but, in most cases, include concerns in the line of promoting social cohesion and coexistence. Every society focus efforts in building sustainable communities that aim to enhance peaceful relationships between people and nature; in this regard Peace education can play an important role, and music has a place in

it. The need to adapt music education to these cross-curricular priorities is indeed challenging.

Every day, children receive artistic stimuli that encapsulate values, ideology and social behavioural patterns. Teachers are generally aware of this issue and they adapt concerns to help students to critically face and manage these stimuli within their educational practices. Music education practices in schools have evolved significantly during the last years. Educational academics and practitioners highlight the need to broadening artistic experiences in school to include the most diverse range of artistic expressions and practices and to integrate music making in comprehensive projects that, together with learning music, enable students to develop different general competences to creatively adapt to the society. Teachers generally show affirmative perceptions on the use of the arts for these aims; however, often fears on how to manage it successfully arise.

What is Peace Education about?

The role of education in peacebuilding has been deeply studied and reviewed (UNICEF, 2011). There are different ways to understand what entails the concept of Peace Education. The idea of including Peace Education in schools has changed underpinnings and approaches on what is peace and why it is important to address it with students. Harris (2004) refers to the notion of Peace Education by pointing the action of teachers teaching about what peace is, why peace does not exist and how it is possible to achieve. In this regard, the aim of Peace Education includes teaching about the challenges of searching and achieving peaceful relationships, developing non-violent skills and enhancing attitudes towards peace.

The idea of explaining what peace is remains complex. Traditionally, the concept of peace has been intrinsically linked to the notion of violence. Peace had been understood as an antagonism of war and, for that reason, peace studies emerged in the academic field of polemology and the analysis of violence. Internationally acknowledged as the father of peace studies, Johan Galtung (1996) defines three kind of violence, that is, the *direct*, the *structural* – the existence of oppressive and unequal socio-economic and political relationships – and the *cultural* – including aspects of culture, in the symbolic sphere of the experience and materialised in the religion, ideology, language, art, empiric and formal sciences, symbols such as crosses, medals, anthems, flags, etc., that can be used to justify or legitimate direct or structural violence. The notion of conflict has been related to violence. However, a number of researchers address that whether the conflicts are inherent to human nature, violence is not necessarily so and, even conflicts may cause sufferings, people are competent to peacefully and positively transform them, in order a conflict can become an opportunity to learn and develop (París Albert, 2009).

Peace is therefore more than the absence of war and includes overcoming, reducing, managing and avoiding any kind of violence, direct, cultural or structural; and it also relates to our abilities to transform conflicts into creative opportunities of encounter, communication, adaptation and interchange (Fisas, 2011). As peace depends on relationships between people with themselves and with nature, is it not possible to talk about one specific way to define peace. Martínez Guzmán (2001) notes that there is not only one way to understand peace, but rather there are as many ways of making peace as there are different people and cultures. Consequently, imagining one unique way to talk about peace in Peace Education would necessary fall into hegemonic discourses to determine what peaceful and violent relationships should include. Discourses of peace need necessarily an interdisciplinary and intercultural perspective. The implications on peaceful relationships and peaceful coexistence need to be addressed from a holistic and comprehensive approach. The processes of configuring values that match with a culture for peace need to take into consideration the values of different social groups through a rich reciprocity. This enables the establishment of solidarity relationships and allows cultures to be opened and able to integrate new knowledge, ideas, traditions and habits. The process of assimilation of values from other cultures is the one that enriches each single culture (Morin, 1999).

Relationship is therefore the core of the process of constructing our personal and cultural identities. Human beings often build – and perform (Butler, 1988) – their identities by identifying what they feel and act they are and are not in reference and in opposition to others. Acknowledging cultural pluralism is an enrichment factor to enable people to reflect on what kind of relationship can lead people to build and act identities to enhance positive relationships. Co-relating with people is complex in itself, and cooperation is the base of every relationship.

However, as Muñoz (2004) notes, the concept of peace is itself dynamic and complex, based on the need to promote people's capacities and to cover their needs. Although there is an intrinsic complexity in people's relationships, solidarity is the basis of most of human's interactions. Most of the conflicts that arise every day are pacifically managed and transformed, and most of the actions that people undertake within a conflict are aimed at creating peace. The notion of *imperfect peace* is understood as a category that recognise the conflicts in which people and human groups decide to strengthen the development of the others' capacities, without any alien cause to their wills that impede this development (Muñoz, 2004, p. 23).

To enable pacific relationships, interaction must be based of principles of justice, civility and recognition. The Hegelian idea of the recognition is interpreted by Honneth (1996), who argues that the cultural and social conflicts are not only considered as a result for the struggle caused by material interests in opposition, but also for the struggle for recognition that arises as a response of disrespectful experiences or those denying people's identity.

As the quote traditionally attributed to Gandhi reads, "there is no way to peace, peace is the way", the concept of peace is not related to *a way* of understanding and living together, but linked to the joint process of look towards the model of living we want, being always aware that it will never be concluded or absolute; in every step we move to cover needs, improve capabilities and enhance coexistence, we are creating peace. Therefore, as UNICEF upholds, Peace Education refers to "the process of promoting the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values needed to bring about behaviour changes that will enable children, youth and adults to prevent conflict and violence, both overt and structural; to resolve conflict peacefully; and to create the conditions conducive to peace, whether at an intrapersonal, interpersonal, intergroup, national or international level" (Fountain, 1999, p. i).

Why Peace Education is important in schools?

While referring to Peace Education in schools, the Spanish educator Tuvilla Rayo (2004) defines education as a human task that is centred in the dialogue between the actors, focused on the learning that favours the understanding of the world, the optimal development of each one's personality and the best possible way to use the individual and collective abilities to face with creativity and success the real problems of a society with constant and rapid changes. The school plays an important role for the construction of communities that raise awareness in permanently focusing on enhancing peaceful relationships between people and with the nature. Adopting the constructivist notion of Peace Education, school is a powerful space to build new meanings on what peace is, and how do people address it, exploring intercultural notions of what entails to cover needs, develop capacities and promote positive coexistence. However, is it necessary to teach peace if we are not in a war?

War is indeed the most extreme reality of all kinds of violence, and the role of school in peacebuilding in contexts of war and post-war has been deeply analysed (Bretherton, Weston, & Zbar, 2003; Maoz, 2000; Markovich, 2015; Spink, 2005). In settings where violence is explicitly generalised, Peace Education has undoubtedly a significant role, and peace educators have an important challenge in helping students to deal with horrific forms of violence, like ecocide, genocide, modern warfare, ethnic hatred, racism, sexual abuse, etc., and promote attitudes towards social reconstruction and reconciliation (McGlynn, Zembylas, Bekerman, & Gallagher, 2009). In such realities, it is important that "peace educators point out problems of violence and instruct their pupils about strategies that can address those problems, hence empowering them to redress the circumstances that can lead to violent conflict. In schools and community settings they impart to their students the values of planetary stewardship,

global citizenship and humane relations" (Harris, 2004, p. 5).

However, besides the aim for the elimination of any kind of violence, Peace Education works in different areas of interest such as conflict transformation – including also those interpersonal and intrapersonal – democracy, human rights, interculturality, emotional education, development studies and, in general, worldview positive transformation. Addressing peace in the school should at first refer to the immediate group of people sharing the community, that is, the classroom. Peace Education needs to focus primarily on fostering democratic behaviours in the classroom and including the emotional dimensions in educational practices, enabling education to adapt to the society. It seeks the promotion of attitudes towards enhancing coexistence between the individuals, in and beyond the classroom. Environmental education needs to be also included to promote attitudes towards respecting and caring nature.

Our societies are plural; as a result, the educational communities and, in them, our classrooms are spaces of connection between individuals from different social collectives. The wish to establish the classroom as a *community of communication* (Martínez Guzmán, 2005, p. 67) needs an intercultural approach to enable multiple debates to explore ways to create peaceful cultures, and that can address topics such as the elimination of prejudices and the enhancement of attitudes towards tolerance. In this regard, the role of the school in values formation for tolerance in intercultural settings includes addressing topics such as recognising the interactions that take place between cultures and the values attached to them, avoiding and exploring the hidden relations of dominances and enhancing the status of migrant's cultures, constantly challenging ethnocentric discourses, promoting pluralistic approach to the acquisition of knowledge or recognising the potential of the arts to develop an appreciation of different cultures, among many others (Reardon, 1994, p. 30).

Peace Education aims at transmitting knowledge and attitudes which lead towards legitimation and reification and, thus, knowledge that expects to be assumed as a common truth and subscribing certain ideological principles; it therefore cannot be shaped as a neutral discourse. The school has great responsibility in the reproduction and legitimation of values attached to peace, conflict and coexistence. Indeed, as Harber and Sakade (2009) state, "there is a growing international literature on the different ways in which schools both reproduce violence by failing to tackling it but also actively perpetrate it through the activities of educational systems and individual teachers. … Moreover, schools also play a significant role in the reproduction of 'structural violence'" (p. 172). It is important to acknowledge that, despite teachers cannot eliminate conflicts, as they are inherent to human beings, they can provide students with valuable skills in transforming these conflicts in opportunities for growth and development. Harris (2004) highlights five postulates for Peace Education: "1. it explains the roots of violence; 2. it teaches alternatives to violence; 3. it adjusts to cover different forms of violence; 4. peace itself is a process that varies according to context; 5. conflict is omnipresent" (p. 6).

The international organisation Teachers Without Borders (2010) highlights the key principles to ensure Peace Education in schools is aimed at creating more democratic environments and including diverse perspectives. These key principles include: "(1) A learning environment where both teacher and students teach and learn from one another through equitable dialogue; (2) Combining academic study with practical application towards societal transformation; (3) Analysing issues in a holistic way that accounts for the past, present, and future, and includes the personal, local and global levels; and (4) Promoting values such as compassion, equality, interdependence, diversity, sustainability and nonviolence". In most educational settings, Peace Education does not have a scheduled

presence within school curricula; it is often not seen as a subject itself by the educational agencies. Furthermore, a great number of project workers and educational actors noticed as an inconvenience that schools cannot often devote time for Peace Education (Harber & Sakade, 2009, p. 180). In this regard, diverse perspectives support the idea of integrating a subject that includes concepts and practices in relation to Peace Education in schools; other approaches refer to the need for Peace Education to become a cross-curricular priority to be taught across the whole school curriculum and integrated in each and every subject. The most referred approach in this regards is the one that understands the role for Peace Education in schools as a combination of knowledge, skills and attitudes (Galtung, 2008; Reardon, 1988).

How can music education contribute to Peace education?

Music education is currently facing multiple challenges. The concept of *music* is experiencing a rapid technological, expressive and conceptual change and it can be seen in the effects it has on its production, distribution and reception realms. Therefore, music cannot be understood decontextualized of the technological changes, mercantilism, different sociocultural meanings, stylistic expressions, ethnic identities or opposite discourses (Lines, 2006). Consequently, music education cannot omit this fact.

In the analysis on how music education could contribute to peace within schools, it is important to deconstruct the idyllic idea that music creates automatically peace itself. In many cultures exists the popular knowledge that reinforces the ability of music to reduce violence in certain situations; and, indeed, the familiar phrase "Music has charms to soothe a savage beast" has undoubtedly potential truth and leads to explore real possibilities for music to enhance peaceful spaces. However, as Kent (2008) notes, music is not peaceful or violent by itself, but it can be

violent or peaceful depending on the use people do. In an interview conducted with internationally renowned music educators, that aimed to bring together ideas on what educators believe music can contribute to peacebuilding and how it can be addressed in the music classroom (Cabedo-Mas, 2012), the British music educator Lucy Green explained:

> Music is fundamental to human society and indeed human nature. So as far as we know, there has never been a society or any kind of community of human beings that didn't have music. So if what we consider to be natural could include those things which don't change in the world, those things which happen without science or some other kind of human intervention, then we can say that making music is natural to humanity. Now, just because something is natural doesn't mean to say that it is good for us. Illness is natural and similarly lots of other bad things, but having said that music is natural, usually, it is also good for us. Of course, music can be used in conflict, to increase conflict. For example, the US-American army sometimes use very loud rock music as a form of torture or to intimidate or annoy the enemy. So there's nothing necessary about music that makes it harmonious. However, in most cases music, as it happens, is used to promote social harmony, a sense of community, and a sense of togetherness. It can have very major effects on this. (p. 362)

In line with the use of art to promote peace or violence, the renowned pedagogue Lev Vygotski understood art as a catalyst of emotions that need to be controlled by human beings. Referring to military music, Vygotski (1971) specified that its aim is not to stimulate warlike emotions but, in establishing a balance between the organism and the environment in a critical moment, it helps to organise the work, provide a relief to the emotions, banish the fears and promote courage and bravery. Art, he says, never generates a practical action, but prepares the organism for this action.

Music is a discourse that can be shaped to unite or divide people. There is power on

how this discourse is articulated and, as Kent (2008) upholds, it can lead to a voice for defiant insurrection to power structures, not only through the lyrics and texts associated to music, but also by configuring based on a contrasting style to the music that connotes the dominant discourse. And music can also be a testimony of experienced and imagined events, and as a source of knowledge that allows us to build the social reality, also enables reflection on our surroundings (Sanfeliu, 2008). Communicating through music can foster the interconnections of different people or communities and this process enables enriching the cultural knowledge and heritage and creating understanding and positive and meaningful attitudes. As the Irish music educator John O'Flynn commentated in the interviews above mentioned (Cabedo-Mas, 2012), "music making and responding can connect people in real time, in virtual time, across communities and across social categories – it also connects with communities of the past and holds potential for future social impact" (p. 365).

Recognising other cultures, taking the aforementioned Honnethian (1996) concept of recognition, has been often promoted through music and art forms, as art and music enables the creation of intercultural spaces - workshops, associations, schools, academies, exhibitions, concerts – that promote integration and favour the elimination of social prejudices and the increasing of self-esteem (Díez Jorge, 2004). The role of music and music education in reducing and eliminating cultural prejudices has been widely explored (Bradley, 2006; Gergis, 1993; Siankope & Villa, 2004). The contribution of some elements of the cultural heritage to the joint musical dialogue can be thence a link to positive communication and transcultural cooperation; if intercultural fusion music is organic, can be a celebration of creativity, adaptability and human diversity (Cohen, 2008). The process of experiencing music making is often understood through the perspective of organisational parameters which reflect certain social structuring models; sometimes

different conceptions of cultural structures and knowledge reproduce and legitimate different ways in organising music ensembles and people's approach to music. Multiple studies in the anthropology, musicology, ethnomusicology or music education fields have analysed musical practices in different cultures as means of social structure and organisation (Blacking, 1967; De Zoete, 1953, 1957; Mead, 1970; Small, 1977).

Considering the idea of the ability of musical discourses to shape cultural identities, the capacity for music to generate common identity links that can foster the self-association shows music's potentiality to become integrative. Although music's integrative power can be lead to destructive power, when the construction of common identities in relation to musical discourses becomes domineering and, therefore, does not recognise different music forms. This will not respect the individual or group identity of diverse persons or communities and will turn music discourse into a vehicle of exclusion or domination. Acknowledging the importance of the cultural knowledge embedded in music forms we can overcome the exclusive limits on focusing on *what* people say, not say or make, and to incorporate in the communicative rationality the consideration on *how* people say, not say or make to other people and to the nature (Martínez Guzmán, 2001).

Taking the aforementioned into consideration, arts and music discourses and practices have had an impact on people's lives, ways to engage with their social and cultural realities and relate to other people or communities. Alex Ross (2007), in his book *The Rest is Noise,* illustrates the influence of music in history by presenting a series of occurrences that shape not so much a history of twentieth-century music but a history of the twentieth century through its music. Throughout the history, we can find multiple examples of the use of arts and, specifically, music as an instrument of conflict transformation (Bergh & Sloboda, 2010; Skyllstad, 1997; Urbain, 2008), as a way to enhance post-war reconciliation (Lederach, 2005; Lederach

& Lederach, 2010), or as a tool to promote resilience (Brader, 2011; Brader & Luke, 2013). In the following subsection some of the challenges and practices for schools to acknowledge Peace Education through music are explored.

How can music teachers incorporate Peace Education in schools?

Music has the power to heal, communicate and affirm our self. It also has the power to transform self and our understanding of our self in relation to other people and cultures. All this is intrinsic. For music experience to be meaningful and for it to lead to transformation in these kinds of positive ways and to educate character at the core of this is simply recognition of this idea. Music is intrinsically motivated – if I have a child in a room with a drum, the child will hit the drum. If we do nothing else then we should not get in the way of the child's desire for playfulness with sonic materials. (Dillon, 2007, pp. 229-230)

To explore the possibilities for music to become an optimal vehicle to contribute to Peace Education in schools it is necessary to reflect on the underpinnings of music education in our culture that, in most cases, have been reproduced in schools. Music education has undeniable positive elements that contribute to a comprehensive education and school takes an active role to adapt them. However, in many cases, some interesting aspects of potential uses of music to enhance coexistence have been not adapted in the music classroom. In Western societies, structures of music performance strengthen the musician-listener dichotomy, promoting the cultural authenticity of those musical practices in which the musician (composer, performer) communicates in a unidirectional way with the listener or consumer; throughout the musical performance, each one knows what is his or her role in the process and what practices should he or she assume to *correctly* act in consequence. Schools often help to reproduce and legitimate these

practices which, as studied, among others, by the aforementioned researchers (Blacking, 1967; De Zoete, 1953, 1957; Mead, 1970; Small, 1977) are not universal. By understanding music as a social praxis that, in terms to make the most of its socialising and positive communicative possibilities, can become a vehicle to connect people and enhance peace, music education should make the effort to turn *presentational* musical practices into *participatory* practices that lead students to share active music making (Regelski, 2004, 2005, 2009; Turino, 2008). Discussing about participatory music for enhancing peaceful coexistence (Cabedo-Mas & Díaz-Gómez, 2015), the renowned music educator Thomas Regelski pointed out:

If social integration and peaceful coexistence are meant, presentational music needs to be downplayed in favour of participatory musicking of various kinds. At the very least, a large dose of the latter is needed to compensate for the social segregation (in-groups, taste publics, etc.) and hierarchies created by the former (especially "classical" music). In my experience, students who, for whatever reason, are interested in presentational performance seem to get their needs addressed by community (community music schools or private lessons) or school based (public or voluntary) instruction or ensembles. The vast majority of students who don't want to play standard orchestral instruments, but who often would eagerly study other instruments (everything from guitar to locally popular ethnic instruments) are typically ignored in schools. Schools, instead, should be meeting the needs of such students and thereby advancing the quantity and quality of musicking in a society and the contributory role of musicking to sociality and integration. Similarly, forms of musicking that do not focus on the usual conditions of presentational performing (e.g., most music apps for iPhone, iPads, etc.), are also ignored (e.g., various composition and other software), as are the ample forms of musicking already taking place in the community (drumming circles, steel drum bands, karaoke, sing-alongs, etc.). These, too, should be promoted by schools.

Incorporating participatory musicking in schools that, at the same time, make an effort to integrate and respect musical identities of the students has indeed challenges. The figure of the teacher is essential to promote authentic musical practices that enable sharing positive experiences among the students. Today, in our globalised societies, musical diversity goes beyond cultural diversity, as musical identity, understood as an organic identity, is not necessarily constructed according to geographical or cultural boundaries. In classrooms, students from the same cultural context may exhibit a huge musical diversity (Cabedo-Mas & Díaz-Gómez, 2013). For this reason, the teacher cannot be expert in every musical style that shapes the tastes and identities of every student. However, it is important for the teacher to be sensible to different musical genres and, with a receptive attention, to be able to understand different practices and to recognise the different idiomatic variations. The teacher should be interested in the musical activities of his or her surroundings, an active listener that also likes to sing, play, dance, compose, improvise or use technology to transmit sensibility and emotion towards music listening and practicing (Díaz-Gómez, 2014; Swanwick, 1988). In his study about *music, meaning and transformation*, the music educator Steve Dillon suggested the teachers to reflect on three main questions to promote students to engage with music practices that can be transformative:

I began by asking where music in your life is. Before we know what motivates children and indeed any other characters we hope to educate we need to know about the intrinsic motivations, values and tensions in our own musical lives. We need to identify what gives us flow and what has sustained our interest and allowed it to grow so that we engage with music making in our lives as natural part of it. From here I questioned, where is music in the life of a child? What are the locations of meaning? Who influenced it? What contexts and people nurture connections with music making which lead to transformation? I then asked where music is in the life of a school. I suggested an alternative here—one which sees a school not as an artificial environment but as a community where music can serve a purpose beyond education alone to serve community and foster belonging, social inclusion and identity. (Dillon, 2007, p. 218)

The role of the teacher is therefore to become a cultural manager (Dillon, 2005), to observe students practices and interests and, without the need to be the only music expert in the classroom, but integrating students' knowledge, to promote participation and sharing positive musical experiences. Teachers can focus efforts in promoting students to successfully approach to new musical materials that may introduce into their practices, to enhance attitudes towards self and peer learning (Green, 2008), to critically approach to music and music education resources that students may find in internet, to raise positive attitudes towards sharing music and to discover possibilities for engaging with the community and with friends through music making. Quoted directly from the words of John O'Flynn - available in Cabedo-Mas and Díaz-Gómez (2015) -, "while the music educator may not necessarily wish to or may not be in a position to oppose dominant trends, she or he may help students negotiate their way through established music curricula and their attendant cultural values (whatever shape or hue those curricula might take), by periodically introducing students to musicians, genres and perspectives that are 'other' to the mainstream, and through building on their capacity for self-awareness and reflection".

The stimuli of creativity need to be present in educational practices. Teachers have the responsibility to awakening initial students' interests and engagement with music. Despite the importance of the family environment to shape children's first contact with musical experiences (Hemsy de Gainza, 1964), teachers play a significant role in children's first encounter with formal musical life and with their musical experiences sharing with friends. Teachers need to focus on promoting this encounter to become

a motivating and fascinating experience. Artistic experience and creativity, when raised from a celebratory and playful action that can be a link of communication between people, open a way to aesthetical appreciation, education and personal development. The prejudices, fears, educational recipes and obsolete education are set aside to give space to the light, new, clear and to emotion (Díaz Rodríguez & Humanes, 2009). In regards to emotional education, the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL, 2015), which aims to help make evidence-based social and emotional learning an integral part of education from preschool through school, has developed guides for effective social and emotional learning programs both in preschool and elementary education, and in middle and high schools. The *Peace Education Foundation* (http://www.peace-ed.org) held Select Program recognition from CASEL since 2008.

Emotional development, creativity, engagement, participation, sharing and many others are concepts that illustrate underpinnings to facilitate teachers to enable music education in schools aimed at promoting interpersonal and social coexistence, and to exchange musical practices that lead to create peaceful spaces in and beyond the classroom. In short, as Lucy Green explained in the aforementioned group of interviews (Cabedo-Mas & Díaz-Gómez, 2015), the idea of making and experiencing music would be the best attitude the teacher could undertake:

> I would say the best theoretical approach is to regard music-making as being the heart of music education and to regard the musical taste and identity of the student as also being at the heart of music education, and to build from both music-making and the musical tastes and identities of the students from there outwards and beyond that, so that having gained the trust of the students, teachers can then take them into new realms of music that they haven't previously come across; and through that, give them musical insight into other cultures and religions and geographical areas and historical eras as well, that they might not be able to encounter in quite the same way otherwise.

Multiple educational projects dealing with music to work for peacebuilding have been developed in and outside schools. Educational initiatives have been developed to eliminate prejudices and to enhance intercultural attitudes (Baird, 2001; Cohen Evron, 2007; Schippers, 2010; Skyllstad, 1997). Amazing projects have been developed to enable music education to become a tool for integration and development, such as *El Sistema – National Network of Youth and Children Orchestras of Venezuela* (http://fundamusical.org. ve/), the association *Música en los barrios [Music in the neighbourhoods]* in Nicaragua (http:// www.c3mundos.org/musica-en-los-barrios), the *Network of Youth and Children Orchestras of Argentina* (http://www.sistemadeorquestas.org. ar/), the *Batuta Foundation* in Colombia (http:// www.fundacionbatuta.org/), the *Watoto Choir* in Uganda (http://www.watoto.com/the-choir), the *Association of Musicians for Peace and Integration* in Spain (http://www.musicspauintegracio.org/ index.php?lang=ca), the *Harmony in Strings Program* in Australia (McFerran & Crooke, 2014), and many others.

Broadening the borders of schools and including the surrounding communities in artistic and educational practices is undoubtedly a way of increasing students' engagement with positive musical experiences. Most of the projects that deal with music making to building peace, like those aforementioned, often promote participation with formal educational settings in different ways. Integrating community music practices (Higgins, 2012) and habits to learn music in school realms foster multiple ways of participation of schools in the society. Despite the assumption that every cooperative process to enable participation between schools and communities is complex and conflictive itself, communities tend to be normally opened to participation and schools often gain social recognition as a result of these practices.

The teacher sits at the core of all these processes which are indeed challenging; but teachers have the power to transform their surrounding realities in more positive societies by enabling a community

where music can serve a purpose beyond education alone to serve community and foster belonging, social inclusion, identity and improved peaceful coexistence in and beyond the classroom.

References

Baird, P. J. (2001). *Children's song-makers as messengers of hope: Participatory research with implications for teacher educators.* (Doctoral Dissertation), University of San Francisco.

Bergh, A., & Sloboda, J. (2010). Music and art in conflict transformation: A review. *Music and arts in action, 2*(2), 2-18.

Blacking, J. (1967). *Venda children's song: A study in ethnomusicological analysis*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrans University Press.

Brader, A. (Ed.). (2011). *Songs of Resilience*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Brader, A., & Luke, A. (2013). Re-engaging marginalized youth through digital music production: performance, audience and evaluation. *Pedagogies: An International Journal, 8*(3), 197-214.

Bradley, D. (2006). Music education, multiculturalism and anti-racism: Can we talk? *Action, criticism, and theory for music education, 5*(2), 2-30.

Bretherton, D., Weston, J., & Zbar, V. (2003). Peace education in a post-conflict environment: The case of Sierra Leone. *Prospects, 33*(2), 219-230.

Butler, J. (1988). Performative acts and gender constitution: An essay in phenomenology and feminist theory. *Theatre journal, 40*(4), 519-531.

Cabedo-Mas, A. (2012). *Music and social coexistence: A study on music education and its implications in the dialogue between people and cultures.* (Doctoral dissertation), University Jaume I, Castellon.

Cabedo-Mas, A., & Díaz-Gómez, M. (2013). Positive musical experiences in education: Music as a social praxis. *Music Education Research*, 1-16.

Cabedo-Mas, A., & Díaz-Gómez, M. (2015). Music education for the improvement of coexistence in and beyond the classroom: A study based on the consultation of experts. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*.

Cohen, C. (2008). Music: A Universal Language? In O. Urbin (Ed.), *Music and Conflict Transformation. Harmonies and Dissonances in Geopolitics* (pp. 26-39). New York: I.B.Tauris.

Cohen Evron, N. (2007). Conflict and Peace: Challenges for Arts Educators. In L. Bresler (Ed.), *International Handbook of Research in Arts Education* (pp. 1031-1054). Dordrecht: Springer.

Collaborative for Academic Social and Emotional Learning. (2015). The CASEL Guide Effective Social and Emotional Learning Programs. Retrieved 6 July, 2015, from http://www.casel.org/guide

De Zoete, B. (1953). *The Other Mind: A Study of Dance and Life in South India*. London: Theatre Arts Book.

De Zoete, B. (1957). *Dance and magic drama in Ceylon*. London: Faber and Faber.

Díaz-Gómez, M. (2014). Enseñar música en el siglo XXI. In A. Giráldez Hayes (Ed.), *Didáctica de la música en primaria* (pp. 13-30). Madrid: Editorial Síntesis.

Díaz Rodríguez, S., & Humanes, E. (2009). Taller de creatividad. Analogías musicales: punto y línea. *Eufonía. Didáctica de la música, 47*, 7-19.

Díez Jorge, E. (2004). Arte y Paz. In M. López Martínez (Ed.), *Enciclopedia de Paz y Conflictos* (pp. 69-72). Granada: Universidad de Granada.

Dillon, S. C. (2005). The music teacher as Cultural Manager (English translation from Spanish) Construir comunidades culturalmente sostenibles mediante actividades musicales expresivas. *Revista Electrónica Complutense de Investigación en Educación Musical, 2*(3), 1-10.

Dillon, S. C. (2007). *Music, Meaning and Transformation. Meaningful Music Making for Life*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Fisas, V. (2011). *Educar para una Cultura de Paz*. Barcelona: Escola de Cultura de Pau.

Fountain, S. (1999). *Peace Education in UNICEF*. New York: UNICEF.

Galtung, J. (1996). *Peace with peaceful means: Peace and conflict, development and civilization*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Galtung, J. (2008). Form and content of peace education. In M. Bajaj (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of peace education* (pp. 49-58). Charlotte, N.C.: IAP-Information Age Publishing.

Gergis, S. (1993). The power of women musicians in the ancient and near East: The roots of prejudice. *British Journal of Music Education, 10*(03), 189-196.

Green, L. (2008). *Music, Informal Learning and the School: A New Classroom Pedagogy*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Harber, C., & Sakade, N. (2009). Schooling for violence and peace: how does peace education differ from 'normal' schooling? *Journal of Peace Education, 6*(2), 171-187.

Harris, I. M. (2004). Peace education theory. *Journal of Peace Education, 1*(1), 5-20.

Hemsy de Gainza, V. (1964). *La iniciación musical del niño*. Buenos Aires: Ricordi.

Higgins, L. (2012). *Community music: In theory and in practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Honneth, A. (1996). *The struggle for recognition: The moral grammar of social conflicts*. Cambridge, MA: Mit Press.

Kent, G. (2008). Unpeaceful Music. In O. Urbin (Ed.), *Music and Conflict Transformation. Harmonies and Dissonances in Geopolitics*. New York: I.B.Tauris.

Lederach, J. P. (2005). *The moral imagination: The art and soul of building peace*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lederach, J P., & Lederach, A. J. (2010). *When Blood and Bones Cry Out: Journeys Through the Soundscape of Healing and Reconciliation*. St Lucia: University of Queensland Press.

Lines, D. K. (2006). *Music education for the new millennium: Theory and practice futures for music teaching and learning*. Milton: Wiley-Blackwell.

Maoz, I. (2000). An Experiment in Peace: Reconciliation-Aimed Workshops of Jewish-Israeli and Palestinian Youth. *Journal of Peace Research, 37*(6), 721-736.

Markovich, D. Y. (2015). The personal as political: the function of the private space in contextualizing the 'other' in Jewish–Palestinian encounters. *Journal of Peace Education, 12*(2), 167-181.

Martínez Guzmán, V. (2001). *Filosofía para hacer las paces*. Barcelona: Icaria.

Martínez Guzmán, V. (2005). *Podemos hacer las paces. Reflexiones éticas tras el 11-S y el 11-M*. Bilbao: Desclée De Brower.

McFerran, K. S., & Crooke, A. H. D. (2014). Enabling Tailored Music Programs in Elementary Schools: An Australian Exemplar. *Journal of Education and Training Studies, 2*(4), 138-147.

McGlynn, C., Zembylas, M., Bekerman, Z., & Gallagher, T. (Eds.). (2009). *Peace education in conflict and post-conflict societies: Comparative perspectives*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mead, M. (1970). Children and Ritual in Bali. In J. Belo (Ed.), *Traditional Balinese Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Morin, E. (1999). *Seven complex lessons in education for the future* Paris: UNESCO.

Muñoz, F. A. (2004). Una paz compleja, conflictiva e imperfecta. In F. A. Muñoz (Ed.), *Una paz compleja y conflictiva*. Granada.

París Albert, S. (2009). *Filosofía de los conflictos: una teoría para su transformación pacífica*. Barcelona: Icaria.

Reardon, B. A. (1988). *Comprehensive Peace Education: Educating for Global Responsibility*. New York and London: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Reardon, B. A. (1994). *Tolerance: the threshold of peace. A teaching/learning guide for education for peace, human rights and democracy*. Paris: UNESCO.

Regelski, T. A. (2004). Social theory, and music and music education as praxis. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education, 3*(3), 2-52.

Regelski, T. A. (2005). Music and Music Education: Theory and praxis for 'making a difference'. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 37*(1), 7-27.

Regelski, T. A. (2009). Curriculum Reform: Reclaiming "Music" as Social Praxis. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education, 8*(1), 66-84.

Ross, A. (2007). *The rest is noise: Listening to the twentieth century*: Farrar Straus & Giroux.

Sanfeliu, A. (2008). La música i la pau. Retrieved 2 July, 2015, from http://escolapau.uab.cat/img/programas/musica/la_musica_la_paz.pdf

Schippers, H. (2010). *Facing the Music: Shaping Music Education from a Global Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford Univ Press.

Siankope, J., & Villa, O. (2004). *Música e interculturalidad*. Madrid: Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia, Los Libros de la Catarata.

Skyllstad, K. (1997). Music in conflict management—a multicultural approach. *International Journal of Music Education, 29*(1), 73-80.

Small, C. (1977). *Music, Society and Education*. Hanover: Wesleyan University Press.

Spink, J. (2005). Education and politics in Afghanistan: The importance of an education system in peacebuilding and reconstruction. *Journal of Peace Education, 2*(2), 195-207.

Swanwick, K. (1988). *Music, mind and education*. London: Routledge.

Teachers Without Borders. (2010). What is Peace Education? Retrieved 24/06/2015, from http://teacherswithoutborders.org/page/what-peace-education

Turino, T. (2008). *Music as Social Life: The Politics of Participation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tuvilla Rayo, J. (2004). Cultura de Paz y Educación. In F. A. Muñoz (Ed.), *Manual de Paz y Conflictos* (pp. 389-425). Granada: Universidad de Granada.

UNICEF. (2011). *The Role of Education in Peacebuilding: Literature Review*. New York: United Nations Children's Fund.

Urbain, O. (Ed.). (2008). *Music and Conflict Transformation: Harmonies and Dissonances in Geopolitics*. New York: I.B.Tauris.

Vygotski, L. S. (1971). *The Psychology of art*. Boston: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.

Alberto Cabedo Mas teaches at the University Jaume I of Castellón, Spain. He studied music, speciality in violin, at the Conservatorio Superior de Música in Castellón and got a Master's Degree in Music at the Estonian Academy of Music and Theatre, in Tallinn, Estonia, and a Master's Degree in Peace Studies, Conflict and Development at the University Jaume I, Spain. He obtained his PhD at this University. He is author of several books and publications in academic journals. His research interests include music education, musical heritage, coexistence, interculturality and the transmission of music across cultures.