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Counseling professionals are informed and guided in professional
development, research and practice by the relevant professional organizations that
derline{endorse} the field’s professional, ethical, and competency standards. Amidst the
contemporary professional proclamations of multicultural- and social justice
counseling as professional grounding principles, is also the directive to promote and
engage in peace building. Although the notion of peace building appear to be
conceptually congruent with the multicultural and social justice counseling
competencies; peace building concepts and issues, and research on nonviolence,
reconciliation, democratization, and conflict transformation, are as yet unchartered
notions in the counselor education literature.

The purpose of this study was thus to begin to address the paucity in the
counselor education literature with an initial quantitative and qualitative exploration
of the unique manifestation of peace building in counselor education. The quantitative
and qualitative research methodology incorporated an online survey and follow-up
qualitative interviews. The exploration gauged the study participants’
conceptualization of how peace building is manifested, and the opportunities and
challenges specific to the field of counselor education in promoting and engaging in
the practice of peace building.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the influence of:

My doctoral committee, Dr. S. M. Hedstrom, Dr. K. R. Blaisure, and Dr. R. O. Brinkerhoff, for their professional and scholarly guidance;
The South African Fulbright Commission for engendering the opportunity;
My spouse, Martin Neethling, for his relentless encouragement; and
The South African peacemakers, peace builders, and peace keepers, who continue to serve as role models for local and global initiatives in conflict transformation and reconciliation.

Jenny Ritha Keller
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS** .......................................................................................... ii

**LIST OF TABLES** ....................................................................................................... v

**CHAPTER**

I. **INTRODUCTION** ..................................................................................... 1

  - Purpose of the Study ....................................................................... 4
  - Definitions........................................................................................ 5
  - Delineation of the Research ........................................................... 6
  - Significance and Limitations of the Study .................................... 8

II. **REVIEW OF THE RELEVANT LITERATURE** .......................... 10

  - Organization of the Chapter.......................................................... 10
  - Conceptualization of a Culture of Peace........................................ 10
  - Peace Building ................................................................................ 16
  - Psychology's Conceptualization of Peace Building ...................... 20
  - Counselor Education and Peace Building...................................... 24
  - Conclusion ....................................................................................... 30

III. **METHODOLOGY** .................................................................................... 32

  - Research Design.............................................................................. 34
  - Participants....................................................................................... 38
  - Data Collection ............................................................................... 40
  - Data Analysis .................................................................................. 41
  - Standards of Quality, Trustworthiness, and Credibility of the Results................................................................................................................. 43

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Table of Contents—continued

CHAPTER

IV. RESULTS ........................................................................................................ 45
   Online Survey .................................................................................................. 45
   Interviews ......................................................................................................... 69

V. CONCLUSION .................................................................................................. 87
   Counselor Education and Peace Building: Current Status ......................... 88
   Counselor Education and Peace Building: Future Directions ...................... 93

APPENDICES

A. Recruitment of Participants via the CESNET Listserv ................................. 102
B. Online Survey Consent Document ............................................................... 103
C. Online Survey ............................................................................................... 104
D. Email Script to Interview Participants ........................................................... 113
E. Invitation Letter to Interview Participants ................................................. 114
F. Interview Consent Document ......................................................................... 115
G. Interview Telephone Scripts .......................................................................... 116
H. Interview Questions ....................................................................................... 117
I. HSIRB Approval Letter ................................................................................... 118

BIBLIOGRAPHY .................................................................................................. 119
LIST OF TABLES

1. Counselor Educator Profile of the 60 Survey Participants ........................................ 47
2. Experience in Years as a Counselor Educator of the 60 Survey Participants .......................................................... 48
3. CACREP Accreditation and ACES Regions of the 60 Survey Participants ............................................................... 49
4. Ethnicity and Sex of the 60 Survey Participants .............................................................................................................. 50
5. Personal Experience in Peace Building of the Survey Participants ........................................................ 65
6. Survey Participants’ Rating of the Level of Alignment of Peace Building with the Professional Principles of Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling ........................................................ 66
7. Survey Participants’ Rating of the Relevance of the UNESCO Peace Building Action Areas for Counselor Education .......................................................... 67
8. Survey Participants’ Rating of Professional Expression of Peace Building in Teaching, Research, and Service/Volunteer Work .................................................. 68
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Counseling professionals are informed and guided in professional development, research and practice by the relevant professional organizations and affiliations that endorse professional, ethical, and competency standards. Although counselor development of, and competency in, multicultural knowledge, attitudes and skills are conceptualized and affirmed as professional grounding principles, an amplification of multiculturalism has been called for through the contemporary professional discourse of, and commitment to, advocacy- and social justice counseling (Arredondo & Perez, 2003; Jackson, 2000; Kiselica & Robinson, 2001; Lee & Walz, 1998; Lewis & Bradley, 2000; Lewis, Lewis, Daniels, & D’Andrea, 1998; Mays, 2000; Melton, 2000; Swenson, 1998; Vera & Speight, 2003). Multicultural competence is acknowledged as the foundation for social justice work in counseling, and facilitates client empowerment within disempowering social contexts. Social justice competencies propel multiculturism toward sociopolitical activism, systemic social change, the dismantlement of structural violence, and the promotion of human dignity, justice, and equity in terms of access, participation and opportunity.

Amidst the contemporary professional proclamations of multicultural- and social justice counseling is also the directive that “building global cultures of peace is a top priority” (Gerstein & Moeschberger, 2003, p. 117) and counselor educators are
encouraged to “modify their mission and curricula” in order to prepare counselors for this
“urgent task” (p. 115). The counseling profession’s concern with and initiatives in peace
building are at a juncture when international professional collaboration and discourse,
and global events accentuate the role and function of counseling in support of an
international culture of peace. For example, service to international mental health issues
and international counselor credentialing are identified as instrumental in globalizing the
counseling profession from the minority to the majority world (Clawson, 2004). The
pandemic repercussions of the terrorist events in the USA on September 11, 2001,
continue to consciensitize professional and civic peace movements to the atrocities of
cultural, structural, and direct violence. Contemporary scholarship in the field of peace
psychology and peace education, and the United Nations’ (UN) visionary leadership in
peace building serve as frameworks for the counseling profession’s contributions to the
international movement for the advancement of a global transition from “a culture of war
to a culture of peace” (Harris, 2003, p. 349).

An extant international peace movement, promoted and coordinated by the
leadership of the UN and the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural
Organization (UNESCO), with the collective objective of transforming the pernicious
inheritances of the 20th century, culminated in the inception of the 21st century as the
International Year for the Culture of Peace, and the first decade of the new millennium to
be the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Nonviolence for the Children of
the World. The last century was the “bloodiest in history” (Brenes & Wessels, 2001, p.
99) as evidenced by over twenty wars per annum, mainly ethnopolitical and genocidal in
nature, with more than two million conscripted child combatants, extensive
noncombatant casualties, maiming, and trauma, and with more than forty-two million
displaced peoples, most of them refugees (Anderson & Christie, 2001; Brenes &
Wessels, 2001; Ediger, 2003; Shapiro, 2002). The proliferation of direct and structural
violence, environmental destruction, and the polarization of wealth and resources, has
relegated a quarter of the world’s peoples to poverty, disenfranchisement, and
incapacitated to functionally satisfy basic human needs (Anderson & Christie, 2001;
Brenes & Wessels, 2001; Ediger, 2003; Shapiro, 2002).

The UN Millennium Declaration for building a worldwide culture of peace to
address the global human suffering, sociopolitical injustice, and militarism is based on
principles such as the protection and promotion of human rights, equality, freedom,
tolerance, nonviolence, solidarity, and sustainable development. UNESCO’s action
program for a peace culture transition and peace building is captured in several
facilitative priorities, of which peace education is mandated as an important vehicle to
nurture social justice, nonviolence, and environmental sustainability. Civic peace
movements and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are solicited to contribute to,
and to participate in the multidisciplinary and multisystemic peace building initiatives
and enterprises. Counseling professionals, in particular, are challenged to apply their
professional capacities and competencies to not only address the psychosocial trauma of
all forms of violence, but also to collectively and actively work towards the eradication
thereof, and in so doing, build and support communities of peace.

Peace building is not foreign to, or even a neoteric function of the counseling
profession that is fundamentally concerned with the promotion of human potential and
capacity building, psychoeducation, and trauma prevention and intervention. In fact, the
counseling profession’s orientation to promoting world peace emerged during the
Vietnam War (Kincaid & Kincaid, 1971), and was again reaffirmed in the late 1980s with
Carl Rogers’ conflict resolution work in Ireland, South Africa, and at Camp David
(Capuzzi, 1987; Cooper, 1987; Ibrahim, 1987). Counselors’ “potential to espouse peace”
(Cooper, 1987, p. 71) is situated in the access to, and empathic interaction with
individuals, families, groups and communities, in such ways that promote multicultural
understanding, and foster self-actualizing existence at intra- and interpersonal, and
intergroup level. Peace building, multicultural competence, and social justice counseling
thus converge in terms of multicultural competence, the conceptualization of structural
and cultural violence as being unjust social conditions, and the role of social action and
advocacy in facilitating individual and community empowerment. Peace building also
augments social justice and multicultural counseling. The promotion and protection of
human rights, democratization, nonviolent conflict transformation, communal healing,
reconciliation and restorative justice are purported to be the fundamental outcomes for
peace education and peace building (Gerstein & Moeschberger, 2003; Staub, 2003).

Purpose of the Study

Peace is a complex, dynamic, and culturally loaded concept and the inherent
passivity associated with the concept further complicates the conceptualization of peace
building processes and activities. One of the purposes of peace education is to facilitate a
collective construction of a context-specific concept of peace, as well as concept syntonic
initiatives and processes that are geared at building, supporting, and maintaining peace
(Oppenheimer, 1995). The contemporary professional heed or “urgent task” (Gerstein &
Moeschberger, 2003, p. 115) for counselors is to facilitate peace building initiatives and
processes. Although peace building and peace education appear to be conceptually congruent with counselor competencies, peace building concepts, issues, strategies, and research on nonviolence, reconciliation, democratization processes, and conflict transformation, are "rarely addressed in the counseling profession" (Gerstein & Moeschberger, 2003, p.117).

The purpose of this exploratory study was thus to begin to address the paucity in the counselor education literature with an initial quantitative and qualitative exploration of the unique conceptualization and manifestation of peace building in counselor education. An online survey for counselor education faculty and doctoral students was designed to gauge the interest, knowledge, perspectives, and experiences related to peace building in the field of counselor education. Follow-up qualitative interviews with self-selected survey participants augmented the survey information by exploring concepts and issues relevant to a meaningful and contextualized understanding of peace building in counselor education. Analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data garnered from the survey and interview responses thus endeavored to elucidate pertinent concepts, approaches, strategies, and challenges specific to the conceptualization of peace building processes and activities in counselor education.

Definitions

For the purposes of this exploratory study the following definitions apply.

*Culture of Peace* refers to the United Nation’s international conceptualization of the promotion of peaceful values, attitudes and behaviors that reject violence and the global intention to promote nonviolent conflict transformation.

*Peace Building* refers to actions and initiatives that “prevent, reduce, transform,
and help people recover from violence in all forms . .” (Schirch, 2004, p. 9).

*Peace Education* is an integral tool of peace building and refers to the socio-educational processes that support peace building (Salomon & Nevo, 2002).

*Counselors* are helping professionals licensed, registered or chartered to practice counseling according to the ethical standards of a professional organization such as the American Counseling Association.

*Counselor Education* is the graduate level education and training of counselors.

*Counselor Educator* refers to a counseling professional directly involved in the graduate education and training of counselors.

**Delineation of the Research**

A research methodology with both quantitative and qualitative elements was applied to explore the conceptualization and manifestation of peace building in the field of counselor education. An online survey (Appendix C) was utilized to gauge the peace building interest, perspectives, and experiences of the participants. The online survey incorporated open-ended, closed-ended, and Likert-type scaling questions. The survey participants were counselor education faculty and doctoral level students who voluntarily completed the online survey that was availed and accessed via the CESNET listserv. The CESNET listserv is a professional forum for counselor education faculty and students to discourse and share information on current issues and topics related to the field of counselor education. The online survey participants could voluntarily indicate their interest to participate in a follow-up interview that further explored the areas covered in the online survey.
The research methodology of the follow-up interviews was informed by the constructivism-interpretivism research paradigm and aligned with the qualitative interviewing models of Rubin and Rubin (1995), and Taylor and Bogdan (1984). Qualitative interviewing is a dynamic, flexible, and self-correcting interview model for capturing meaningful, detailed, and contextualized descriptions of an indistinct or unexplored notion (Rubin & Rubin, 1995; Taylor & Bogdan, 1984). The interviews were by telephone with self-selected survey participants who had indicated their willingness to volunteer for a follow-up interview. The interview questions elaborated on the areas covered in the survey, and focused on the participants’ perspectives of and experiences in peace building, the role of counselor education in building local and global cultures of peace, and the challenges of counselor education in promoting peace building.

The interviews were audio taped and transcribed in their entirety. The transcribed responses to the interview questions were subjected to the procedures of inductive analysis. Inductive analysis is a systematic and cyclical process of qualitative data analysis that incorporates multiple readings and coding of the data, and the reflective processing, categorizing, and display of singular meaning units uncovered in the data. The outcome of the analysis is an emergent understanding of the qualitative data in terms of elucidated patterns and themes, as assessed against, and supported by the data, hence the term inductive (Creswell, 1998; Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach & Zilber, 1998; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Miles & Hubermann, 1994; Morse & Richards, 2002).
Significance and Limitations of the Study

The exploratory study has the potential to raise the participants’ interest in and awareness of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization’s (UNESCO’s) programs in support of the *Decade for a Culture of Peace and Nonviolence for the Children of the World*. The significance of the research is further seated in the potential of the study to contribute to the counselor education literature by exploring how peace building is uniquely conceptualized and manifested in the field of counselor education. The results of the study identified pertinent issues, capacities and challenges specific to counselor peace education curricula, and how counselors are prepared for and practice local and global peace building. Analysis of the quantitative survey data elicited from the survey intended to provide a general overview of the interest, perspectives, and experiences related to peace building in the field of counselor education. Analysis of the qualitative data collected from the open-ended survey questions and the follow-up interviews explored for the context-specific aspects of counselor peace building.

Although the study has significance in terms of being an initial exploration of an unchartered notion of counselor education, the results of the explorative study are, however, limited in its capacity for inferences and transferability. The results should be with caution due to the sampling procedures and the consequential bounded iterative nature of the study. Ideal or suitable participants in qualitative research are usually selected on the basis of their capacity to contribute to the comprehensive description and clarification of the notion or experience being studied (Polkinghorne, 2005). Qualitative research in general, and in particular the model of qualitative interviewing of Rubin and Rubin (1995), relies on open selection and iterative data gathering processes to acquire
the desired comprehensive and redundant body of data of which patterns and themes are extrapolated. The depth and breadth of the information garnered from the surveys and follow-up interviews in this study were contingent upon attracting suitable survey participants and further soliciting volunteers for the follow-up interview who can contribute to an expansive clarification and understanding of peace building in counselor education. Online surveys are considered to have limited sampling representation in that “the quality of the sample primarily is determined by the quality of the list” (Granello & Wheaton, 2004; Lyons, Crude, Lawrence, & Gutter, 2005, p. 347). Suitable research participants may have been excluded simply because they were not signed on to the CESNET listserv, the primary recruitment mechanism. Static, instead of iterative participant selection procedures, thus constituted the convenience sample of the study. The bounded iterative nature of the research may thus in effect have inhibited the realization of data saturation, rendering the results with limited transferability.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELEVANT LITERATURE

Organization of the Chapter

The literature review explores the contemporary discourse and advancements in peace studies, the United Nation's Culture of Peace development program, and peace psychology. The literature review thus provides an exposition of the major movements, concepts, principles, strategies, and contributions announced in peace studies and peace psychology with the objective to extrapolate a relevant and foundational orientation for counselor peace education. In the final section of the chapter, the established counselor standards of practice and competencies are considered as guiding principles for counselor peace building.

Conceptualization of a Culture of Peace

Peace

The concept of peace is complex, culturally loaded, and contextually determined (Oppenheimer, 1995). Peace is a dynamic and systemic state that evolves and fluctuates and is experienced on an ecological, international, national, local, intercultural, interpersonal, and intrapersonal level. Wagner (1993) distinguishes between negative peace and positive peace. Negative peace is the absence of war, with the presence of reactionary and monitoring peacekeeping and conflict management activities. In addition
to the absence of war, Roesch and Carr (2000) also include in the definition of negative peace a minimal threat of war and an unlikely occurrence of the application of military might as intervention or conflict resolution strategy. Positive peace is the optimization of culturally determined social justice and human potential, as evidenced by the absence of structural violence, economic, political, and social equity and empowerment, demilitarization, conflict transformation, and ecological interdependence and sustainability (Barash, 2000; Pilisuk, 2001; Roesch & Carr, 2000; Wagner, 1993). According to Groff and Smoker (2006) the research conceptualization of peace in Western cultures has evolved through stages in terms of increased complexity and multiplicity. Differentiation between negative and positive peace is the first stage, followed by understanding peace as a dynamic balance between socio-cultural, political, economical and technical factors. Feminist perspectives represent a later stage in exploring the micro- and macro-levels of peace in terms of individual, family, group, community, and global dynamics. The later two stages in the Western conceptualization of peace incorporate bioenvironmental systems and inner spiritual peace as foundation of outer peace. The later stages correspond with an Eastern conceptualization of peace. Anderson (2004) integrates the essence of Western and Eastern definitions by acknowledging both low levels or the absence of violence, and the presence of positive intra- and interpersonal characteristics and relationships in an integrated concept of peace.

*Nonviolence*

Nonviolence, as an organized and collective strategy to bring about political change and social transformation, has been exemplified as an effective strategy in the US
Civil Rights movement, the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the democratization of the Philippines and South Korea, and in India’s independence from British colonial rule. Nonviolent means to social change, however remarkable the sociopolitical impact has been, remain understudied and under reported (Barash, 2000; Boulding, 1993). Nonviolence is personified in the ethical and spiritual peace building of Mohandas Gandhi who transformed an individual orientation into a civil strategy for social justice. Gandhi’s social activism against oppression in South Africa and for India’s liberation is based on the principles of compassion, truthfulness, interdependence and cooperation, material simplicity, dedicated service to others, and the nonviolent and noninjurious pursuit of distributive social justice and empowerment across race, gender, and class (Gandhi, 2000; Mayton, 2001; Walz & Ritchie, 2000). Gandhi’s nonviolent resistance is an active struggle over several stages of which the first is the utilization all existing constitutional and legal mechanisms to address the experienced injustice (Groff & Smoker, 2005). Preparation for deliberate organized mass action includes education and collective awareness and communication of the social issues, needs and grievances, and a penultimate stage of self-reflection during which a recommitment to nonviolence and a strengthening of self- and other respect should occur. The final stage of nonviolent civil disobedience and resistance may take shape in marches, vigils, picketing, boycotts, strikes or any combination of nonviolent activities (Barash, 2000; Groff & Smoker, 2005; Sharp, 2000). The objective of nonviolent civil disobedience is to raise public awareness and facilitate social strain or imbalance in the institutionalized expressions of oppression, and in so doing to initiate movement and social change (Montiel, 2001).
Violence

The antithesis of peace is violence. Violence manifests itself in direct, structural, and cultural violence. Structural violence occurs when unjust, inequitable, and oppressive economical, political and social constraints and practices bring about marginalized and exclusionary access to opportunities and resources (Galtung, 1996). Cultural violence is the collective beliefs and attitudes that justify and legitimize structural violence (Galtung, 1996).

The United Nations' Culture of Peace

The conceptualization of the UN's *Culture of Peace* is problematic as it assumes the existence of a stable culture based on a coherent set of peaceful values, attitudes, and behaviors (Fernández-Dols, Hurtado-de-Mendoza, Jiménez-de-Lucas, 2004). Further, the UN’s *Culture of Peace* envisages societies that exhibit Western-based core principles of social justice, civil society, freedom, equality, democracy, nonviolence, tolerance, solidarity, and sustainability. As such, and although representative of international consensus, the UN conceptualization is normative and idealistic. The intention, however, is to stimulate the international peace movement and to evoke continued multicultural dialogue of, and participation in the prevention of pervasive violence and the promotion of nonviolent conflict transformation (Brenes & Wessells, 2001; de Rivera, 2004). Smoker and Groff's (2005) broader view of a culture of peace as the socialization processes that strategize a context- and culture-specific manifestation of peace is aligned with this intention.

In support of the *Culture of Peace*, UNESCO identified eight peace building areas of action. The action areas are conceptualized as strategic conditions and initiatives that
would facilitate the transition to a worldwide culture of peace (de Rivera, 2004; Milani & Branco, 2004; Staub, 2003; Wessells, Schwebel, & Anderson, 2001). Descriptions of each of the eight action areas follow.

*Actions to foster a culture of peace through education*

Peace education focuses on equitable, collaborative, and accessible educational initiatives that develop values, attitudes, and behaviors to promote human dignity, tolerance, non-discrimination, solidarity, cooperation, and consensus building. These initiatives may include programs for nonviolent advocacy, violence prevention, peaceful dispute settlement, crisis management, and post-conflict peace building.

*Actions to promote sustainable economic and social development*

Actions to promote sustainable economic and social development are comprehensive, collaborative, and participatory. These actions include strategies that optimize resource allocation and development with the purposes of eradicating poverty, and empowering women, special need groups, and communities for self-determination and the fulfillment of needs. Capacity building processes should address social and economic inequities, and enable rehabilitation and reconciliation. Environmental sustainability is to be considered, with the prevention of environmental degradation, and the preservation and regeneration of natural resources.

*Actions to promote respect for all human rights*

Actions to promote respect for all human rights refer to the development and strengthening of national and international institutions and capacities that promote and
protect civil, political, cultural, and self-determinative human rights, the rights of indigenous peoples, and environmental rights.

*Actions to ensure equality between women and men*

Actions to ensure equality between women and men refer to the promotion of gender equality in all spheres of economic, political, and social life. Actions include the prevention of violence against women, and the provision of support services to women who are victims of violence.

*Actions to foster democratic participation*

Actions to foster democratic participation involve citizen advocacy and the empowerment of civil society. Participation in self-governance and the strengthening and diversification of civic groups that promote and sustain democratic practices such as accountable governance and socio-economic equality, are examples of participatory citizenship.

*Actions to advance understanding, tolerance, and solidarity*

Actions to advance understanding, tolerance, socio-cultural integration, and solidarity in and between communities apply the appropriate use of technologies for the dissemination and exchange of information that promote the understanding of indigenous knowledge bases, traditions and practices in nonviolent dispute resolution. These actions also target the eradication of disparities that debilitate solidarity, cooperation, and cohesion, and include support initiatives that foster tolerance and solidarity with marginalized and vulnerable groups such as displaced peoples, refugees, and migrants.
Actions to support participatory communication and the free flow of information and knowledge

Actions to support participatory communication and the free flow of information and knowledge refer to the support for independent media and communication technologies that promote a culture of peace. Communication technologies are utilized in service of democratization processes such as information sharing and dissemination, civil advocacy, debate and decision-making.

Actions to promote international peace and security

Actions to promote international peace and security involve the promotion of the rule of international law, and global disarmament and demilitarization. The actions also aim at promoting the understanding and engendering of nonviolent conflict management, and conflict transformation. The optimization of humanitarian aid services in conflict and post-conflict contexts, with specific attention to health services, the role of women, and reparative processes such as reconciliation, restorative justice, and societal reintegration are also emphasized.

Peace Building

Peace building refers to all culture-centered processes, actions and initiatives that promote alternatives to violence, and foster nonviolent conflict resolution and transformation, reconciliation, trauma-healing, restorative justice, and equitable and sustainable living (Christie, 2001; Reychler, 2001). Peace building initiatives may vary in process and outcome, but generally incorporate two interactive sociopolitical and psychoeducational areas of action that (a) transform relationships for greater equity and
justice in terms of power, and access to resources and opportunities, and (b) dismantle conditions, structures, and institutions that support and perpetuate structural and cultural violence (McKay & de la Rey, 2001).

A feminist conceptualization of peace building focuses on empowerment and capacity building for gender equity in the areas of human rights; political, social, and economic resources and participation; and the reduction in gender-related violence and psychosocial redress of injustices and inequalities through culture-specific peace building processes and outcomes (McKay, 2002; McKay & de la Rey, 2001). Feminist approaches to peace building are indicated as relevant and functional because women and children are particularly at risk for victimization and marginalization in conflict and post-conflict contexts.

Peace building differs from but does not exclude peace making and peacekeeping (Harris, 1999; Harris, 2003; Wagner, 2001). Peace making refers to the management of direct conflict and violence through nonviolent, integrative, and collaborative mechanisms of conflict resolution strategies. Peacekeeping refers to the containment of violent engagement through force, or conflict management through deterrence by means of sanctions and zero tolerance policy implementation. Peace making and peacekeeping are both reactionary and containing processes, and are not primarily concerned with systemic social change such as peace building.

Peace Education

Peace education is indicated as an important and functional interdisciplinary mechanism for change in facilitating processes of peace building and the development of a culture of peace (Harris, 2003; Johnson & Johnson, 1995; Lourenço, 1999; Nevo &
Peace education is complex and dynamic in terms of its content, contexts, processes, objectives, and outcomes, and has had over the past centuries focused on various global and regionally-specific threats to human existence (Harris, 1999; Salomon, 2002). Fundamental to peace education, also referred to as “pedagogy of justice” (Shapiro, 2002, p. 67), is the application of didactic processes based on socio-moral development to promote peace and reduce violence. The didactic processes focus on developing knowledge of the different forms and dynamics of violence and peace and the contextual maintenance thereof; the cultivation attitudes such as multicultural sensitivity, concern for social justice, respect for human rights, and empathy; and skill building in nonviolent conflict transformation and social activism (Salomon & Nevo, 2002; Tidwell, 2004).


School-based and entrenched peace education programs promote nonviolent, democratic and collaborative learning environments, and address interpersonal, intergroup, and interethnic tensions and conflicts through teaching prosocial skills such as
tolerance, respect, empathy, cooperation, assertiveness, and alternative dispute resolution behaviors such as collaborative problem-solving and mediation (Adams, Waldo, Steiner, Mayfield, Ackerline, & Castellanos, 2003; D’Andrea, & Daniels, 1996; Erickson, Mattaini, & McGuire, 2004; Harris 1999, Harris, 2003; Thompson, Murray, Harris, & Annan, 2003). Research indicates that school-based peace education programs are effective in that acquired skills are transferred to non-school settings, socio-emotional competencies and academic performances are increased, and positive changes in school climate are achieved (Erickson, Mattaini, & McGuire, 2004; Harris, 1999; Harris, 2003).

Peace education and peace building become less distinctive in terms of strategy and process in contexts of intractable conflict and interethnic tension, as exemplified by peace education initiatives in Northern Ireland, Israel/Palestine, Bosnia, Cyprus, Croatia, South Africa, and Rwanda (Salomon & Nevo, 2002). Peace education in these contexts goes beyond developing an understanding of the manifested violence and skills to manage and transform the contextual maintenance thereof (Salomon, 2004). The purposes of peace education are also to facilitate intergroup and interethnic dialogue, and to build trust and empathy, so that the common ground and shared reality can be explored and opposing perspectives can be validated. Peace education in contexts of intractable conflict intends to transform the polarized and pervasive collective narratives of oppression, struggle, and animosity, to narratives of reconciliation, collective trauma healing, and interdependent coexistence. Despite the many and pervasive challenges and barriers to peace education in contexts of intractable conflict, the global initiatives have been found to positively affect, if not change, intergroup perceptions, attitudes, and relations (Salomon, 2004).
Psychology’s Conceptualization of Peace Building

Professional psychology’s support of, and contribution to the UN’s *Culture of Peace* and UNESCO’s program of peace action, is grounded the profession’s commitment to social justice, and the contemporary paradigms of humanistic and positive psychology, community psychology, peace psychology, the psychology of liberation, and feminist perspectives. Humanistic psychology conceptualizes peace in terms of conditions and relationships that promote healthy human development, dignity and positive identity, and people’s capacity to forge positive social change (Pilisuk, 2001). Positive psychology is an emerging field with humanistic roots that focuses on understanding and promoting human strengths and the social conditions that support prosocial behaviors, positive intra- and interpersonal development, and psychological well being (Aspinwall & Staudinger, 2003). Community psychology studies the effects of adverse and destructive social conditions on human health and development and promotes prevention through community capacity building (Roesch & Carr, 2000).

Peace psychology is a movement within the professional field of psychology that develops perspectives on and conceptual and action frameworks for cultures of peace, and sets professional guidelines and expectations for peace building by psychology professionals. Peace psychology incorporates various perspectives on nonviolent conflict management, and the promotion of social justice and peace. The primary theoretical orientation of peace psychology is human needs theory that posits the equitable and sustainable satisfaction of human needs related to security, identity, well being, and self-determination as necessary conditions of peaceful coexistence and priorities for peace building processes (Blumberg, 1993; Christie, 1997).
The psychology of liberation refers to psychological movements that address the psychological needs of marginalized and oppressed majorities in the struggles for freedom against oppressive regimes, as found for example in Latin America and Africa. Liberation psychologists assist in the individual and communal healing and redress from structural and direct violence, and use psychological knowledge and practice for activism against the structural and cultural injustices that generate and maintain marginalization and oppression, and promote liberation at communal and societal levels (Comaz-Díaz, Lykes, & Alarcón, 1998; Dawes, 2001; Moeschberger, & Ordoñez, 2003). Feminist perspectives dispute androcentric biases in understanding violence, conflict and peace, and advance gender equity and relational processes such as dialogue, cooperation, and reconciliation, in building contextual capacities for peace processes and outcomes (McKay, 1995, 1996, 2002).

With the professional paradigms and foundations for peace building in psychology established, the continued professional discourse and intercultural collaboration aim to inform, frame, and facilitate psychologists' roles and functions in promoting national and international cultures of peace. Psychology's peace movement contributes to peace building through continued scholarship in areas such as: (a) social and psychological dimensions of participatory community building and democratization processes, (b) policy development and activism in the interest of peace and social justice, (c) conceptualization of, and research on nonviolence as a behavioral paradigm, philosophy and political strategy, and the dispositional and situational factors associated with the manifestation thereof, (d) prevention and mitigation of structural violence, (e) expansion of intellectual boundaries to incorporate indigenous psychologies,
multidisciplinary interactions and international collaboration, (f) feminist perspectives on militarism, peace, conflict resolution, and sustainable development, (g) trauma-healing and reconciliation, and (h) human rights, demarginalization, and social equity (Anderson & Christie, 2001; Hoshmand & Kass, 2003; Mayton, 2001; McKay, 1996; Montiel & Wessells, 2001).

Areas of Participation in Peace Building by Psychologists

A special issue of Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology (Brenes & Wessells, 2001b) reported on the Sixth International Symposium on Contributions of Psychology to Peace, and encapsulated the quintessence of the international collaboration, scholarship, and guidelines for the continuing professional discourse and participation in the UN and UNESCO program of action. Four areas of psychology’s systemic and proactive action for peace building were identified as conscientizing, consultation, activism, and policy development (Anderson & Christie, 2001; Brenes & Wessells, 2001a; Hoshmand & Kass, 2003; Lykes, 1999; Mayor, 1995; Montiel & Wessells, 2001, Wessells, Schwebel, & Anderson, 2001; Ibrahim, 2005).

Conscientizing refers to the profession’s capacity to challenge, debunk, and deconstruct ethnocentric, androcentric, linear, and unidimensional understandings of conflict, and violence and the contextual antecedents thereof. Psychology as a human science must endorse ecological, engendered, and intercultural understanding of conflict transformation and concede to indigenous psychologies and non-Western approaches to peace building, and the prevention and intervention of violent conflicts. Leung (2003), for example, comments on the potential of Asian psychology, based on the vast populace and extensive diversity of the continent, to assess, refine, and expand existing theoretical
frameworks, and develop new conceptualizations and constructs. Honwana (1997), and Wessells and Monteiro (2001) describe the integration of traditional and spiritual healing practices and rituals with Western approaches in rendering assistance with reintegration, reconstruction, and psychosocial healing in postwar Mozambique and Angola.

The area of consultation focuses on international, intercultural, and multidisciplinary collaborations in support of the enterprises and projects of NGOs and the UN to provide training, refugee assistance, conflict management, trauma healing, reconciliation, and community rebuilding where ethnopolitical violence has occurred. Consultative actions should also develop peace education for social justice, ecological literacy, spiritual development, sustainable living, and facilitate intergroup communication and collaboration. The South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) modeled the establishment of a culture of peaceful co-existence through the psychosocial processes of rapprochement, reconciliation, and restorative justice. The TRC functioned as a public judicial process with the purpose to psychological and civic reconstruction (Peltzer, 2000). The multiple narratives of oppression and human rights violations were shared during public hearings to facilitate individual, familial, as well as communal healing, restitution, and reconciliation with the nation’s past. Counseling professionals provided psychosocial support during and after the TRC processes towards national reconciliation (de la Rey, 2001; Dowdall 1996; Kagee, Naidoo, & Van Wyk, 2003; Wessells & Bretherton, 2000).

Activism for social responsibility, social justice, nonviolent conflict transformation, and peace studies, is promoted at the organizational level through national divisions such as the Committee for the Psychological Study of Peace and
Conflict and Psychologists for Social Responsibility. Outcomes for professional advocacy and activism are indicated as the mitigation and prevention of direct and structural violence; demarginalization; inclusive, equitable and sustainable appropriation of human needs and rights; and the promotion of attitudes and values such as plurism, egalitarianism, solidarity, participative democracy, and restorative justice. Dworkin and Yi (2003), for example, appeal to mental health organizations to take a position against the violent harassment of LGBT people, and to advocate for equitable treatment and LGBT affirmative professional services.

In conclusion, psychologists are encouraged to participate in public policy decision-making through education and client advocacy, and in so doing inform, critique and influence policy development. Public policy development should be monitored for contravention of human rights and social justice, and for the abuse of psychological knowledge to justify such injustices and discriminatory policies.

Counselor Education and Peace Building

A review of the quintessential issue of Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology (Brenes & Wessells, 2001b) was published in the Journal of Counseling and Development (Gerstein & Moeschberger, 2003) of the American Counseling Association, outlining suggestions for counselor peace building, and counselor education and training in the areas of research, training, and practice. Counselor education and training could incorporate multisystemic, multicultural, and interdisciplinary analysis of conflict and nonviolence, in the development of culturally appropriate competencies relevant to community empowerment and nonviolent conflict transformation. Non-Western theories and models of counseling and peace practice could also augment counselor multicultural
development. In addition, ethnographic and qualitative research on nonviolence, peace, democratization and reconciliation could affirm the profession’s capacity to contribute to international peace building. Specific areas of practice for counselor involvement are identified in counseling humanitarian aid workers (Ehrenreich, & Elliot, 2004), peace and human rights education, and training community peace builders.

Counselors’ roles in cross-cultural conflict resolution and peace building was indeed acknowledged almost two decades ago (Ibrahim, 1987), and although affiliation with the international peace movement has as yet not been explicitly affirmed at the professional organizational level, peace building initiatives are being facilitated by counselors in a variety of contexts. School-based conflict mediation training, domestic violence prevention and intervention at communal level, and psychoeducational programs and community-based interventions for communities rendered vulnerable by intranational wars and violent conflicts are examples of counselor contributions to building cultures of peace (Abu-Saba, 1999; Anna, Amuge, & Angwaro, 2003; Johnson, 1993; Mitchels, 2003). The peace building action areas identified by professional psychology are not entirely incompatible with the capacity of counselors to contribute to the analysis, intervention and activism dimensions and processes of peace building (Norsworthy & Gerstein, 2003). In fact, the urgency and magnitude of counseling processonals’ peace building roles and functions does not justify professional elitism and monopoly.

Counselor Standards of Practice and Competence

Professional psychology’s conceptualization and practice of peace building, as informed by the international peace movement and intercultural collaboration, does not appear to be entirely incompatible with counselor education and practice. However, the
to “modify . . . mission and curricula” (Gerstein & Moeschberger, 2003, p. 115) in order to functionally and effectively prepare counselors for peace building, is relevant and auspicious in terms of developing a professionally unique conceptualization and manifestation of peace building for counselor education, training, and practice.

Nelson and Christie (1995) suggest an accommodation model for curricular orientation to peace building. Program content and democratized pedagogies are aligned to realize the objectives of peaceful values and attitudes, competencies for peaceful behavior, and sociopolitical efficacy expectations. Peaceful values and attitudes include an appreciation for cultural diversity, and feminist perspectives on participatory democracy, social justice, human rights, nonviolence, positive peace, and socially responsible activism. Competencies for peaceful behavior are developed in all three interactive peace processes, namely peacekeeping - avoiding and containing destructive conflict interpersonally, peacemaking - principles, methods and skills of multilevel conflict management, and peace building. Peace building knowledge, skills, and attitudes aim to develop understanding of the role of societal inequities and injustices and the satisfaction of human needs in mobilizing for social and conflict transformation. Peace building efficacy expectations are developed through engaging in problem-solving discussions of social issues, and opportunities to engage in social action to experience the significance of interpersonal involvement in social change processes.

However, before counselor education curricula are adapted to adopt existing models or incorporate inherent peace building incentives, the professional ethical and competency standards, as primary informants of curricular and pedagogical orientations, should be reviewed to determine to what extent the standards and competencies are in
support of culturally competent, socially just, and ethical counselor peace building.
Counselor development of, and competency in, multicultural knowledge, attitudes and
skills are already conceptualized and affirmed as professional grounding principles.
Multiculturism and competence in diversity are also acknowledged as the foundations for
social justice work in counseling, and facilitates client empowerment within
disempowering sociopolitical contexts. The following discussion explores the
multicultural, social justice, and ethical standards and competencies of the American
Counseling Association (ACA) in terms of its alignment with, and support of peace
building practice.

Multicultural Competencies

The multicultural competencies “provide guidelines for ethical counselor practice
from multicultural and culturally specific perspectives” (Vera & Speight, 2003, p. 255) in
the contexts of counseling, therapy, and psychological testing. The competencies are
categorized as attitudes, knowledge, and skills, and sensitize counselors to issues of
marginalization, oppression, and sociocultural diversity between counselor and client that
interact with the appropriateness and effectiveness of the therapeutic service delivery,
although research has yet to validate that expressed counselor multicultural competencies
do in fact promote client well-being and empowerment (Vera & Speight, 2003).

Multicultural competencies are critical to all peace building processes and
outcomes in understanding the cultural and intergroup dimensions of the conflict context.
Multicultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes relate to understanding and managing peace
as dynamic and sustainable sociocultural outcome; how peace building is constructed and
expressed in culturally specific stakeholder roles and functions, strategies, indigenous
knowledge and capacities, and community-based supports and networks. The
multicultural competencies, as currently conceptualized, focus on facilitating individual
adaptation rather than proactive and advocacy oriented macro level interventions. The
concepts of peace and conflict are not explicitly addressed in the competencies, and the
multicultural implications of the multiple and interactive counselor roles in peace
building such as mediator, life skills educator, policy consultant, advocate, change agent,
community mediator and collaborator, and liaison with indigenous healing practices,
necessary to accommodate community needs, are not outlined.

Social Justice Competencies

The social justice competencies propel multiculturism toward sociopolitical
activism, systemic social change, the dismantlement of structural violence, and the
promotion of distributive justice, and equity in terms of power, self-determination,
sociopolitical participation, access to, and opportunity in resources. In this sense, the
social justice competencies are the systemic, proactive, preventative, and advocacy
oriented expression of the multicultural competencies. The social justice competencies
span three advocacy domains, namely client empowerment, community collaboration and
systems advocacy, and sociopolitical advocacy. The advocacy orientation serves to
mitigate and prevent the detrimental impact of cultural, social, political, and economical
brutalities on human development and actualization. Although competencies related to
advocacy and community collaboration are essential to peace building capacities,
nonviolent conflict transformation, human rights education, and reconciliatory
community interventions are not implicated in the social justice competencies.

Peace building and the multicultural and social justice competencies thus
converge in terms of tolerance for diversity, the conceptualization of structural and cultural violence as being unjust social conditions, and the role of social action and advocacy in individual and community empowerment. Peace building augments the multicultural and social justice competencies, in that the promotion and protection of human rights, sustainable satisfaction of human needs, democratization, nonviolent conflict transformation, communal healing, reconciliation and restorative justice are fundamental processes and outcomes for building communities of peace.

*Ethical Standards*

Ethical standard pertain to a specific cultural context that reflect the norms, values, and attitudes of the philosophical assumptions and moral reasoning on which ethical decision-making and the judgment of ethical professional behaviors are based. The ethical guidelines of ACA reflect a Western, absolutist, and an individualist perspective on professional counselor behaviors (Pedersen, 1997). Applying the ethical standards to peace building thus becomes complicated and contraindicative in non-Western oriented contexts, with specific reference to professional limitations on roles and functions, inevitable dual relationships, and unconventional settings and parameters of client-counselor relationships.

Professional promotion and endorsement of counselor peace building initiatives and professional alignment with the international peace movement may require inclusion of areas in the ACA ethical guidelines that would be specific to the practice of peace building. Areas in the ethical standards that could be considered for inclusion relate to the professional protection and support of peace building roles and functions, protection of peace building practitioners from nonaligned harassment and discrimination, the legal
and ethical dilemmas of advocacy and social activism, and the development of professionally-relevant decision-making models for humanitarian ethics. Slim (2001) states that moral dilemmas occur in humanitarian ethical decision-making when the sociocultural characteristics of the humanitarian service context challenge the inclusive application of humanitarian ethical principles. In contexts of intractable conflict ethical principles such as the protection of human rights, preserving human life, principles of justice, and practitioner safety may become as mutually exclusive. Counselor ethical development in preparation for peace building will benefit from exploring and understanding humanitarian ethics.

Conclusion

Peace building initiatives manage and prevent violence, promote social justice, and facilitate the reconstruction of traumatized communities through engendered and reconciliatory processes for communal healing, restorative justice, and equitable self-determination and self-actualization. Peace building is the contemporary and pressing directive for counseling professionals to submit their training, research, and practice to the international peace movement in developing and supporting cultures of peace. Priorities for peace building are endorsed through the leadership of the UN and UNESCO, professional psychology, and international peace building practice. Peace building practices are particularly significant in regions of intractable conflict and where environmental sustainability has been realized. An example of such a realization is the holistic approaches of the Kenyan 2004 Nobel Peace Prize Laureate, Wangari Maathai, whose approaches in nonviolent activism, promotion of women’s rights, education, and family counseling, are adapted to other contexts in Africa.
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Counselors’ capacities for peace building are grounded in the profession’s general concerns with the promotion and protection of self-actualizing human development, and specifically affirmed in the multicultural and social justice competencies. Social justice counseling propel multiculturism toward sociopolitical activism, systemic social change, the dismantlement of structural violence, the promotion of distributive justice, and equity in terms of power, self-determination, sociopolitical participation and resources utilization. However, the urgency and magnitude of prioritized counselor peace building roles and functions justify curricular and pedagogical innovations if counselors and counselor educators are to be aligned with the international peace movement.

The peace movement has been in existence for more than two centuries, relying on individual and civic action to promote demilitarization, social justice, and peaceful coexistence (Schwebel, 1993). The leadership of the UN has unified the peace movement in a common vision for the 21st century, and has goaded the helping professions and their commitment to social justice as allies in the realization of global cultures of peace. Although social justice counseling is indicated as the fifth force in the counseling profession, I would suggest counselor peace building become the united force in reframing the multicultural and social justice competencies for a superordinate goal in cultivating counselors for peace building, because “We must work toward achieving world peace consistently, seriously, vehemently, enthusiastically, as if our very own existence depends upon it, and it does” (Cooper, 1987, p. 72).
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The contemporary professional heed or "urgent task" (Gerstein & Moeschberger, 2003, p. 115) for counselors is to facilitate peace building initiatives and processes. In addition, qualitative research of peace building concepts, issues, and approaches, has been specifically indicated as an area in which the counseling professions can make contributions to building global cultures of peace (Gerstein & Moeschberger, 2003; Norsworthy & Gerstein, 2003). Although peace building and peace education appear to be conceptually congruent with counselor competencies, peace building concepts, issues, strategies, and research on nonviolence, reconciliation, democratization processes, and conflict transformation, are "rarely addressed in the counseling profession" (Gerstein & Moeschberger, 2003, p.117). Peace building is complex, dynamic, socio-culturally informed, context-specific, and as yet an unchartered notion of counselor education. A qualitative research tradition is thus well suited to an inquiry as to the conceptualization and manifestation of a complex and indistinct notion such as peace building in counselor education (Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Ponterotto, 2005). The exploratory purpose of the research was thus to survey for a general impression of the notion of peace building in counselor education. Follow-up qualitative interviews elaborated on the surveyed information and aimed to explore for pertinent issues, perspectives, opportunities and challenges specific to promoting peace building in counselor education.
The online survey (Appendix C) was used for the initial exploration of the notion of peace building in counselor education. The survey was designed to garner quantitative and qualitative data on the survey participants' interest in, experiences in, and perspectives on peace building. The survey participants were counselor education faculty and doctoral level students in counselor education who voluntarily accessed, and anonymously completed the online survey that was availed via the CESNET listserv.

The qualitative research methodology of the follow-up interviews is grounded in the constructivism-interpretivism research paradigm and aligned with the qualitative interviewing models of Rubin and Rubin (1995) and Taylor and Bogdan (1984). Ponterotto (2005) refers to the constructivism-interpretivism paradigm as the "anchor" of qualitative research methods (p. 129). According to the constructivism-interpretivism paradigm, knowledge is socially co-constructed through collaborative and interactive dialogue (Ponterotto, 2005; Rubin & Rubin, 1995). The dialogue explores meanings that emerge through reflective processes and are always contextually situated and relative. The goal of the dialogue is to reconstruct an authentic and essential understanding of the topic of the dialogue, in this case counselor peace building (Ponterotto, 2005; Rubin & Rubin, 1995).

The follow-up interviews were by telephone with survey participants who voluntarily communicated their interest and consent to participate in an interview to the co-principal researcher. The interview questions elaborated on the areas covered in the survey, and focused on the interviewees' perspectives of and experiences in peace building, the role of counselor education in building local and global cultures of peace, and the opportunities and challenges in promoting and engaging in peace building.
This chapter further outlines the details of the research design, the procedures for participant selection, and the strategies of the data collection and analysis. The research procedures were conducted over a four-month period.

Research Design

The first phase of the research design was the online survey (Appendix C). As the Internet is widely and increasingly used to access and disseminate information, so are online surveys also becoming convenient and acceptable research tools. The characteristics of online surveys offered as confirmation of their viability as practical and effective research tools include time and cost effectiveness, ease of completion, simplified data entry and processing, and fewer respondent and processing errors (Granello & Wheaton, 2004; Lyons, Cude, Lawrence, Gutter, 2005). Online surveys are also effective research tools for accessing less visible or difficult-to-reach populations (Granello & Wheaton, 2004; Lyons, Cude, Lawrence, Gutter, 2005; Riggle, Rososky, & Reedy, 2005). The quality and quantity of the information elicited by online surveys are at least comparable to information elicited from traditional survey methods, if not more effective in attaining increased self-disclosure and more substantive responses from the participants (Coderre, Mathieu, & St-Laurent, 2004; Hodge, & Rose, 2006; Huang, 2006; Londsdale, Kiernan, Kiernan, Oyler, & Gilles, 2005). A review of the literature shows that online surveys have as yet not been applied to the research of peace building or peace related concepts and issues. Liu, Shen, and Williams (2004) used an online survey to examine multicultural competency in research. Traditional survey formats have been used to explore the experience and process of interpersonal reconciliation (Molina, 2000), school children’s perceptions of conflict (Brown, 2000), and how humanitarian aid
agencies support stress management in aid workers (Ehrenreich & Elliot, 2004).

The online survey (Appendix C) was utilized to gauge the interest, perspectives, and experiences of the participants on peace building. The online survey incorporated open-ended, closed-ended, and Likert-type scaling questions. The development of the survey questions was informed by the exploratory nature of the study and the major peace building principles, strategies, and professional guidelines annunciated in the literature review. The online survey was pre-tested through a posting on the local counselor education listserv. The purpose with the survey pre-test was to establish estimations of completion time and to identify and modify format and content issues that posed response difficulties. None of the pre-test survey participants (8) indicated any response difficulties and the pre-test version became the final version of the online survey.

The survey participants voluntarily completed the online survey that was availed and accessed via the CESNET listserv, a professional information and discussion forum for counselor education faculty and students. The online survey also invited counselor education faculty and doctoral students to voluntarily communicate their interest to participate in a follow-up interview. The follow-up interviews constituted the second phase of the research design.

The second phase of the research design was guided by the principles of qualitative interviewing as grounded in the constructivism-interpretivism epistemological paradigm (Rubin & Rubin, 1995; Taylor & Bogdan, 1984). Qualitative interviewing is a dynamic, flexible, iterative, and self-correcting interview model for capturing meaningful, detailed, and contextualized descriptions of an indistinct or unexplored notion (Rubin & Rubin, 1995; Taylor & Bogdan, 1984). Interviews function as the
medium through which the notion and experience under investigation is expressed and captured in language. In qualitative interviewing the interviewer and research participant, also referred to as a “conversational partner” (Rubin & Rubin, 1995, p. 11), engage interactively and collaboratively in exploring a mutual, meaningful, contextualized, and detailed description of an indistinct or unexplored notion.

Qualitative interviewing typically involves face-to-face and semi-structured or focused interviews. Such interviews have been used to capture children’s conceptualization of peace and war (Hakvoort, 1996; Myers-Bowman, Walker, & Myers-Walls, 2005), and adolescents’ perspectives on the indicators for the potential for war and strategies for promoting peace (Juhasz & Palmer, 1991). Ben-David and Lavee (1996) used face-to-face semi-structured interviews to explore couples’ relational dynamics and challenges during the Israeli/Palestinian peace process. In-person and focused interviews were also used to describe the reflections of victims of human rights abuses and violations who participated in the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission processes (Byrne, 2004).

Although qualitative interviewing typically involves semi-structured face-to-face interviews, the follow-up interviews for this study were by telephone. Telephone interviews were considered a practical arrangement to overcome travel constraints. Lavee, Ben-David, and Azaiza (1997) used semi-structured telephone interviews with adult spousal members of Israeli and Palestinian families living in the West Bank to explore family processes under conditions of stress and conflict during the Israeli-Palestinian peace process. Telephone interviews were also used to explore strategies applied by physicians in managing ethical dilemmas (Hirst, Hul, DuVa, & Danis, 2005).
and to explore the experiences of early-entrant school counselors (Portman, 2002). Oegema (1994) used telephone interviews to explore the factors contributing to nonparticipation in a mobilization campaign of the Dutch Peace Movement. Telephone interviews are comparable to face-to-face interviews in eliciting valid and reliable qualitative data (Aziz, 2004; Sturges & Hanrahan, 2004; Wilson & Roe, 1998).

The semi-structured telephone interview questions elaborated on the areas covered in the survey, and focused on the participants’ perspectives of and experiences in peace building, the role of counselor education in building local and global cultures of peace, and the challenges of counselor education in promoting peace building. The interviews were audio taped and transcribed in their entirety. The transcribed participant responses to the interview questions were subjected to the procedures of inductive analysis.

Inductive analysis is a systematic and cyclical process of qualitative data analysis that incorporates multiple readings and coding of the data, and the reflective processing, categorizing, and display of singular meaning units uncovered in the data. The outcome of the analysis is an emergent understanding of the qualitative data in terms of elucidated themes, as assessed against, and supported by the data, hence the term inductive (Creswell, 1998; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Miles & Hubermann, 1994). A minimum of 5 interview participants was hoped for, and attained, in accordance with the recommendation of Pollio, Henley, and Thompson (1997) that states that “Although not a formal methodological rule, the situational diversity necessary for identifying thematic patterns is often provided by three to five interview transcripts” (p. 51).
Participants

Participants in qualitative research are selected on the basis of their capacity to contribute to the comprehensive description and clarification of the notion or experience being studied (Polkinghorne, 2005). To overcome the challenge of identifying and accessing suitable participants for an explorative study of peace building, as yet an unchartered notion of counselor education, an online survey (Appendix C) was used to (1) gauge the interest, experiences and perspectives of the participants on peace building, and (2) solicit potential participants for the second phase of the research design.

The online survey was posted on the CESNET listserv with an invitation (Appendix A) to all counselor educator faculty and doctoral level counselor education students subscribed to CESNET. The CESNET listserv is a professional forum for counselor education faculty and students to discourse and share information on current issues and topics related to the field of counselor education. At the first posting of the invitation, the listserv had 867 subscribers. At the second posting of the invitation, 2 weeks after the first posting, the listserv had 876 subscribers. The invitation had a link to the survey consent document (Appendix B), which preceded access to the survey. Online survey completion and submission was voluntary and anonymous.

Survey participants could volunteer participation in the second phase of the research study, the qualitative follow-up telephone interviews, by contacting the co-principal researcher via the e-mail address provided in the survey. Typically, data in qualitative interviewing are gathered until saturation is achieved, that is no new information emerges from the cyclical and interactive data collection and analysis processes (Morrow, 2005; Rubin & Rubin, 1995). However, for this particular research
design the researcher applied the recommendation of Pollio, Henley, and Thompson (1997) stating that “Although not a formal methodological rule, the situational diversity necessary for identifying thematic patterns is often provided by three to five interview transcripts” (p. 51).

Five potential follow-up interview participants responded and were contacted via e-mail (Appendix D) to confirm their interest with the opportunity to ask questions and raise concerns prior to finally deciding and consenting to be interviewed. The five potential interview participants received the interview invitation letter (Appendix E) and two copies of the interview letter of consent (Appendix F). All five potential interview participants returned one signed copy of the consent letter with convenient times indicated for conducting the telephone interviews (Appendices G and H).

The collection, processing, and storage of the research data were managed in such a way as to ensure the confidentiality and protect the anonymity of the research participants. Online survey completion and submission was voluntary and anonymous. Survey participants were cautioned not to provide identifying information in responding to the open-ended questions of the survey. The responses of the participants in the online survey were compiled by an independent and secure data collection service (Zoomerang) and were provided to the co-principal researcher with a respondent code, stripped of the survey respondents’ email addresses. Zoomerang is Internet based software for survey data collection and processing. Access to the online survey data was firewall and password protected, thus preventing illicit access and use of the survey data. All identifying information of the interview participants was masked and the audiotapes of the follow-up interviews were destroyed once the interviews were transcribed.
Data Collection

The first phase of data collection was an online survey (Appendix C) designed to gauge the interest, experiences and perspectives of the participants on peace building. Survey participants were counselor education faculty and doctoral students who accessed the online survey through two postings on the CESNET listserv. The CESNET listserv is a professional forum for counselor education faculty and students to discourse and share information on current issues and topics related to the field of counselor education. The first posting was sent to 867 subscribers to CESNET. The second posting, two weeks after the first posting, was sent to 876 subscribers. Responses to the open-ended, closed-ended, and Likert-type scaling survey questions produced exploratory quantitative and qualitative data on the participants’ interest, perspectives, and experiences related to peace building in counselor education. The online survey further functioned as a means to attract potential participants for the second phase of the study.

The second phase of the data collection was a single audio taped telephone interview (Appendix H) of 40 to 60 minutes in duration with five survey participants who voluntarily responded to the survey invitation for a follow-up interview. The semi-structured and open-ended format of the interview incorporated the three types of questioning typical of qualitative interviewing (Rubin & Rubin, 1995; Taylor & Bogdan, 1984). The main questions (Appendix H) provided the focus and direction of the interview and asked for descriptions of the participants’ experiences in, and perspectives of counselor peace building. The participants’ responses to the main questions were probed for clarification, elaboration, and detail. Probing questions were accompanied by rephrases and restatements to demonstrate and enhance the researcher’s understanding.
Follow-up or additional questions are context-specific and consequential to each interview and justified by the self-corrective and interactive nature of qualitative interviewing. All three types of questions were executed to facilitate the exploration of emerging concepts, patterns and themes. The participants' responses to the questioning were transcribed verbatim for analysis. A summary that captured the salient aspects of the content and themes of each interview were compiled and a copy thereof returned to the participant via e-mail for review, verification and feedback. Two interviewees responded and approved of their contact summaries without additional feedback or changes, other than the correction of a spelling error of a name.

A third source of data was in the form of a reflective journal in which the co-principal researcher recorded interview reactions, feedback, revisions, preliminary ideas about data analysis, and self-corrective reflections (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Rubin & Rubin, 1995; Taylor & Bogdan, 1984). Self-corrective reflections are concerned with improvement of the interview procedures in terms of the quality of the interaction and questioning, and the consideration of emerging concepts and themes.

Data Analysis

The online survey produced quantitative and qualitative data. The quantitative data are summarized and represented in chapter four. The participants’ responses to the open-ended survey questions and the interview transcripts of the second phase were subjected to the sequential and cyclical procedures of inductive analysis. The outcome of inductive analysis is an emergent understanding and expression of the qualitative data in terms of salient categories and emerging themes, as assessed against, and supported by the data (Creswell, 1998; Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach & Zilber, 1998; Marshall &
The primary procedure in the inductive analysis of qualitative data is an immersion in the data by reading the transcripts in totality several times to gain a familiarity with, and an overall impression of the data. The contents of the reflective journal, survey responses, transcripts, and contact summaries were reviewed continuously to facilitate impression forming of the collective data, and to contemplate a coding scheme for the data (Rubin & Rubin, 1995; Taylor & Bogdan, 1984). The next procedure was to organize and truncate the voluminous data in categories of salient and singular units of meaning, also referred to as first level coding (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Rubin & Rubin, 1995). First level coding entails the assignment of referent labels or abbreviations to the exact words, phrases, sentences, and paragraphs in the participants’ responses identified as singular meaning units. The coding scheme was continually assessed against reflective interaction with the data to remain flexible and expansive (Rubin & Rubin, 1995).

Coding at the second level attempts to group the first level coded meaning units in connected categories or clusters of concepts and themes. The meaning clusters or categories are conceived by the participants and/or the researcher, and always grounded in the collective data (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Rubin & Rubin, 1995). Second level coding also facilitates the construction of data typologies. The function of a data typology is to represent an integrated understanding of the truncated data in terms of meaningful and interconnected emerging patterns and themes (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Qualitative data analysis not only elucidates generalities in terms of themes and patterns, but also
underscores differences and deviations from the themes and patterns (Babbie, 1983). Discrepant and disconfirming findings were extracted through analyses within and across categories, and the reflective process of continually assessing emerging understanding against the data collective.

Standards of Quality, Trustworthiness, and Credibility of the Results

According to Stewart (2000), validity in qualitative research is achieved through the trustworthiness of the research processes and the usefulness of the data garnered thereby. Morrow (2005) distinguishes between paradigmatic and transcendent criteria for trustworthiness of qualitative research. The specific criteria for trustworthiness in the constructivism-interpretivism epistemological paradigm are that of fairness and authenticity. Exploring the data for differences, variations, and discrepancies attains fairness. Authenticity entails research processes that support the multiplicity of perspectives and facilitate sensitivity for dialogued meanings. Researcher reflexivity about the effects of contextual aspects and preconceived notions on the research processes is another dimension of research authenticity. The transcendent criteria for trustworthy qualitative research are social relevance of the research topic, subjectivity and reflexivity, and the adequacy of data collection and interpretation.

Subjectivity and reflexivity requires monitoring and “bracketing” (Morrow, 2005, p. 254) of researcher subjectivity. Morrow (2005) encourages the researcher to perform as a “ naïve inquirer” (p. 254) continually gauging and assessing mutuality of meaning and understanding. Adequacy of data collection implies that contemplation of strategies and researcher competence that would garner comprehensive data in terms of breadth, depth, and variety is a more relevant to trustworthy research than the magnitude of the
number of research participants. Adequacy of data interpretation requires flexible
analytic scheme developed through cyclical and interactive data collection and analysis
procedures, immersion in the data, and exact representation of the participants’ responses.

The paradigmatic and transcendent criteria for trustworthy qualitative research
described by Morrow (2005) are aligned with Rubin and Rubin’s (1995) standards of
credibility for qualitative interviewing. The standard of transparency requires adequate
record keeping and explication of the research processes and data management strategies.
The standard of communicability also requires explication of the processes of data
interpretation, in particular in terms of the authentic documentation and representation of
participant responses. Finally, the standard of consistency-coherence standard refers to
the analysis of the data within and across cases in terms of generalities and
commonalities as well as inconsistencies and contradictions.

Meaningful and valid qualitative conclusions are thus attained if the research
design and protocols manage researcher bias, identify and access suitable research
participants, and elicit and capture authentic and essential narratives. The standards of
quality and trustworthiness for this particular qualitative study on peace building were
aspired to by following the guidelines for qualitative interviewing established by Rubin
and Rubin (1995) and the general guidelines of Miles and Huberman (1994). Specific
procedures that would render the study trustworthy included the following: (1)
explication of the research paradigm, methods, and procedures as informed by the
exploratory nature of the research question, (2) multiple data sources: the online survey,
the follow-up interview, participant feedback, and a reflective research journal, (3)
inductive data analysis, and (4) consideration of the boundaries and constraints in terms
of the transferability of the results.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this exploratory study was to obtain an impression of the notion of peace building in counselor education. An online survey gauged the peace building interest, experiences, and perspectives of the counselor education participants. Follow-up qualitative interviews elaborated on the surveyed information and aimed to explore for pertinent concepts, approaches, strategies, and challenges specific to counselor education in engaging and promoting peace building. The results of the online survey and the follow-up telephone interviews are presented in this chapter.

Online Survey

The invitation for survey participation with the link to the online survey was posted on the CESNET listserv. The CESNET listserv is a professional forum for counselor education faculty and graduate students to discourse and share information on current issues and topics related to the field of counselor education. At the first posting, the invitation with the link to the online survey was sent to 867 CESNET subscribers. At the second posting, two weeks later, the invitation with the link to the online survey was sent to 876 CESNET subscribers. Online survey completion and submission was voluntary and anonymous. The online survey was available for an eight-week period that started at the first listserv posting. During this period the online survey had 99 visits, which resulted in 60 completed surveys. No partially completed surveys were submitted.
Participants

Of the 60 online survey participants, 25 were doctoral students and 35 were faculty in counselor education. The faculty survey participants included 22 (63%) assistant professors, a director of counseling programs, and a director of research. The counselor educator profiles of the 60 survey participants are summarized in Table 1.

Counselor educator experience in years is summarized in Table 2. The mode of experience as a counselor educator of the survey participants was 2 years. Of the 42 survey participants with experience as a counselor educator, 20 (48%) had experience between 1 and 5 years. Five participants had less than one-year experience, and 6 participants had more than fifteen years experience.

Of the 60 survey participants, 49 were affiliated with CACREP accredited counselor education programs. The distribution of the survey participants according to ACES region and CACREP accreditation is summarized in Table 3. Thirty-one participants (52%) were from the Southern ACES region, and 12 (20%) from the North Central region. Two participants did not indicate an ACES region.

Ethnicity and sex of the survey participants are summarized in Table 4. Forty-one participants (68%) indicated their ethnicity as White, non-Hispanic. Two participants did not specify their ethnicity. The female survey participants totaled 41, and male survey participants totaled 19. The nationality of the survey participants was predominantly (91%) indicated as the United States of America. Other nationalities were indicated as Cherokee (1), Dutch (1), Puerto Rican (1), and “dual citizenship” (2). Two survey participants did not indicate their nationality.
The next chapter section, following Tables 1 to 4, describes the survey results in terms of the participants’ responses related to their interest and professional development in peace building, and the participants’ responses as to how they perceived peace building as aligned with, expressed, and supported in the field of counselor education.

Table 1

*Counselor Educator Profile of the 60 Survey Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile descriptor</th>
<th>Number of survey participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral students</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate professors</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant professors</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Experience in Years as a Counselor Educator of the 60 Survey Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience in years</th>
<th>Number of survey participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None, doctoral students</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

CACREP Accreditation and ACES Regions of the 60 Survey Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACES region</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Atlantic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountain</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not indicated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

*Ethnicity and Sex of the 60 Survey Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiethnic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of Counselor Education and Peace Building

The survey results are described in this section in terms of the participants' responses related to their interest and professional development in peace building, and their responses as to how they perceived peace building as aligned with, expressed, and supported in the field of counselor education.

Interest Development

Interest in peace building was indicated by 95% (57) of the survey participants. Forty (67%) of the survey participants indicated knowledge of peace building between the moderate and extensive levels, and 28% (17) indicated a minimal knowledge of peace building. Sixteen (27%) of the survey participants had received training, continuing education or professional development related to peace building.

Survey participants’ personal experience in peace building was gauged through a closed-ended survey question in which the participants could select any combination of the options provided in the question. Activities promoting human rights awareness and democratic principles and practices had the highest number of selections by the survey participants. Lobbying and/or interaction with law- or policymakers regarding peace building issues had the lowest number of selections by the survey participants. Table 5 summarizes the survey participants’ selections of personal experience in peace building.

Thirty-six participants (60%) responded to the open-ended survey question on the influence of life experiences on their perspectives on peace building. The responses were subjected to the procedures of inductive analysis. Inductive analysis is a systematic and cyclical process of qualitative data analysis that incorporates multiple readings and coding of the data, and the reflective processing, categorizing, and display of singular
meaning units uncovered in the data. The outcome of the analysis is an emergent understanding of the qualitative data in terms of elucidated themes, as assessed against, and supported by the data, hence the term *inductive* (Creswell, 1998; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Miles & Hubermann, 1994).

The inductive analysis of the qualitative data resulted in the following categories or meaning clusters: (1) values, (2) multicultural experiences, (3) social justice issues, (4) conflict, and (5) intra- and international events. The categories represent connected and salient units of meaning of the participants’ responses, with words and phrases used by the participants applied as the labels of the categories. The category label of intra- and international events was named by the researcher.

*Values.* The meaning cluster labeled as values refers to the participants’ beliefs and standards that have informed their interest development in peace building. Exposure to positive and negative family and community values was indicated to contribute to an interest in peace building activities. Prejudiced values and “politics of the marketplace” or competitive values encouraged exploration of peace building as an expression of resistance, or to counteract discriminatory values. Church affiliations and activities, and religious beliefs and teachings were also mentioned as grounding the participants’ expressions of humanitarian aid and assistance, nonviolence, and the sanctity and dignity of human life. Participant responses that exemplify this meaning cluster are:

“In my family of origin I learned to value and believe in peace within families, communities, nations, and the world as an important ideal and one worth striving for.”

“I was raised in a very prejudiced home and knew that I did not want to take those values as my own.”
“Church teachings . . . it was the local church that started the peace movement in the country. They were actually practicing what we in the Western world were ‘preaching.’ ”

“I have also noticed that the ‘politics of the marketplace’ are based on competition, where academic disciplines have to fight/struggle to survive. The juxtaposition of these competing perspectives has served as an incubator for my views on peace building, and they are still very much in the process of unfolding.”

“I came of age in the late ’60s and early ’70s when it was the way to be. As I matured into the profession and my life it seems to be the only ethical way to live.”

**Multicultural experiences.** The category of multicultural experiences incorporates the participants’ diversity experiences. Travel, work and living in different countries, and cultural immersion activities such as learning another language are indicated to have shaped participants’ perspectives on peace building. Two participant quotes are offered as examples for this category.

“Travel, work with multicultural populations, efforts with poor communities, spirituality . . . these and others have encouraged me to recognize differences which lead people to choose less ‘peaceful’ ways of handling situations.”

“Being part of another culture and therefore being sensitive to people from other cultures, ethnicities, races, and religions. I am also a woman, which makes me aware of gender issues and inequalities.”

**Social justice issues.** This category reflects the participants’ activism and engagement both through personal or vicarious experiences in social justice issues. These experiences were indicated to have encouraged participants to resist prejudicial social values, and contribute to change through peace building activities. Social justice issues
such as social inequities, marginalization, and oppression were emphasized by the survey participants.

"I have become more interested in the concepts associated with peace building because I was raised in a low-income home. Experiencing the challenges of inequities has made me more empathetic to all groups who experience marginalization. I feel a responsibility to challenge the system and individuals that support and maintain inequities."

"As a black man, my life is nothing but peace building in my community and in my profession. It is a way of life for me; advocating and promoting social justice is a way of life, not a job or a career, that is what sets us (apart) from people who have a hard time developing standards of living."

Conflict. Some participants indicated direct exposure to violence and conflict, whereas other participants were engaged in the interventions to, and recovery processes from violence and conflict. The meaning cluster referent to conflict captures the aforementioned participant experiences that have contributed to the participants' perspectives on peace building. Living in violent communities, personal exposure to the ravages of civil war, and/or being engaged in such settings with conflict resolution or community recovery from genocide forged several participants' commitment to peace building. Multicultural experiences were also noted as facilitating an appreciation for the sociopolitical context of conflict. Peace studies, involvement in a peace movement, and admiration of Martin Luther King’s nonviolent resistance were also indicated as playing a role in peace building perspectives. The following participant quotes exemplify this category.
“Born and raised in a war-torn country; had more than three near death experiences due to war; my religious views on non-violence and the sanctity and dignity of human life.”

“Recognizing that having the knowledge to resolve conflict constructively leads to a less chaotic lifestyle.”

“I have witnessed the ravages of war and would do anything to prevent such an occurrence.”

“Visiting another country . . . that had just come out of civil war, and witnessing those that were engaged in peace-making at all levels in an effort to stop another round of genocide.”

“I was influenced by the non-violence movement promoted by MLK and the conversations about the development of moral judgment, social perspective taking, and empathy in children and adults.”

Intra- and international events. Participants’ interests in international affairs, the exploration of global social, political and cultural issues, and international experience such as an externship with the UN, ameliorated the survey participants’ perspectives on peace building. Domestic events with international repercussions, such as 9-11, the war on terror, and US foreign policies stimulated participants’ exploration of peace building issues. Military experience, the Vietnam War, and opposition to military interventions were also identified as contributing to an interest in peace building. The encompassing responses from two of the survey participant illustrate this category.

“Honestly, I can say only that when I went to the UN, and talked to delegates and ambassadors I realized that my education alone was not enough. A person has to be student of the international community and have an interest in those political, social, and
cultural affairs abroad. I had to open my mind and look beyond what was written in major magazines and newspapers. I started reading materials from the countries in question. I started asking questions and I started to gain a real understanding of the situations abroad.”

“The idea of going through the same ordeals as others in America has affected me . . . Desert Storm, Oklahoma City bombing, 9-11, current war in Iraq. On a personal note, my immediate life has not been personally affected although I am very much aware of close friends and family who are currently in Iraq but to date have not been killed but very well could be.”

Professional Development

Fifteen survey participants (25%) elaborated on the training, continuing education or professional development related to peace building that they have engaged in. The survey participants’ responses were subjected to the procedures of inductive analysis. Inductive analysis of the qualitative survey responses identified two categories or meaning clusters: (1) training, and (2) professional experiences. The categories represent connected and salient units of meaning of the participants’ exact words and phrases, and were also labeled as such. The participants indicated training experiences such as courses, seminars, and workshops. The participants’ listed training experiences that covered the areas of conflict and alternative dispute resolution, mediation, trauma interventions, peace studies, human rights education, and multicultural and social justice issues. The participants’ professional development in peace building is associated with work-related experiences and initiatives in multicultural and social justice capacity building. The participants listed experiences such as empowerment of refugees and immigrants, conflict
resolution in school and community settings, GLBT education and programming, and international experience in interethnic conflict transformation and reconciliation.

In consideration of the compatibility of the fields of peace building and counselor education, 95% of the 60 survey participants agreed to a level of compatibility, with 23% (14) of the survey participants rating the compatibility as moderate, 37% (22) as considerable and 22% (13) as totally compatible. Thirteen percent of the survey participants were of the opinion that the fields of peace building and counselor education are minimally compatible. One survey participant indicated that the fields of counselor education and peace building are not at all compatible.

Table 6 summarizes how the survey participants rated the level of alignment of peace building with the professional principles of multicultural and social justice counseling. Thirty-nine participants (65%) rated the alignment of peace building with multicultural counseling between the considerable and total levels. Forty-eight participants (80%) rated the alignment of peace building with social justice counseling between the considerable and total levels. Alignment at the minimal level was rated by 7 (12%) and 1 (2%) of the participants for multicultural and social justice counseling respectively. Table 7 summarizes how the survey participants rated the relevance of UNESCO’s eight areas of peace building for counselor education. Three of the eight UNESCO action areas had relevancy ratings between the considerable and total levels for more than 80% (48) of the survey participants. These areas are gender equality, human rights, and the area of understanding, tolerance and solidarity. Three of the eight action areas had relevancy ratings between the considerable and total levels for more than 50% (30) of the survey participants. These areas are participatory communication, peace
education, and democratic participation. The remaining two UNESCO action areas for peace building, sustainable development and international peace, were rated between the considerable and total levels of relevance by 41% (25) of the participants.

In the professional realm, 50% of the survey participants indicated a moderate to considerable level, and 40% a minimal level of incorporation of peace building issues and concepts in their academic teaching. Peace building is incorporated in professional research interests and activities at a moderate to considerable level by 35% of the survey participants, and at a minimal level by 33% of the survey participants. Peace building issues were incorporated in a moderate to considerable level in the professional service work and volunteer activities of 53% of the survey participants, and 35% of the survey participants acknowledged to a minimal level of incorporation of peace building issues in service and volunteer work. Table 8 summarizes the survey participants’ professional expression of peace building.

Forty participants (67%) responded to the prompt for elaboration on their research, teaching, and service/volunteer activities related to peace building. Connected and salient units of meaning, using the participants’ exact words and phrases, were grouped according to these three surveyed categories.

Research. Participants’ research activities related to peace building focused on conflict resolution, community building, civic development and engagement, and working with marginalized groups.

Teaching. Participants indicated a variety of ways in which peace building issues and concepts were assimilated into their practice of counselor education. Methods of teaching included discussions, seminars, and immersion activities. Specific topics were
indicated as conflict resolution and conflict management, mediation, and interpersonal violence. Multicultural and social justice courses were acknowledged as auspicious conduits for peace building interchange. Peace building was indicated to feature in multicultural courses through the exploration of feminism, diversity, oppression, marginalization, poverty, and culturally appropriate service structures. In social justice courses, peace building issues and concepts emerge through the exploration of primary prevention, counselor advocacy and civil engagement, contextual issues that impact work with clients, and the conceptualization of conflict. The following participant responses are offered as illustration of this category.

"I actively discuss issues of oppression and privilege in teaching community counseling and multicultural counseling classes."

"Build immersion activities into the syllabus to enhance students' experiences of otherness."

"Incorporate peace and justice issues in virtually all courses I teach."

"It is infused in all that I do as it is an integral part of me. I present advocacy as an appropriate professional activity as well as look at the contextual issues that impact my and our work with clients. I also maintain that stance in my therapeutic work."

In contrast, a few of the survey participants indicated that they have encountered opposition to the curricular expression of peace building concepts and issues. This is illustrated by one of the survey participants: "I am trying to incorporate those ideas in my current counselor education program; however I am not able to gain strong faculty support for my ideas, especially those ideas that are contradictory to the major focus of the program."
Service and Volunteer Work. Three prominent areas of service and volunteer work, namely conflict management, advocacy and activism, and humanitarian assistance, were identified in the survey participants' listed examples. Participants engaged in conflict resolution, mediation, and arbitration work in, for example, the school and juvenile court systems. Conflict transformation work at intra- and international levels was also indicated. Advocacy and activism for the human rights of children, families, marginalized groups, and refugees was another area of professional service and volunteer work. Community building, psychosocial interventions, relief work, and humanitarian assistance to trauma victims, communities recovering from natural disasters, civil war and genocide, and to communities managing HIV/AIDS, constituted the third salient area of volunteer work.

In terms of the professional activities of research, teaching, and service/volunteer work, one participant succinctly stated, "While I incorporate concepts about advocacy, prevention, mediation, and active civil engagement in my teaching, research, and practice, I have never termed these activities 'peace building.' I simply see these activities as important skills and responsibilities of counselors and counselor educators."

In contrast to the survey participants' apparent interest in, knowledge of, and personal and professional activities and experiences related to peace building, the field's performance in preparing counselors for peace building was rated as fair by 47%, and as poor by 42% of the survey participants. Seven (13%) survey participants rated the performance of counselor education as a field as good in preparing counselors for peace building. The survey participants also rated their academic department's concern with peace building curricular development, and professional organizational support for
counselor peace building initiatives and activities. Academic departments' concern with
the promotion of peace building concepts and issues was rated as minimal by 45% of the
participants and moderate by 25% of the survey participants. Six (10%) of the survey
participants indicated that their academic departments were considerably to very
concerned, whilst 20% of the survey participants indicated that their academic
departments were not concerned about curricular development in peace building.
Professional organizational support was rated as minimal by 48% of the participants, as
moderate by 20% of the participants, and as considerable by 17% of the survey
participants. Six or 10% of the survey participants rated no professional organizational
support for counselor peace building initiatives and activities.

Forty-one survey participants (68%) responded to the open-ended question on
how peace building could be augmented in counselor education. The results are
incorporated in the next section that presents the results of follow-up interviews.

Summary of the Online Survey Findings

Of the 876 subscribers to the CESNET listserv who potentially could have
accessed and participated in the survey, 60 (7%) submitted completed surveys. The 60
survey participants consisted of 2 program directors, 33 faculty, and 25 doctoral students
of counselor education. The faculty participants represented predominantly early career
professionals, with 22 (63%) identified as assistant professors. The mode of experience in
years as a counselor educator of the faculty participants was two years. The survey
participants were predominantly white, non-Hispanic (68%) and indicated their
nationality to be the United States (91%). Female participants totaled 41, and male
participants totaled 19. Forty-nine participants (82%) were associated with CACREP
accredited counselor education programs. The Southern ACES region had the highest representation of survey participants (52%), followed by the North Central ACES region (20%).

Fifty-seven (95%) survey participants indicated an interest in the field of peace building, and 67% of the survey participants stated their knowledge of peace building to be between the moderate and extensive levels. Twenty-seven percent of the survey participants had received training, continuing education or professional development related to peace building. These professional development experiences involved experiential conflict resolution, and multicultural and social justice capacity building. The survey participants' life experiences that contributed to their interest development in peace building were synthesized in five categories, namely that of values, multicultural experiences, social justice issues, conflict, and intra- and international events. Values refer to the participants' beliefs and standards that have informed their interest development in peace building. The category of multicultural experiences incorporates the participants' diversity experiences. Social justice issues such as social inequities, marginalization, and oppression were emphasized in the participants' activism and engagement both through personal or vicarious social justice experiences. Some participants indicated direct exposure to violence and conflict, whereas other participants were engaged in the interventions to, and recovery processes from violence and conflict. Participants' interests in international affairs, the exploration of global social, political and cultural issues, and domestic events with international repercussions, ameliorated the survey participants' perspectives on peace building.
Ninety-five percent of the survey participants indicated compatibility between the fields of counselor education and peace building. Eighty percent of the participants indicated peace building to be aligned with the principles of social justice counseling at least at the considerable level, whilst 65% rated a similar alignment between peace building and the principles of multicultural counseling. Three of the eight UNESCO action areas had relevancy ratings between the considerable and total levels for more than 80% of the survey participants. These areas are gender equality, human rights, and the area of understanding, tolerance, and solidarity.

Forty percent of the survey participants incorporated peace building issues and concepts in their teaching, 35% incorporated peace building issues and concepts in their research activities, and 53% of the survey participants stated that they engaged in peace building related service and volunteer work. Participants’ research activities related to peace building focused on conflict resolution, community building, civic development and engagement, and working with marginalized groups. Participants indicated a variety of ways in which peace building issues and concepts are assimilated into counselor education, with multicultural, social justice, and community counseling courses acknowledged as an auspicious conduit for peace building interchange. Three prominent areas of the survey participants’ service and volunteer work were identified as that of conflict resolution, advocacy and activism, and psychosocial interventions and humanitarian assistance. In addition to professional expressions of peace building, the survey participants also indicated participation in peace building activities in their personal lives. These activities related to the promotion of human rights awareness, democratic principles and practices, understanding of peace and conflict issues,
humanitarian assistance, and advocacy against poverty and oppression. Participants also indicated their personal membership in organizations that support the aforementioned activities.

In contrast to the survey participants’ apparent interest in, knowledge of, and personal and professional activities and experiences related to peace building, the field’s performance in preparing counselors for peace building was rated as fair by 47%, and as poor by 42% of the survey participants. Twenty percent of the survey participants indicated that their academic departments were not concerned about curricular development in peace building, and 45% of the participants rated their academic department’s concern with peace building curricular development to be minimal. Professional organizational support for counselor peace building initiatives was rated as minimal by 48% of the participants, and as moderate by 20% of the participants.

The next chapter section, following Tables 5 to 8, describes the qualitative data garnered from the follow-up telephone with the five survey participants who volunteered to be interviewed. The interview questions explored five areas of peace building in counselor education: (1) interest and professional development, (2) conceptualization of peace building in counselor education, (3) counselor preparation for peace building, (4) contributions of counselor education to peace building, and (5) opportunities and challenges in amplifying the notion of peace building in counselor education.
Table 5

*Personal Experience in Peace Building of the Survey Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of personal experience</th>
<th>Number of selections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human rights awareness and protection</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic principles and practices</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness, knowledge and understanding of peace and conflict issues</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief aid or humanitarian assistance</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy to eliminate poverty, disenfranchisement, and oppression</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships in organizations that support any of the above</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-violent civil disobedience</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention, response, intervention, and/or reparative processes</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation, mitigation, negotiation, and/or reconciliation</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/national/global peace movement</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disarmament, demilitarization, and/or environmental protection</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbying and/or interaction with law- and policymakers</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International education reform consultation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Survey Participants’ Rating of the Level of Alignment of Peace Building with the Professional Principles of Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment with peace building</th>
<th>Multicultural counseling</th>
<th>Social justice counseling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totally</td>
<td>15 (25%)</td>
<td>26 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerably</td>
<td>24 (40%)</td>
<td>22 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>12 (20%)</td>
<td>9 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimally</td>
<td>7 (12%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain/No opinion</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

Survey Participants' Rating of the Relevance of the UNESCO Peace Building Action Areas for Counselor Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNESCO Action Areas</th>
<th>Totally</th>
<th>Considerably</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Minimally</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peace Education</td>
<td>6 (10%)</td>
<td>27 (45%)</td>
<td>13 (22%)</td>
<td>9 (15%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Development</td>
<td>5 (8%)</td>
<td>20 (33%)</td>
<td>17 (28%)</td>
<td>8 (13%)</td>
<td>7 (12%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>29 (48%)</td>
<td>22 (37%)</td>
<td>6 (10%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Equality</td>
<td>29 (48%)</td>
<td>23 (38%)</td>
<td>6 (10%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Participation</td>
<td>13 (22%)</td>
<td>18 (30%)</td>
<td>21 (35%)</td>
<td>4 (7%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance, and Solidarity</td>
<td>27 (45%)</td>
<td>23 (38%)</td>
<td>7 (12%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory communication</td>
<td>23 (38%)</td>
<td>17 (28%)</td>
<td>16 (27%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Peace</td>
<td>8 (13%)</td>
<td>17 (28%)</td>
<td>18 (30%)</td>
<td>10 (17%)</td>
<td>4 (7%)</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

Survey Participants' Rating of Professional Expression of Peace Building in Teaching, Research, and Service/Volunteer Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Areas</th>
<th>Extensive</th>
<th>Considerable</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Minimal</th>
<th>None/Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>17 (28%)</td>
<td>13 (22%)</td>
<td>24 (40%)</td>
<td>5 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>6 (10%)</td>
<td>6 (10%)</td>
<td>15 (25%)</td>
<td>20 (33%)</td>
<td>13 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/ Volunteer Work</td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
<td>17 (28%)</td>
<td>15 (25%)</td>
<td>21 (35%)</td>
<td>4 (7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviews

Online survey participants could volunteer for participation in the follow-up telephone interviews by contacting the co-principal researcher via the e-mail address provided in the survey. Five survey participants volunteered for the follow-up interviews and were contacted via e-mail (Appendix D) to confirm their interest with the opportunity to ask questions and raise concerns prior to consenting to be interviewed. The 5 interview volunteers received the interview invitation letter (Appendix E) and two copies of the interview letter of consent (Appendix F). All of the 5 interview volunteers returned one signed copy of the consent letter with convenient times indicated for conducting the telephone interviews (Appendices G and H), and all 5 were subsequently interviewed.

Participants

Of the 5 participants in the follow-up interview, 4 were counselor education faculty, and 1 was a doctoral student. The 5 interviewees were all affiliated with CACREP-accredited counselor education programs. The interview participants were from these ACES regions: North Central (2), Southern (2), and Western (1). Of the faculty interviewees, 3 were male and 1 was female. A female doctoral student was interviewed.

Exploration of Peace Building in Counselor Education

The semi-structured follow-up telephone interview questions explored five areas: (1) interest and professional development in peace building, (2) conceptualization of peace building in counselor education, (3) counselor preparation for peace building, (4) contributions of counselor education to peace building, and (5) opportunities and
challenges in amplifying the notion of peace building and counselor education. The qualitative data garnered from the interview questions were subjected to the procedures of inductive analysis. Inductive analysis is a systematic and cyclical process of qualitative data analysis that incorporates multiple readings and coding of the data, and the reflective processing, categorizing, and display of singular meaning units uncovered in the data. The outcome of inductive analysis is an emergent understanding and expression of the qualitative data in terms of salient and connected categories and emerging themes, as assessed against, and supported by the data. The emergent understanding, applying the participants' exact words and phrases, is supplemented and contrasted with the findings from the online survey questions that covered similar and related areas of peace building in counselor education.

Interest Development in Peace Building

Three categories of interest development, namely visceral, experiential, and formal, were identified. The term visceral was used by one of the interviewees and emerged as a descriptor of the contents of that category. The researcher labeled the other two categories of the participants' interest development in peace building.

The interviewees' visceral interest refers to the interviewees' innate or acquired awareness and encompasses their personal beliefs, values, attitudes, and philosophy of life that kindled their interest in peace building issues and initiatives. One participant explained this visceral interest as follows:

"I just think that it's something about my nature . . . it's just something that is a part of who I am . . . and was socialized by the events of the United States in the '60s, and
particularly Martin Luther King’s nonviolence approach to dissent. And I’ve just basically adopted that orientation towards events.” The same interviewee said: “Intellectually I knew that, but it’s really different, I mean, because it’s visceral, you know; it’s a visceral awareness, and we’re taught to deny those things.”

Interviewees expressed visceral interest in peace building through personal resistance to oppressive socialized values and attitudes, and civic resistance to political actions and decisions not in support of peace initiatives such as governmental non-endorsement of, or noncompliance with international treaties, and civilian oppression and human rights violations consequential to military interventions. The following interviewee responses are depictive of this category.

“Well, I think that one of the real pivotal ones was in the height of the Vietnam War thing, I found myself in an argument with a close friend about involvement of the US troops in Vietnam. And all of a sudden I was able to stand outside myself, and I thought, what a fool . . . arguing and not being attentive to what the other person I was talking with was saying, and I just thought this is really crazy. So that became really a very critical event in terms of me checking about how I wanted to conduct myself, and what I thought about violence. And so this awareness that I had in the middle of this argument was just a bit of an epiphany if you will, and I began to see that, you know, I needed to be more open to differences of opinion; and so it kind of went from there.”

“Pivotal issues would be being cognizant of what happens in main stream society . . . political actions or political decisions . . . support of some sort of treaty . . . civil rights. I think things like that get my attention . . . And for me, we need an antiwar mentality if we’re going to be able to have more people prosper.”
Experiential interest development refers to particular personal and professional experiences that stimulated the interviewees’ interests in peace building concepts, issues, and activities. For one interviewee it was the personal experience of violence as a youth, for another it was the threat of the draft during the Vietnam War, and for yet another it was the contemplation of parental roles and identity within a particular socio-cultural context.

"Another thing that I would say that influenced me is becoming a parent . . . you know, it’s really about children, my children’s children, and so on. And that’s a different perspective that I only got, again, when I became a parent."

A combination of personal, social and political experiences was indicated to be at play in facilitating interest development in peace building. This interplay of experiences appears to be facilitated by the particular zeitgeist the interviewees have encountered. Political engagement in civil rights issues, the nonviolent resistance of Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King, peace activism during the Vietnam War, contemporary domestic and international terrorism, and the Middle East turmoil are prominent impressions of the interviewees’ experienced zeitgeist.

Experiences as a counselor educator and contemplation of the counselor role and identity were indicated as another area of experiential interest development in peace building. Professional concern for social justice and advocacy issues in particular entrenched and institutionalized sociopolitical inequalities and injustices, and the negative effect of social adversities on psychological well being, were specified as stimulating interest development in peace building. The following quotes have relevance.

"Probably so a pivotal point would be beginning to work as a counselor educator, seeing
my colleagues talk about the need for social justice, but also seeing them do things that contribute to inequality and people not being treated fairly.”

“I think that as counselors and psychologists that we do have an opportunity to influence the dialogue about peace, and introduce peace education into the work we do as well, because it’s part of our work. I think psychological well being is very much affected by societal and global situations where there’s unrest, and where we aren’t looking towards peace. I think that has an adverse emotional and often physical effect on people, and people’s well being . . . .”

The interviewees’ formal interest development in peace building is associated with undergraduate and graduate courses related to moral education and community building that focused on issues of peace and justice. All the interviewees encountered exposure to prominent professional and social role models, for example through the work, writings, teachings, and speeches of leaders such as Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King, and Carl Rogers. A lecture series by John Whiteley, called Quest for Peace, was also mentioned by one of the interviewees.

*Professional Development in Peace Building*

Professional development in peace building mirrored the identified categories of interest development, namely visceral, experiential, and formal development. Visceral professional development in peace building refers to the interviewees’ personal initiatives in self-explored and self-initiated education development in areas related to worldviews, spirituality, and counseling values. One participant stated aptly:

“I consider myself largely self taught, and intensely interested, and talk with people at the drop of a hat.”
Experiential professional development occurred through work as a counselor. Counselor experiences involved systemic engagement in violence intervention and prevention activities, intercultural relationship building, interethnic conflict resolution and reconciliation, international travel, and affiliations with professional, secular and religious special interests groups, networks, and peace movements. Counselors for Social Justice (CSJ), a division of ACA, was indicated by one of the interviewees to function as an appropriate medium for professional development in "...issues related to peace, and civil rights, and nonviolent resistance..." Two other interviewees, however, expressed uncertainty about CSJ's formal allegiance with a peace building agenda.

"There's a division within ACA that's social justice, and we have that at the state level, but I don't know, I think that there may be things going on related to peace building, but I don't know of anything that's going on formally."

"Promoting peace education is something that links very closely with issues of social justice. I'm not sure that the Counselors for Social Justice have peace studies as an agenda."

Formal professional development refers to pre- and in-service educational activities such as courses, lectures, workshops, and specialized training. Areas covered in these educational activities included interaction with professional role models, multicultural and social justice issues, human rights education, peace studies, community building, spirituality, and conflict transformation. All the interview participants indicated that continuing education in peace building that articulates the professional peace agenda is called for. This is how two participants reflected on this requisite:

"I think especially at the doctoral level of incorporating course work into the program..."
that trains people how to do peace building, and emphasizes how that is an ethical responsibility of ours.”

“But I think this conversation [peace building] is a larger one that takes us, I don’t want to say out of our comfort zone, but takes into an area where I think traditional counselor education does not visit. So from that point of view I think it’s important.”

*Conceptualization of Peace Building in Counselor Education*

The interviewees unanimously expressed that there is an absence of a theoretical and practical paradigm for peace building in counselor education training programs. One survey participant stated that “more education is needed as to how peace building is defined” prior to a field specific conceptualization. Two interviewees indicated that the conceptualization of peace building in counselor education is complicated by the referent being perceived as a “controversial” notion.

“Well I think part of it is because as counseling has tried to become more legitimate as a group that counselors and counselor educators have tried to keep away from controversial topics and issues over the years.”

“I would say it’s very much of a personal agenda . . . and that we are a pretty diverse group; I mean in the profession we have people who would be supportive of this kind of work and others who would say, you know, that that’s not really something that’s relevant to counselor education as a profession at all.”

The following interviewee responses captured the indistinctive conceptualization of peace building in counselor education.
"... perhaps now peace building: one, is not formally conceptualized in counseling, and number two, that in some ways it's related to the work of social justice primarily and maybe it peripherally is a multicultural counseling movement."

"Well, I don’t know that it [peace building] really is. I think probably people would tend to look at it more as conflict resolution and effective communication skills, that the whole concept of peace and peace building are I think sort of alien to counselor education, it’s a little bit here and there, but not much of anything specifically."

Peace building concepts and issues are perceived to receive minimal attention in counselor education and are circuitously addressed in the study of conflict resolution, and multicultural and social justice counseling. Two interviewees did, however, allude to possible conceptualizations of peace building in counselor education. One of the interviewees viewed the pro-peace and pro-inclusion activities of CSJ as a possible formal articulation of peace building in counselor education. Another interviewee stated that peace building is an assumed ethical responsibility of counselor education and fundamental to the principles of multicultural and social justice counseling. Several survey participants applied the terms “fit” and “extension” in reference to the conceptualization of peace building in terms of multicultural and social justice counseling.

Inductive analysis of the survey participants’ responses to the open-ended survey question on how peace building could be augmented in counselor education supplemented the interviewees’ perceptions. In contrast to the interviewees’ sparse input on the conceptualization of peace building, the survey participants’ responses contributed to a more expansive description of how counselor education might currently and
potentially be involved in peace building. A synthesis of the survey responses indicates that counselor education’s concern with primary, secondary and community intervention, conflict resolution, systemic thinking, and values and attitudes of tolerance and understanding, renders peace building a natural extension of the enterprise of counselor education. One survey participant’s response succinctly captures this theme: “I believe counselor education participates in peace building every time a counselor educator challenges a student to examine their views regarding tolerance, multicultural awareness, personal growth, partnerships with others, marginalized groups, and advocacy. We could do a better job by acknowledging that the ‘personal is political’ and engaging in these kinds of discussion beyond the walls of the classroom.”

As the particular open-ended survey question had a future oriented focus, the results are included in the section on the opportunities and challenges in amplifying the notion of peace building in counselor education.

Counselor Preparation for Peace Building

In the absence of a theoretical and practical paradigm for peace building in counselor education training programs, counselor preparation for peace building draws on individual initiatives and the development of peace building related counselor competencies. Peace building related counselor competencies were indicated as conflict resolution training, multicultural awareness and understanding, and advocacy and activism competency development. Individual initiatives were depicted as the facilitation of a teaching and training environment that is peace building oriented in topics, issues and concepts. This teaching and training environment fosters openness and curiosity, and supports conversations on the notion of peace building. As one interviewee responded:
"... everything I do has to do with fostering communication between and among individuals. And that I think if you were to talk to my students, particularly the doctoral students with whom I work, that this is a central feature of the conversations that I have. I guess the other thing that I do systematically is attempt to teach understanding, or actually what I teach is not necessarily understanding; I teach not knowing. And what I mean by that is by encouraging students to be open and curious to the reasons why individuals may behave the way they do, particularly in a reactive stance."

*Contributions of Counselor Education to Peace Building*

Categories and themes of the preceding explored areas are reverberated in the exploration of the contributions of counselor education as a field to building local and global cultures of peace. The interviewees endorsed the field’s capacity to cultivate understanding, tolerance, acceptance, forgiveness, reconciliation, and respect for socio-cultural diversity. Conflict resolution, systemic intervention for, and prevention of all forms of violence, counselor activism against marginalization, and advocacy for marginalized clients are further endorsements of the field’s contribution to building thriving communities. However, the specificity of the interviewees’ endorsement of the aforementioned capacities and contributions appear to be paradoxical to the previously indicated indistinctiveness of the professional conceptualization of peace building. The paradox may be explained as that in the absence of a formally articulated peace building agenda, the field’s capacity for peace building are interpreted and expressed by individuals. The interviewees were in agreement that the contributions of counselor education to peace building are vested in, and reliant upon, the individual initiatives and expressions of their peace building counselor roles and identities. The following
The interviewee response is illustrative of this theme: “Well, I think there’s a bit of a paradox here because, you know, to move forward, are we to move forward as individuals, or move forward as a profession? And the paradoxical nature is that I think it’s hard to do peace building, and to force people to do things at the same time. So, resolving that paradox is a real dilemma.”

*Opportunities and Challenges for Peace Building in Counselor Education*

The interviewees were asked to consider how counselor education can become more active or involved in peace building and what the challenges would be to generate such an active involvement. A related open-ended survey question on how peace building could be augmented in counselor education was included in the online survey. The outcome of inductive analysis of the qualitative data garnered from the indicated interview and survey questions is featured in this section. The following categories or meaning clusters were uncovered: (1) values and attitudes, (2) counselor role and identity, (3) leadership, and (4) infused curricula. The category labels are words and phrases used by the survey, as well as the interview participants.

*Values and attitudes.* Certain values and attitudes were indicated as challenges that stifle individual initiatives to incorporate peace building in counselor education. Academic conservatism was indicated to discourage discourse on sociopolitical issues. Open engagement in activism and advocacy was indicated to run the risk of social marginalization. The following responses from three interviewees are case in point. “But part of the challenges in a small community like this is that you run the risk of being branded as some sort of a wacko, and that’s a clinical term here, and being socially marginalized.”
“... and once was even threatened with being arrested and taken out of the hall, because I was passing out flyers encouraging people not to go to the ... because of their discriminatory policies.”

“I think in academia where there are watchdog groups that are accusing faculty of being too liberal, and so that may contribute to not wanting to mention political issues. ... not wanting to do activities for fear of how that looked to the students. ...”

Three interviewees identified the academic “competitive environment” as a challenge for the incorporation of peace building concepts and issues in counselor education. The competitive environment is described by the following interviewee responses:

“. . . a pertinent challenge is to get air space or print space. . . .”

“. . . but with the limited number of faculty we have, and the courses that we are required to offer, the only way that I can really do that is to do it out of my own hide and teach an extra course for no reimbursement.”

“. . . administrative bodies like legislators, third party payers, licensing boards, are putting more and more demands about things that that have to be covered in classes or courses of study, and all of these demands seem to take precedent.”

“And so as they [stakeholders] take precedent, there’s less and less time for important things like peace studies, or reconciliation ... one has to be sly about working it in, and so figuring out a way to have access to the air time or to the print space I think is really very critical.”

Counselor roles and identity. Counselors’ non-offensive attitudes or neutrality were indicated to contribute to a professional reticence to take a stand on peace building
issues. One of the interviewees stated as follows: “I think that counselor educators are afraid of offending people by taking a stand, instead wanting to come across as neutral, and so there are many opportunities to speak out which include speaking out in the classroom that counselor educators do not do.”

Advocacy emerged in the survey as well as the interview responses as a peace building role for counselors and counselor educators. Counselors’ capacity building in advocacy and activism was called for, specifically in models of systems advocacy that promote peaceful co-existence and prosperity for more people. Linkages between counselor education and peace building can be clarified by framing advocacy as an instrument of peace education, and by “broadening the advocacy language” in terms of peace building concepts and models. The following statements from two interviewees exemplify.

“When I think about one of the expectations of counselors is to be able to do advocacy work, advocacy work is not just at the individual level, but it’s at the institutional and societal level. I think part of our preparation as counselors needs to have attention drawn to the role we have at this more societal level of advocating for systems then, to contribute to building cultures of peace . . . advocacy competencies . . . and I think those are instruments or tools that can be linked to paradigms for peace education and counseling.”

“So helping to re-conceptualize the whole concept of advocacy is part of what we could be doing too, to help the students to understand that it’s not just those very limited kinds of definitions of advocacy; that actually we are talking about working to make the world a better place when we talk about advocacy.”
A survey participant stated: “Counselor educators need to become aware of their important role in including peace as an attainable goal of counseling.” And another encouraged counselors and students “to become active agents of change and not of the status quo.”

Although most survey and all the interview participants endorsed peace building as an integral part of the counselor role and identity, three survey participants raised cautionary consideration of counselor involvement in peace building. This caveat in asserting a peace building identity for counselors was not identified by any of the interviewees.

“Provide knowledge, but also respect free choice to be involved or not.”

“l’m not entirely sure that we should be [involved in peace building]. Are we diluting our instructional messages and purposes from counselor education into politics and lobbying? And whose lens of social justice are we embracing? There are so many…..”

“While I think that peace building and social justice are important, I’m not sure that counselor educators are the ones to promote an agenda per se. We may alienate a lot of students, clients, and the general public by taking strong, dogmatic positions on issues that may warrant more consideration than what we can give them. If counselor educators want to write policy, let them go into politics instead. Our primary mission is to teach, and we are not the values police.”

Leadership. Peace building in counselor education could gain momentum through organizational leadership initiatives, as indicated by several survey responses and all the interviewees. Such initiatives would encompass committing to the values of empowerment, tolerance, and reconciliation at the leadership level, an articulation of a
professional peace agenda, and endorsing the visibility of the professional conversation on peace building in terms of scholarship, conferences, learning institutes, and a special interest group. Organizational support for individual initiatives, collaboration with CSJ, and amplifying student involvement, are further examples of leadership initiatives. In addition to gaining support from professional organizations such as ACA, ACES and CSJ, a survey participant also referred to the role of Chi Sigma Iota in generating opportunities for students to get involved in peace and reconciliation initiatives. Other survey participants mentioned collaboration with UNESCO, UNHRC, and the UN, in support of counselors’ preparation for working with global concerns such as conflict, refugees, and sustainable development. The following statements from three survey participants are offered as further clarification of the leadership theme.

“Counselor Education has a long way to go . . . this is evident by the number of minorities involved in the approved tenure process, and minorities in leadership positions. It’s not a matter of peace building nationally, if we cannot bridge the issues and terminologies that compound peace building in our own organizations.”

“First of all you need to stop looking at JUST the concerns of the local environment. For example, many immigrant students come from countries where there was civil unrest, and school counselors should have some idea of the political and social structures of that country and population. To only focus on U.S. concerns doesn’t give credence to the issues that effect structures of that country and population. To only focus on U.S. concerns doesn’t give credence to the issues that effect a world population. On other words, the ACA needs to form an alliance with the U.N. and its various partnerships and other interest groups to prepare counselors for international service, so that we can
properly assist clients in need, i.e., refugee students, victims of human trafficking, clients from war torn countries, etc."

*Infused curricula.* Infusion of peace building concepts and issues in counselor education curricula featured as a recommendation by several survey and all the interview participants. A multicultural/social justice/peace building triad emerged as a theme for curricular adaptation. One of the interviewees suggested peace education as a connecting core in the triad. The notion of peace education in counselor education refers to a didactic context for the interdependent, interactive and systemic dialogue on international sociopolitical issues. Most survey participants favored classroom-supported community outreach projects and immersion activities for the development and practice of triadic competencies. Advocacy competencies in particular were underscored for promotion and re-conceptualization in terms of larger social systems whilst remaining client- and community- focused. Another curricular proposal was to avail elective courses in peace building to doctoral students. One survey participant titled such a proposed elective course as “Peace, Reconciliation, and Counseling.” Survey participants indicated that an international perspective on conflict and peace is required to enable counselors to effectively work with immigrants, refugees, clients from regions of intractable conflict, and victims of torture, human rights violations and human trafficking. In this regard, a survey participant stated: “For one thing, the field needs to do more to prepare counselors to work effectively in a global environment with individuals and issues from conflict and non-conflict societies . . . .” Another stated: “By taking the principles we teach and more overtly relating [the principles] to an interactive and interdependent global application, as opposed to an isolated counseling relationship.”
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The current CACREP standards for counselor education were perceived to be hindering in gaining ground for peace building in counselor education. The extent of the existing standards curtails the incorporation of new and additional standards for peace building. The absence of standards for peace building inhibits the development of a peace building paradigm for counselor education. The four faculty interviewees concurred in an appeal for a review of the standards, with a re-investment in, and re-language of the social justice and advocacy standards to incorporate peace building concepts and models. As the following interviewee prospectively declared: “I think that we’re going through the revision of the CACREP standards right now, possibly looking at the proposed revisions, and see how language related to peace building as part of our preparation, whether it falls under social cultural foundations, whether it falls under advocacy; but using that as the for instance [language]. It would certainly add value to the way we are moving into the next phase of preparation of counselors . . . it could definitely be beneficial to put it in at this time.”

Summary of the Interview Results

The 5 interview participants were all affiliated with CACREP accredited counselor education programs. Four were faculty and one a doctoral student in counselor education. The interviewees’ interest and professional development in peace building revealed visceral, experiential, and formal dimensions of development. The interviewees unanimously expressed that a formal theoretical and practical paradigm for peace building is absent in counselor education. Peace building concepts and issues are circuitously addressed in the study and practice of multicultural and social justice counseling. The practice in, and preparation of counselors for peace building are vested
in and reliant upon individual initiatives and individual expressions of a peace building
counselor role and identity. Opportunities and challenges in amplifying the notion of
peace building in counselor education were also explored with the interviewees. Their
responses, supplemented by the survey findings, indicated four areas for consideration,
namely (1) values and attitudes, (2) counselor role and identity, (3) leadership, and
(4) curriculum development.

The purpose of this exploratory study was to survey for a general impression of
the notion of peace building in counselor education. Follow-up qualitative interviews
elaborated on the surveyed information and aimed to explore for pertinent concepts,
strategies, and challenges specific to counselor education in promoting and engaging in
peace building. The chapter outlined the quantitative and qualitative findings of the
online survey in terms of an overview of how peace building is understood and expressed
in counselor education. The survey overview described the survey participants, their
interests and professional development in peace building, and how peace building
manifests personally and professionally for the participants. The second part of the
chapter outlined the qualitative findings of the follow-up interview, supplemented by and
contrasted with survey findings that explored similar areas as the interview questions.
These areas were: (1) interest and professional development, (2) conceptualization,
(3) counselor preparation, (4) counselor education’s contributions, and (5) opportunities
and challenges in amplifying the notion of peace building in counselor education.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

A contemporary heed or “urgent task” (Gerstein & Moeschberger, 2003, p. 115) for counselors is to facilitate peace building initiatives and processes. Peace building and peace education appear to be conceptually congruent with counselor competencies, especially in terms of the multicultural and social justice standards of practice. Peace building concepts, issues, strategies, models and research on nonviolence, conflict transformation, reconciliation, and democratization are, however, “rarely addressed in the counseling profession” (p. 117).

The purpose of this exploratory study was to attend to the paucity in the counselor education literature with a preliminary exploration of the unique conceptualization and manifestation of peace building in counselor education. The exploration gauged the peace building interest, perspectives, and experiences of counselor educators, and attempted to reveal a contextualized understanding of peace building in counselor education. The purpose of the exploratory research was thus to survey for a general impression of the notion of peace building in counselor education, and to reveal pertinent concepts, contributions, and challenges of counselor peace building. The concluding chapter interprets the explorative study’s results by summarizing the current status of, and future directions for peace building in counselor education. The current status is represented in terms of a profile of counselor peace builders and a general expression of peace building
in counselor education. Future directions are described in terms of the opportunities and challenges in amplifying the notion of peace building in counselor education. Finally, the limitations and significance of the study were addressed.

Counselor Education and Peace Building: Current Status

A Profile of Counselor Education Peace Builders

The results of both the online survey and the follow-up interviews indicate that the field’s capacity for peace building are interpreted and expressed through individual initiatives. The contributions of counselor education to peace building are vested in, and reliant upon, the individual initiatives and expressions of their peace building counselor roles and identities. The results of both the survey and interviews also indicate that these individual initiatives and expressions of counselor peace building activities are stimulated through a visceral, experiential, and formal interest and knowledge development in peace building issues and strategies. A consolidated review of these development areas is offered as a description of this conspicuous aspect of a counselor peace builder profile. The profile highlights the influence of values, attitudes, and experiential activities in promoting counselor peace building.

Formal interest and knowledge development refer to training experiences such as courses, seminars, and workshops in the areas of conflict and alternative dispute resolution, mediation, trauma interventions, peace studies, human rights education, and multicultural and social justice issues. Visceral and experiential interest and knowledge development encompass awareness, values, beliefs, and particular personal and professional experiences related to the notion and practice of peace and peace building.
Personal or life experiences are indicated to contribute to perspectives on peace building. These life experiences incorporate pro-peace values, social justice issues, multicultural immersion, and encounters with local and global incidents of conflict and violence. Personal peace building initiatives are expressed as activities promoting human rights awareness, democratization processes, humanitarian assistance and interventions, understanding of conflict and peace issues, and elimination of marginalization and oppression.

Visceral professional development in peace building refers to self-explored and self-initiated experiences in areas related to worldviews, spirituality, and counseling values. Professional peace building initiatives and experiences include work to empower marginalized groups and communities, violence prevention and intervention, school- and community based conflict resolution, and affiliations with special interest groups. Professional development is also facilitated through teaching and training environments that fostered openness and curiosity, and supported conversations on peace building issues and strategies. Counselors’ individual initiatives in peace building are inspired by the work and teachings of peace builder role models such as Martin Luther King and Carl Rogers. The ethical and spiritual social activism of Mohandas Gandhi in particular is observed as a nonviolent and non-injurious civil strategy in pursuit of social change and distributive social justice.

Peace Building in Counselor Education

The results of this exploratory study support a latent compatibility between peace building and counselor education. This compatibility may be understood in terms of the majority of participants’ endorsement of the level of alignment of peace building with the
imperative professional principles of multicultural and social justice counseling. The participants’ endorsed alignment suggests the capacity of the professional standards and competencies to provide the underpinnings of culturally competent, socially just, and ethical counselor peace building. Peace building, multicultural competence, and social justice counseling thus converge in terms of the conceptualization of structural and cultural violence as being unjust social conditions, and the role of social action and advocacy in facilitating individual and community empowerment. According to the participants in this exploratory study peace building augments social justice and multicultural counseling. The promotion and protection of human rights, democratization, nonviolent conflict transformation, communal healing, reconciliation and restorative justice were acknowledged as fundamental outcomes for counselor peace building.

UNESCO identified eight areas of peace building action necessary to facilitate the transition to a global culture of peace. The study’s participants endorsed all eight areas as being relevant to counselor education to various extents. The action areas for development in human rights, gender equality, tolerance and solidarity, and participatory communication were indicated to be particularly relevant. Action areas related to democratic participation, international peace and security, peace education, and sustainable development were also indicated to be relevant but to a lesser extent than the aforementioned areas.

A foundational understanding of counselor peace building thus appears to be aligned with how peace building is conceptualized in the discussed literature review. Peace building is conceptualized as culture-centered processes, actions and initiatives that: promote alternatives to violence, foster equitable and sustainable living, and support
nonviolent conflict resolution and transformation through reconciliation, trauma-healing, and restorative justice. The results of the survey and the follow-up interviews indicate that peace building concepts; issues and strategies are actually compatible with the principles and practices of counselor education. The absence of a theoretical and practical paradigm for peace building in counselor education training programs was, however, indicated to be hindering the professional articulation and manifestation of counselor peace building. Counselor preparation for peace building thus capitalizes on individual initiatives and the development of related multicultural and social justice counselor competencies. The conceptualization of peace building in counselor education is complicated by the perception of peace building as a controversial notion. Some of the interviewees explained this controversy in terms of a professional attitude that aspires to counselor neutrality and thus avoids or rejects issues of perceived controversy. A further dilemma is whether professional leadership has the mandate to stipulate counselor peace building and how such a directive may encumber individual counselor initiatives and expressions. The inconspicuous discourse of peace building issues at the professional and organizational levels may thus be consequential to these identified professional predicaments.

In contrast to the reported absence of a theoretical and practical paradigm for peace building in counselor education, professional psychology's support of, and contribution to UNESCO's program of peace action is grounded in the contemporary paradigms of humanistic and positive psychology, community psychology, peace psychology, the psychology of liberation, and feminist perspectives. With the professional paradigms identified, psychology's peace movement contributes to peace
building through continued engagement in the four identified discipline specific action areas of consciensitizing, consultation, activism, and policy development. A brief review of these discipline specific action areas, as described in chapter two, follows. The four action areas promote the affirmation of indigenous psychologies and nonviolence as paradigms and political strategies, and socially just and equitable policy development and activism. Activities in community building, democratization processes, trauma healing and reconciliation, the prevention and mitigation of structural violence, and the promotion of human rights and sustainable development are also articulated as professional psychology’s involvement in peace building.

The peace building activities in the areas identified by professional psychology are thus not entirely incompatible with the capacities and practices of counselor education. Counselor education’s concern with primary, secondary, and community intervention and prevention, conflict resolution, systemic thinking, and values and attitudes of multicultural understanding, renders peace building a plausible dimension of the enterprises of counselor education. The results of the explorative study also endorsed counselor competency development in activism against marginalization and advocacy for marginalized clients. Although counselor education’s capacity for peace building is already rooted in individual expressions and initiatives, an articulated discipline specific theoretical and practical paradigm may stimulate growth in the field’s contribution to the global processes of peace building analysis, intervention and activism.
Counselor Education and Peace Building: Future Directions

*Challenges and Opportunities for Peace Building in Counselor Education*

The results of this exploratory study indicated that the capacity for peace building in counselor education is established in terms of appreciation for socio-cultural diversity, conflict resolution, systemic intervention, and advocacy for marginalized groups. Further exploration of the identified challenges and opportunities may be important to the development of the field’s capacity for, and engagement in peace building. The challenges and opportunities for peace building in counselor education are described in terms of values and attitudes, counselor role and identity, leadership, and peace building infused curricula.

Certain values and attitudes were indicated as challenges that stifle individual initiatives to incorporate peace building in counselor education and confine the field’s engagement and discourse. Conservatism in the academic environment was indicated to discourage discourse on sociopolitical issues. Open engagement in activism and advocacy was indicated to run the risk of social marginalization. Academic resource limitations for research and curricular innovation, and the challenge to access professional air and print space, contributed to the perception of counselor education academics as being competitive. A further challenge contributing to this perceived competitiveness in the field was indicated to be the prescribed and bounded counselor education curriculum, and the demands from stakeholders such as legislators, third party payers, and licensing boards, that are perceived to limit the incorporation of peace building concepts and issues in counselor education.
Counselors' non-offensive attitudes or neutrality were indicated as a factor in the professional reticence to take a stand on peace building issues. Activism and advocacy, however, were indicated by both survey and interview participants as peace building roles for counselors and counselor educators. Counselors' capacity building in advocacy and activism is called for, specifically in models of systems advocacy that promote peaceful co-existence and prosperity for more people. Linkages between counselor education and peace building can be clarified by framing advocacy as an instrument of peace education, and by “broadening the advocacy language” to include peace building concepts and models. Although several survey participants and all the interview participants endorsed peace building as an integral part of the counselor role and identity, caution was, however, expressed by a few survey participants. The cautionary comments related to affording counselor educators a choice in peace building participation, and the contemplation of the consumers' and stakeholders' responses to counselors' engagement in peace building activities.

Peace building in counselor education could gain momentum through organizational leadership initiatives driven by ACES, CSJ, and Chi Sigma Iota, as indicated by several of the study's participants. Such initiatives would encompass an articulation of a professional peace agenda, amplification of student involvement, and endorsement of the professional conversations on peace building through scholarship, conferences, and learning institutes. Facilitating collaboration with UNESCO, UNHRC, and the UN, in support of counselors' preparation for working with global issues and concerns, is another leadership initiative to be considered.
Infusion of peace building concepts and issues in counselor education curricula could feature as a multicultural/social justice/peace building triad with peace education as a connecting core. Peace education in counselor education provides a didactic context for the interdependent, interactive and systemic dialogue on international sociopolitical issues. Such a didactic context would capitalize on classroom-supported community outreach projects for the development and practice of triadic competencies. Amongst these triadic competencies, the advocacy competencies would feature prominently, but re-conceptualized in terms of larger social systems whilst remaining client- and community focused.

The current CACREP standards for counselor education were perceived by several of the study’s participants to be hindering in gaining ground for peace building in counselor education. The extent of the existing standards curtails the incorporation of new and additional standards for peace building. The absence of standards for peace building inhibits the development of a peace building paradigm for counselor education. This perception of the professional practice standards calls for a continuation of the professional dialogue on the nature of counselor peace building development and practice. Such a dialogue, as indicated by the study’s participants, may stimulate a review or a “relanguageing” of, and a subsequent re-investment in, the social justice and advocacy standards and competencies in terms of peace building concepts and models.

The leadership of the UN and UNESCO has developed a common vision for global peace building in the 21st century, and has invited the helping professions and their commitment to social justice as allies in the realization of global cultures of peace. Counselors’ capacities for peace building are grounded in, and affirmed by the
multicultural and social justice competencies. Social justice counseling augments multiculturalism toward sociopolitical activism, systemic social change, the dismantlement of structural and cultural violence, and the promotion of distributive and reparative justice. Multicultural and social justice counseling have been ratified as the fourth and fifth forces respectively in steering the counseling profession towards culturally and socially responsive service delivery (Essandoh, 1996). A triadic conceptualization of peace education, multicultural and social justice counseling begets counselor peace building to emerge as a united force in steering counselor education towards cultivating local and global cultures of peace. Steering counselor education’s capacity for peace building, however, requires leadership initiatives, articulation of a professional peace identity and agenda, and curricular and pedagogical innovations, for “We must work toward achieving world peace consistently, seriously, vehemently, enthusiastically, as if our very own existence depends upon it, and it does” (Cooper, 1987, p. 72).

Limitations of the Study

According to Stewart (2000), validity in qualitative research is achieved through the trustworthiness of the research processes and the usefulness of the data garnered thereby. Meaningful and valid qualitative conclusions are attained if the research design and protocols manage researcher bias, identify and access suitable research participants, and elicit and capture authentic and essential narratives (Morrow, 2005). The standards of quality and trustworthiness for this particular qualitative study on peace building and counselor education were aspired to by following the guidelines for qualitative interviewing established by Rubin and Rubin (1995) and the general guidelines of Miles and Huberman (1994). Specific procedures that would render the study trustworthy
included the following: (1) explication of the research paradigm, methods, and procedures as informed by the exploratory nature of the research question, (2) multiple data sources: the survey, interview, reflective research journal, and participant feedback, (3) inductive data analysis, and (4) consideration of the bounded transferability of the results.

Although online surveys are considered to be practical and effective research tools in terms of time and cost effectiveness, accessing less visible populations, ease of completion, simplified data processing, and the quality and quantity of the information elicited, low response rates, though higher than mail surveys, are indicated as a limitation of online survey data collection (Lyons, Cude, Lawrence, & Gutter, 2005; Granello & Wheaton, 2004). Response rates for online surveys are increased if potential survey respondents are informed of the cost of time of survey completion, assured of respondent privacy and anonymity, and receive frequent reminders (Granello & Wheaton, 2004). Excessive open-ended survey questions are also associated with higher abandonment rates (Granello & Wheaton, 2004). The ratio (1: 0.61) of survey site visits (99) to survey completion (60) raises the questions as to what deferred 39 potential survey participants from survey completion, and what else could have been implemented, either in terms of changing the content and format of the survey, or posting more CESNET listserv reminders to increase the response rate of the online survey. Thus, despite following the guidelines of Granello and Wheaton (2004), and the assertion that online surveys have a higher response rate than mail surveys (Lyons et al., 2005), the response rate of 7% for the study’s online survey was disappointing. However, the online survey targeted an unknown or less visible population as peace building is an unexplored notion of
counselor education. As the possible or base response rate is thus unknown, and the purpose of the survey was to explore for an initial and general impression of the notion of peace building, the 7% response rate could also be considered as optimum.

Another limitation of online survey data collection is that of sample representativeness (Granello & Wheaton, 2004; Lyons et al., 2005). The CESNET listserv was the only medium for participant solicitation for both survey and interview phases of the study. Although the CESNET listserv is a professional forum for counselor education faculty and students to discourse and share information on current issues and topics related to the field of counselor education, relying only on Listserv subscription may have restricted the scope of participant recruitment. Ideal or suitable counselor education participants, as defined by a capacity to contribute to a comprehensive description and clarification of the notion or experience being studied, may have been excluded simply because they were not signed on to the CESNET listserv, the only recruitment mechanism. As stated by Lyons et al. (p. 347), “... the quality of the sample primarily is determined by the quality of the list.”

Qualitative research in general, and in particular the model of qualitative interviewing of Rubin and Rubin (1995), relies on open selection and iterative data gathering processes to acquire the desired comprehensive and redundant body of data of which patterns and themes are extrapolated. The depth and breadth of the information garnered from the surveys and follow-up interviews in this study were contingent upon attracting suitable survey participants and further soliciting suitable volunteers for the follow-up interviews. Static, instead of iterative participant selection procedures, thus constituted the convenience sample of the study. The bounded iterative nature of the
research and sampling procedures may thus in effect have inhibited the realization of data saturation, rendering the findings with limited transferability.

Trustworthiness of the research processes, and consequentially the meaningfulness of the qualitative conclusions, depends upon auditing processes that guarantee fairness and authenticity in data representation and interpretation. The study’s auditing process could have been improved with peer reviews of the inductive qualitative analysis procedures and outcomes. As only two of the five interviewees responded to the e-mail request for review and confirmation of their contact summaries, sending e-mail reminders to the other three interview participants may have increased the responses to the request for review and/or confirmation of the follow-up interview contact summaries.

**Implications for Future Research**

Despite the aforementioned limitations, the study is of some consequence in terms of being an initial exploration of an unchartered notion of counselor education. The exploratory purpose of the research was to survey for a general impression of the notion of peace building in counselor education, and to reveal pertinent concepts, contributions, and challenges of counselor peace building. The study explored the peace building interest and experiences of the counselor education participants, and their perspectives on the context specific capacities and challenges of peace building in counselor education. The results underscored the dimensions of the study participants’ interest development in peace building and the peace building activities in which the counselor education participants were engaged. The study’s participants endorsed the suitability of the multicultural and social justice counseling competencies as conduits for peace building
concepts, issues, and strategies. The study also identified the opportunities for and the challenges of the amplification of the notion of peace building in the counselor education.

The explorative study is thus significant in having produced results that identified and elaborated on counselor peace building perspectives and practices, although in a limited way. The results of the explorative study are limited in its capacity for inferences and transferability due to the bounded iterative nature of the study. Although the study’s participants endorsed the compatibility of the notion of peace building with the principles and practices of counselor education, several participants referred to the need for a continued professional conversation on the implications of counselor peace building.

The professional conversation on peace building in counselor education could be facilitated through ACES initiatives such as peace building symposiums, learning institutes, or a peace building theme for the regional or annual conferences. The professional conversation could be steered by a counselor education special interest group in peace studies. Collaboration or partnerships with organizations that facilitate peace building initiatives could inform and guide the professional conversation. Organizations with global impact, such as the UN, UNESCO, and the UNHRC, could be considered for these professional partnerships, as well as local and community-based organizations that engage in building cultures of peace. As 42% of the study’s participants were doctoral students in counselor education, the role of Chi Sigma Iota in this professional conversation on peace building should be considered. In fact, many of the faculty participants underscored the role of students in bringing about academic and professional innovation. The professional conversation could also be continued in print through articles in the professional newsletter Counseling Today and a special issue of
the Journal of Counseling and Development. Although the results of the explorative study have limited capacity for inferences and transferability, the significance of the study is indicated by the identified call for a professional conversation on peace building to continue. The results of the study are indicative of an individual counselor educator’s interest in, and practice of peace building. A continued professional conversation could explore the breath and depth of this individual peace building interest and practice, as one of the interviewees aptly stated: “I think that it [professional conversation on peace building] has to begin probably with a trickle, and hopefully it will build into a stream.”

The continued professional conversation would hopefully also advance further research of the notion of counselor peace building. Although the results of this exploratory study indicated that peace building is conceptually and experientially congruent with the multicultural and social justice principles and counselor competencies, the counselor education perspectives on peace, nonviolence, reconciliation, conflict transformation, restorative social justice, and professional peace capacity building are still focal areas for future research.

The concluding chapter summarized the results of an initial quantitative and qualitative exploration of the unique conceptualization and manifestation of peace building in counselor education. The results of this explorative study were consolidated and featured in two main sections. The current status of peace building in counselor education was represented by a profile of counselor peace builders and a general expression of peace building in counselor education. Future directions were described in terms of the opportunities and challenges in amplifying the notion of peace building in counselor education. Finally, the limitations and significance of the study were addressed.
Appendix A

Recruitment of Participants via the CESNET Listserv

First Recruitment Posting:

Faculty and doctoral students in the field of counselor education are invited to participate in an online survey designed to explore the conceptualization, practice, and challenges of peace building in counselor education.

With the first decade of the new millennium earmarked by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) as the *Decade for a Culture of Peace and Nonviolence for the Children of the World*, it is important to raise awareness and to gauge the capacity of counselor education to contribute to building local and global cultures of peace. Your perspectives as current and future faculty in counselor education are vital in developing and sharing our field’s understanding and practice of peace building.

Please take time to read the introduction and consent to the survey to help you make an informed decision about whether or not to participate. The survey is designed to facilitate ease of completion and will take approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete. Thank you for your time and willingness to consider participating in this survey research. By clicking on the link below, you will be directed to the survey introduction.


Second Recruitment Posting (Posted two weeks after first recruitment posting):

This is another invitation to faculty and doctoral students in the field of counselor education to participate in an online survey designed to explore the conceptualization, practice, and challenges of peace building in counselor education.

If you have already completed the survey, thank you for taking time and sharing your valuable perspectives on peace building.

With the first decade of the new millennium earmarked by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) as the *Decade for a Culture of Peace and Nonviolence for the Children of the World*, it is important to raise awareness and to gauge the capacity of counselor education to contribute to building local and global cultures of peace.

Your opinions as current and future faculty in counselor education are vital in developing and sharing our field’s understanding and practice of peace building.

Please take time to read the introduction and consent to the survey to help you make an informed decision about whether or not to participate. The survey is designed to facilitate ease of completion and will take approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete. Thank you for your time and willingness to consider participating in this survey research. By clicking on the link below, you will be directed to the survey introduction.

Appendix B

Online Survey Consent Document

Purpose and Procedures:
You are invited to complete an online survey designed to explore the conceptualization, practice, and challenges of peace building in counselor education. A pre-test indicated that it would take approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete. Your participation and perspectives are important in raising awareness and developing an understanding of how the field of counselor education in contributing to building local and global cultures of peace. Thank you for taking time to consider sharing your perspectives on counselor education and peace building.

Discomfort and Risks:
There are no foreseen risks or discomforts involved in your participation, other than the cost of time. However, if you experience any discomfort during or after survey completion, please notify the researchers to discuss your concerns. Their contact details are provided below.

Confidentiality and Anonymity:
When you complete the online survey, your responses will be compiled by an independent data collection service and provided to the co-principal researcher with a respondent code. Please do not respond with identifying information of yourself or others in the open-ended questions. Access to the information is password protected and will remain anonymous and confidential. Your participation in this study is voluntary. You are free to decide not to participate. Completion and submission of the inline survey signifies your participation in this study and your consent for use of the responses you supply.

Research Contact:
Dr. Suzanne Hedstrom, principal researcher, and Jenny Ritha Keller, co-principal researcher, from Western Michigan University, Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology, are conducting the study. The study is the co-principal researcher’s doctoral dissertation project entitled: “Counselor Education and Peace Building: Current Status and Future Directions.” If you have any questions or concerns about your participation, you may contact the principal researcher, Dr. Suzanne Hedstrom at 616-7425069, or Jenny Ritha Keller at 403-6915976. You may also contact the Chair, Western Michigan University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) at 269-3878293, or the Vice President for Research at 269-3878289.

The Western Michigan University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) approved this study on 1/19/06 for one year. Refrain from participation after 1/19/07.
Appendix C

Online Survey

**Peace Building** values meeting human needs and protecting human rights. Peace building refers to all processes, actions, and initiatives that promote alternatives to direct, structural and cultural violence. Peace building fosters non-violent conflict transformation, reconciliation, restorative justice, and equitable and sustainable living. Peace building may manifest in many different societal levels and contexts. Human rights activism, victim support and trauma healing, community empowerment, environmental protection, public policy initiatives, and facilitating dialogue between conflicting individuals or groups, are a few examples of peace building in action.

1. How would you rate your interest in peace building?
   - Not interested  
   - Interested  
   - Very Interested

2. How would you rate your knowledge of peace building?
   - None  
   - Minimal  
   - Moderate  
   - Considerable  
   - Extensive

3. Have you received or participated in any training, continuing education or professional development related to peace building?
   - Yes
   - No

If yes, please describe. Please do not provide identifying information of yourself or others.
4. Please select all that apply to describe your personal experiences in peace building:

- Engaged in non-violent civil disobedience, for example protest, persuasion, non-co-operation
- Provided services or expertise to prevention, response, intervention, and/or reparative processes
- Attended events related to disarmament, demilitarization, and/or environmental protection
- Joined a local/national/global peace movement
- Encouraged human rights awareness and protection
- Provided or supported relief aid or humanitarian assistance
- Exercised and/or promoted democratic principles and practices
- Engage in mediation, mitigation, principled negotiation, reconciliation, and/or other conflict transformation services
- Lobbied and/or interacted with law- or policymakers regarding peace building issues
- Expanded awareness, knowledge and understanding of peace and conflict issues through readings, discussions, and/or presentations
- Memberships in organizations or groups that support any of the above
- None of the above
- Other, please specify:
5. Please indicate to what extent peace building concepts and issues are incorporated in your PROFESSIONAL experiences with regards to:

Teaching:
None/Not applicable  Minimal  Moderate  Considerable  Extensive

Research interests and activities:
None/Not applicable  Minimal  Moderate  Considerable  Extensive

Service work and volunteer activities:
None/Not applicable  Minimal  Moderate  Considerable  Extensive

6. Please provide details of your professional experiences in peace building as related to your responses in Question 5 above. Please do not provide information that could identify yourself or others.

7. How would you rate your academic department’s concern with curricular development to incorporate and promote peace building concepts and issues?
Not Concerned  Minimally Concerned  Moderately Concerned  Considerably Concerned  Very Concerned

8. How do you consider counselor peace building to be aligned with the professional principles of:
Multicultural counseling:
Uncertain/ Not at all  Minimally  Moderately  Considerably  Totally
No opinion
Social justice counseling:

Uncertain/ Not at all Minimally Moderately Considerably Totally
No opinion

9. In your opinion, how compatible are the fields of peace building and counselor education?

Uncertain/ Not at all Minimally Moderately Considerably Totally
No opinion

10. Please rate how the field of counselor education is currently doing in preparing counselors for peace building:

Uncertain/No opinion Poor Fair Good Excellent

11. When considering your memberships in professional counseling associations, how would you rate the level of professional organizational support for counselor peace building initiatives and activities?

Uncertain/ None Minimal Moderate Considerable Extensive
No opinion

12. In support of the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-violence for the Children of the World, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has identified eight areas of action for peace
building. Please rate how you consider each of the eight areas relevant to counselor education.

Peace Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uncertain/</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Minimally</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Considerably</th>
<th>Totally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sustainable economic and social development:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uncertain/</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Minimally</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Considerably</th>
<th>Totally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Human rights:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uncertain/</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Minimally</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Considerably</th>
<th>Totally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender equality:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uncertain/</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Minimally</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Considerably</th>
<th>Totally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Democratic participation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uncertain/</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Minimally</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Considerably</th>
<th>Totally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Understanding, tolerance, and solidarity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uncertain/</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Minimally</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Considerably</th>
<th>Totally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participatory communication and free flow of information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uncertain/</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Minimally</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Considerably</th>
<th>Totally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
International peace and security:

Uncertain/ Not at all  Minimally  Moderately  Considerably  Totally

No opinion

13. In your opinion, how could counselor education be involved in peace building?

14. Please select your experience in number of years as a counselor educator:
   - Doctoral student, not applicable
   - Less than 1 year
     - 1
     - 2
     - 3
     - 4
     - 5
     - 6
     - 7
     - 8
     - 9
     - 10
     - 11
     - 12
     - 13
     - 14
     - 15
     - 16
     - 17
     - 18
     - 19
     - 20
     - 21
     - 22
     - 23
     - 24
     - 25
     - 26
     - 27
     - 28
     - 29
15. Please select all that describes your counselor educator employment profile:

- Doctoral student
- Part-time faculty
- Full-time faculty
- Lecturer
- Assistant professor
- Associate professor
- Professor
- Untenured
- Tenured
- Other, please specify:
• Black, Non-Hispanic
• Hispanic
• Pacific Islander
• White, non-Hispanic
• Other, please specify:

17. Please state your nationality (e.g. South Africa, Canada, United States of America)

18. Indicate your sex:
• Female
• Male

19. Briefly describe how your life experiences have influenced your perspectives on peace building. Please do not provide information that could identify yourself or others.

20. Please indicate the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) region that applies to you:
• North Atlantic
• North Central
• Southern
• Rocky Mountain
• Western

• Other, please specify:

21. Are you affiliated with a Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) accredited counselor education programs?

• Yes

• No

22. Please provide additional comments and information relevant to peace building and counselor education here. Please do not provide identifying information of yourself or others.

Thank you for your effort and time in completing this survey. Your opinions and perspectives as a counselor educator on peace building are important.

To further explore the conceptualization and manifestation of peace building in counselor education, the co-principal researcher of the study will also be conducting follow-up telephone interviews. The telephone interviews will be approximately 40 to 60 minutes in duration, and will further explore the areas covered by the survey.

If you are interested to participate in such a follow-up interview, please e-mail the co-principal researcher, Jenny Ritha Keller, at jennyr.keller@wmich.edu to communicate your interest and questions you have about your potential participation.
Appendix D

Email Script to Interview Participants

Dear ________________________,

You recently indicated your interest to participate in a follow-up telephone interview on peace building and counselor education. Thank you for taking the time and your willingness to share your important perspectives and experiences. The telephone interview will be audio taped, 40 to 60 minutes in duration, and will further explore the areas covered in the survey by focusing on your perspectives of and experiences in peace building, the role of counselor education in building local and global cultures of peace, and the challenges of counselor education in promoting peace building.

If you are still interested in participating in such an interview, kindly provide a mailing address by return email to which the interview consent documents could be sent to you. If you have any questions or concerns about your participation in the interview, please contact the principal researcher, Dr. Suzanne Hedstrom at 616-7425069, suzanne.hedstrom@wmich.edu, or the co-principal researcher, Jenny Ritha Keller at 403-6915976, jennyr.keller@wmich.edu.

Sincerely,
Jenny Keller
Co-principal Researcher
Appendix E

Invitation Letter to Interview Participants
1817 11th Avenue SW Suite 303
Calgary, Alberta
T3C 0N7
Canada

___/___/2006

Dear ________________________________________,

Follow-up telephone interview on peace building and counselor education

You recently indicated your interest to participate in a follow-up telephone interview on peace building and counselor education. Thank you for taking the time and your willingness to share your important perspectives and experiences.

Please find enclosed two copies of the interview consent document. If you are still willing to participate in a follow-up telephone interview, please read the enclosed consent document, and return one signed copy with the detached portion below in the stamped envelope provided. On receipt of the documents, the co-principal researcher, Jenny Ritha Keller, will contact you by telephone to schedule the research interview at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Jenny Ritha Keller
Co-principal Researcher
jennyr.keller@wmich.edu

Please detach this portion

(Please provide area codes and extensions where applicable)

Name: ____________________________ Telephone: __________________________

Most convenient days and times to be contacted for the follow-up research telephone interview:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
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I have been invited to participate in a research study entitled, Peace Building and Counselor Education: Current Status and Future Directions, by Dr. Suzanne Hedstrom, principal researcher, and Jenny Ritha Keller, co-principal researcher. The study is Jenny Keller's doctoral dissertation project. The purpose of the study is to explore the conceptualization, practice, and challenges of peace building in counselor education. The findings may benefit counselor educators in developing an understanding of how their field contributes to building local and global cultures of peace.

My participation in this study will involve a telephonic interview with the co-principal researcher, Jenny Ritha Keller. The telephonic interview will be approximately 40 to 60 minutes in duration, and will be audio taped and transcribed for analysis. During the telephonic interview I will be asked to discuss my conceptualization of, and experiences in peace building as a notion of counselor education.

My participation in this study is voluntary and my confidentiality will remain protected and respected throughout all the phases and processes of the research project. Measures to protect my confidentiality will include conducting the telephonic interview in privacy, masking all identifying information, destroying the audiotapes once transcribed, and storing all processed data and documentation securely in the WMU archives for a three-year period and destroyed thereafter. I retain the right to refuse to participate or to quit at any time during the study without prejudice or penalty.

Participation in this study has no foreseen negative effects, other than the inconvenience of the cost of time involved. As in all research, however, there may be unforeseen risks to participants. If I have any questions or concerns about my participation in this study, I may contact the principal researcher, Dr. Suzanne Hedstrom at 616-7425069, suzanne.hedstrom@wmich.edu, or the co-principal researcher, Jenny Keller at 403-6915976, jennyr.keller@wmich.edu. I may also contact the chair of Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) at 269-3878293 or the vice president for research at 269-3878289, if questions or concerns arise during my participation in this research project.

Western Michigan University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) has approved this consent document for use for one year from the stamped date and signature of the board chair in the upper right corner. Refrain from participation in the study if the stamped date is older than one year.

By my signature, I indicate that I have read the purpose and procedures of the study and agree to participate.

SIGNATURE

DATE
Appendix G

Interview Telephone Scripts

Interview Appointment:
Good day, may I please speak with ___________________? If participant is not available, say that you are Jenny Keller, that the participant is expecting your call, then enquire as to when the participant may be available, and that you will call again at that time. If participant identifies her or himself, proceed as follows. This is Jenny Keller, the co-principal researcher in the study exploring the conceptualization, practice, and challenges of peace building in counselor education. I am calling to set up an appointment with you to conduct the audio taped follow-up research interview of approximately 40 to 60 minutes to which you have indicated your willingness to participate in, as per your returned signed consent document. Is this still the case? No, thank participant for their willingness to participate in the research and confirm the right to refuse participation or to quit at any time during the study without prejudice or penalty. Yes, proceed as follows. When will be a good time for us to engage in the follow-up research interview? Concur on the date and time. Thank you ___________ , I will contact you on ___________ at ___________.

Interview Introduction Script:
Good day, may I please speak with ___________________? If participant is not available, say that you are Jenny Keller, that the participant is expecting your call, then enquire as to when the participant may be available, and that you will call again at that time. If participant identifies her or himself, proceed as follows. This is Jenny Keller, the co-principal researcher in the study exploring the conceptualization, practice, and challenges of peace building in counselor education. I am calling to conduct the audio taped interview of approximately 40 to 60 minutes to which you have indicated your willingness to participate in, as per your returned signed consent document. Is this still the case? No, thank participant for their willingness to participate in the research and confirm the right to refuse participation or to quit at any time during the study without prejudice or penalty. Yes, proceed as follows. Is this still a good time for you to be interviewed? No, arrange for an alternative time. Yes, proceed as follows. Do I now have your permission to start audio taping this research interview? No, thank participant and confirm the right to refuse to participate or to quit at any time during the study without prejudice or penalty. Yes, proceed as follows. Thank you. You may at any time request to have the audio taping ceased, at which time the interview will be terminated. I am now starting the audiotape. (Click). The interview is now being audio taped. Proceed with interview questions.

Interview Exit Script:
The interview is now completed. I am stopping the audiotape. (Click). Thank you for your time and sharing your personal perspectives on, and experiences in counselor peace building. Your contribution to the exploration of the conceptualization, practice, and challenges of peace building in counselor education is important and invaluable. Thank you and good day.
Appendix H

Interview Questions

Interviewee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Doctoral Student</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. How did you get interested in peace building?

2. What have been pivotal moments or issues in developing your interest in, and practice of, peace building?

3. How is peace and peace building conceptualized in counselor education?

4. In what ways do you see counselor education (a) contributing to, (b) could be contributing to building local and global cultures of peace?

5. What kind of training/professional development/continuing education in peace building (a) have you had, (b) do you think would be useful to counselor educators?

6. What is counselor education (a) currently doing, (b) could be doing to prepare counselors for peace building?

7. What are the challenges of counselor educators in incorporating peace building in their spheres of influence?

8. What ideas do you have for counselor education to become more active in promoting peace education and building local and global cultures of peace?
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HSIRB Approval Letter

Date: January 19, 2006

To: Suzanne Hedstrom, Principal Investigator
    Jenny Righa Keller, Student Investigator for dissertation

From: Mary Lagerwey, Ph.D., Chair
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