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Abstract
The Bali bombings of 2002 and 2005 confronted Australia and its neighbours directly for the first time with the dangers of violent extremism. Since then, the Bali Peace Park Association (BPPA), consisting of former victims, their families and other interested parties, has been lobbying for the creation of the ‘Bali Peace Park’ to be built on one of the bombing sites. Peace parks have been conceived as community-driven projects against violent extremism, and the planned Bali Peace Park embodies this principle. In 2012, BPPA initiated “Beyond Bali”, an ambitious and highly relevant curriculum development project, and secured funding from the Australian Attorney General’s Department. Drawing on the expertise of a counter-terrorism expert, two university education experts and the first-hand experiences of victims and their families, the Beyond Bali curriculum package was created. Beyond Bali covers a range of topics and activities, including social science studies and ethical dilemma learning, is suitable for Years 8 and 9 students studying the Australian Curriculum, and is available for free from BPPA: http://www.balipeacepark.com.au/beyond-bali-education-package.html. In this paper we position Beyond Bali as a transformative education resource within the fields of peace and global education and argue that it embodies UNESCO’s learning to be principle.
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Introduction
On the morning of 11th September 2001, the world woke to the news that “the fundamentalist war against modernity had entered into a new phase” (Armstrong, 2002, p. 159). The majority of moderate Muslims worldwide condemned the attack on the World Trade Centre in New York as contravening fundamental Islamic tenets. Nevertheless, there were incidents indicating a backlash against Muslims in several Western countries. As a result, Karen Armstrong, a respected and prolific researcher and writer, suggested that, “it has never been more important for Western people to acquire a just appreciation and understanding of Islam. […] What happens in Gaza, Iraq, or Afghanistan today, is likely to have repercussions in New York, Washington or London tomorrow.” She added that, “to cultivate a distorted image of Islam, to see it as inherently the enemy of democracy and decent values, and to revert to the bigoted views of medieval Crusaders would be a catastrophe” (Armstrong, 2002, p. 161).

When the London bombings swept across news headlines on 7 July 2005, immediate attention turned to the bombers who were British nationals from conservative families. The backgrounds of all but one appeared “…largely unexceptional. Little distinguishes their formative experiences from those of many others of the same generation, ethnic origin and social background” (Government of the United Kingdom & Ireland, 2006, p. 13). Moreover, questions surrounding their motives perplexed the media and their actions were interpreted as the result of homegrown radicalisation and as a reaction to perceived injustices towards Muslims by the West.

In Australia we have faced a similar ‘coming of age’: whilst these overseas bombings were concerning, they were still ‘far, far away’ from Australia. By contrast, the Bali Bombings of 2002 and 2005 happened on Australia’s doorstep and affected Australia and its neighbours directly for the first time. Not only were there the direct victims of the attacks and their families, those who died and those who survived, but there was also the suffering of indirect victims, such as Balinese people dependent on tourism. For several years following the bombings they faced serious economic hardship which is often overlooked in the discourse on the impacts of terrorism. The 2002 Bali Bombings left 88 Australians dead, robbed the nation of its ‘innocence’ towards violent extremism and had a major impact on how Australians view Bali (Sobocinska, 2011).

Since then, recent events have once again presented the world with new challenges, for example, the rise of ISIS in Syria and Iraq, the problem of foreign fighters, especially of young people leaving their birth countries to fight alongside ISIS.
In their quest to find ways to counter the problem, some nations have taken to exploring options for countering violent extremism by focusing on the perceived causes of radicalisation and on the prevention thereof (Aly, Taylor, & Karnovsky, 2014). Others have looked to education for a solution.

**Purpose, significance and structure of the paper**

In this paper we address the global need for nations to counter the spread of violent extremism amongst youth through transformative education. We outline the development and evaluation of ‘Beyond Bali’, a curriculum package that is in-line with the Australian Curriculum (Australian Curriculum and Reporting Authority (ACARA), 2013) and that contributes significantly to educational innovation in the Asia-Pacific region. The purpose of this paper is to introduce Beyond Bali to the educational research community and to position the curriculum package within educational theory. Peace parks form the core of the innovative Beyond Bali curriculum. Although the concept of peace parks is not necessarily new, through Beyond Bali students are encouraged to plan and build their own peace park thus giving spatial expression to the need for social cohesion and collaboration which has the potential to involve the wider community in a themed, dedicated space for meeting, collaborating and resilience building. The curriculum materials are available free of charge online.

The paper commences with an invitation to the reader to explore the historical events that led to the development of Beyond Bali and introduces the concept of peace parks. This section is followed by an in-depth literature review positioning Beyond Bali as a transformative learning approach within peace and global education that sits within the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation’s (UNESCO) *learning to be* principle (UNESCO, 2002). We then discuss the development and evaluation of the Beyond Bali program and conclude the paper by presenting our reflections on what we have learned in the process and what future developments in the area could look like.

**Peace parks: A community tool for peaceful thinking**

At the heart of the Beyond Bali curriculum package is the concept of peace parks. Students are encouraged to plan and build their own peace park thus giving spatial expression to the need for social cohesion and collaboration. Building a peace park has the potential to involve the wider community in the process, not just during its...
construction phase but beyond its completion through providing a themed, dedicated space affording the community opportunities for meeting, collaborating and resilience building.

“But what does planting trees have to do with peace?” asks Ali (2007, p. 1). He explains that in line with non-violent conflict resolution strategies, peace parks were introduced around the world during the late 20th Century to foster cooperation between two or more conflicting parties (usually concerning border territories). Duffy (2007) noted that “peace parks can be briefly defined as areas that cross one or more international borders, and they are intended to have common management practices, often to conserve a single transnational ecosystem” (p. 56). Peace parks have been implemented worldwide, many of which transcend national boundaries across former war zones, providing an environmental aspect where two formerly warring parties now share responsibility and care for nature reserves (Ali, 2007).

The planned Bali Peace Park represents a garden that is spiritually shared between the nation-states of Australia and Indonesia. The ecosystem is a man-made environment where the shared management practices and responsibilities include transnational reflection and critical thinking. The Bali Peace Park’s mission is to “create a spiritual garden on the Sari Club site for persons to reflect upon and acknowledge the terrorist attack on October 12th 2002, along with all acts of terror worldwide. To help build a future without fear by promoting tolerance, understanding and freedom for generations to come, irrespective of nationality, culture, religious belief or race” (Bali Peace Park Association, 2013, n.p.).

The Beyond Bali package consists of five modules – after learning about the Bali-Australia connection and the history of the Bali Bombings, students investigate the moral dilemmas involved when considering this topic before learning about peace parks across the globe and their various roles before they are invited to plan and build a peace park in their school community in Module Five. The concept of peace parks and its harmonising potential is central to the Beyond Bali curriculum package and serves as the backbone for linking together five modules. Peace parks have been conceived as mechanisms for enhancing community resilience to violent extremism, and as such are not new. What is new about Beyond Bali is that it links counter terrorism education and peace parks to building community resilience. Across the globe we have identified many different foci and uses for peace parks - details are covered in Module Four of Beyond Bali which raises critical questions such as: What purposes do peace parks serve? What
do they look like? Where do they already exist? How can one design and build a peace park? Ultimately, we hope that when designing and building their own peace parks students will draw on resources such as parents and community members to help them realise their plans. Once established, peace parks can become spaces for getting together and exchanging understanding and insights, and fostering cohesion and collaboration. Peace parks have the potential to involve many people, from individual students to whole-school communities, local authorities and politicians.

Systematic analysis of the effectiveness of using peace parks as a tool to teach about international peace and conflict resolution is limited, however studies connecting the environment with peaceful thinking suggest a positive link. In research on peace parks around the world, Ali (2007, p. 1) explored the profound links between environment, sustainable development, peace and security, stating that peace parks can play an “instrumental role in peacemaking or sustaining amity between communities.” Through research into personal peacefulness, Sommerfelt and Vambheim (2008) concluded that spaces for reflection encourage the adoption of peaceful attitudes. Gardens provide such spaces for contemplation and reflection, as well as a one-ness with the natural world. They argued that encouraging peace on an individual level is perhaps the most important aspect of a peace curriculum as non-violence and cooperation are beneficial from school to global institutional levels. Furthermore, learning about and then building a peace park speaks to both theoretical and emotional (hands-on) learning, as championed by Calder (2000).

Transformative learning for global peace education

Counterterrorism and education

Terrorism has been a tactic employed by marginal groups and individuals for thousands of years, whereas an academic framework to explore terrorism and counterterrorism has only recently been developed (Aly, 2011). According to Chari (2003), the etymology of the words ‘terrorism’ and ‘terrorist’ can be traced back to the French revolution and the Jacobins’ ‘regime de la terreur’ that was known for using coercive intimidation to further Jacobin goals. Whilst terrorism continues to elude a universally agreed upon definition, most governments and scholars agree that it involves the “strategic and tactical use of violence for a political, social or ideological goal” (Aly, 2011, p. 238).

Galtung (as cited in Chari, 2003) explains that, “[terrorism] is a very particular form of warfare…it is fought for political ends. It maims, kills and destroys but is less
predictable in space and time because of the lack of continuity and contiguity, and it is less predictable in the individual choice of victims, however precise it may be in the political choice (p. 429).” Modern technology, especially social media, have helped create a powerful platform with real time media coverage of terrorist violence containing an element of macabre theatre, thus giving “terrorists the kind of attention and glory they seek while also assisting the terrorists’ goal of creating fear in the victim population (Aly, 2011, p. 147).

Governments all over the world have been considering how to respond to the terrorist threat but no simple solutions are available. Martin (2006), paraphrasing Mao Zedong, states that, “the true reformer understands that terrorists will not long survive when…the state successfully dries up the sea of the people’s support for the extremists” (p. 560). This has to be approached with great sensitivity since, as Appadurai in his book “Fear of Small Numbers” (2006) explains, the self-perception of injured minorities can give way to the self-image of a vanguard minority “who actually speak for the sacred majority” (p. 111). He cautions that minorities such as the one from which the London bombers emerged are indeed minorities to be feared because they feel they represent the rogue voice of an injured global majority. As Asad (2007) elaborates, following a terrorist act Western commentators often focus on the terrorists’ reasons for engaging in extremist violence. “That reason is often - not always – seen as pathological. Or as being alienated – that is, as not properly integrated intro Western civilisation” (Asad, 2007, p. 41). Some countries have focused their prevention programs on countering alienation amongst vulnerable communities, however that in itself has the potential to further alienate communities by ‘singling them out’ from the general population of a country. As Weine, Horgan, Robertson, Loue, Mohamed and Noor (2009) note, terrorism experts agree that exposure to adversity per se, which includes traumatic experiences and poverty, is not a sufficient reason for engaging in terrorist acts. It does however affect community cohesion and family support systems which puts some more at risk than others. Whilst some parents and community leaders talk openly to youth about radicalisation, this is not always the case. Consequently there have been calls for education programs for parents (Weine, et al., 2009).

As governments continue to develop the ‘soft’ and ‘hard’ elements of counterterrorism policies, many argue that a form of peace education can play an important role in ‘soft’, community focused, ideological areas. For example, Pigozzi (2006) cautioned that, “on account of the fear of globalisation, ongoing migration and
increasingly diversifying societies, this demonic other [terrorism] threatens the peace in our societies. Our education systems must take this into account” (p. 2).

The power of education to enhance resilience to extremist beliefs is highly complex and must take into account cultural, social and religious aspects of the societies in which programs are to take place thus avoiding over-generalisations (Sayed, Davies, Hardy, Arani, Kakia, & Bano, 2011). Education aimed at countering violent extremism has been theorised by many, and is currently being put into practice in schools in some key regions, for example, Bosnia and Herzegovina (Danesh, 2008) and Saudi Arabia (Ansary, 2008). Resilience in the context of community, family, and trauma psychology refers to “multisystemic adaptive capacities leading to improved outcomes after a disturbance” (Weine, 2012, p. 60). Positive psychologists define resilience as the ability to bounce back from adversity (Frederickson, 2009). Education generally aims at reducing the vulnerability of a population (Luthar & Zigler, cited in Weine, 2012) and at enhancing resilience by building protective resources at multiple levels (Weine, Building resilience to violent extremism in Muslim diaspora communities in the United States, 2012). However, education approaches have often been confined to specialised, integrated programs, most of which are situated in politically volatile regions in need of healing, such as Israel, Palestine, Bosnia, Pakistan, Rwanda, the Philippines and South Africa.

Davies (2006) emphasised the need for school curricula worldwide that promote and teach concepts of cultural hybridity, restorative justice, critical media analysis, critical action, and human rights as the value base necessary for engaging in the analysis of these areas. She argued that the issue has become particularly important in light of the bombings in London where those carrying out the attacks were British citizens who had attended – and in one case worked – in British schools. Davies asked how schools in Western democratic countries can provide tools for students to be resilient to extremist ideologies that they may encounter outside the school walls?

In 2013, UNESCO published ‘Rethinking Education in a Changing World’ as a basis for envisioning and discussing the future of education beyond 2015. UNESCO notes that increased interconnectedness and interdependency of all societies has not only resulted in greater opportunities for collaboration but also in crises, one of which is a central concern for human security: resurgence of violent conflict, cultural chauvinism and identity-based conflict, all of which are undermining the social fabric and cohesion (UNESCO, 2013, p. 10).
Previously, ‘Learning: the Treasure Within’ (UNESCO, 1996), also known as the ‘Delors Report’, promoted the idea of a four pillar model of education – *learning to live together; learning to know; learning to do and learning to be*. The report stressed that, “…due to the current circumstances of education, the pillar of *learning to be* occupies a fundamental focus in education. It is like the central pillar of a canopy. Its attainment needs a new force with special inputs” (p. i). *Learning to be* requires a new perspective on education that transcends an instrumentalist approach: it aims at educating the ‘complete person’. We are reminded that “…to teach human values and social skills most necessary for learners to be a ‘complete person’” (p. ii). What is needed is a form of ‘necessary utopia’, a ‘realistic optimism’ and a new type of humanism that values respect for human dignity and diversity in order to achieve harmony in a diverse world. UNESCO’s *learning to be* principle calls for education that promotes peace and it made sense to position Beyond Bali in that space (UNESCO, 2002). We wanted to promote *learning to be* by promoting education of the whole person and by engaging more than just the analytical, critical mind. We were mindful of the need to challenge students to examine their taken-for granted beliefs and values in addition to learning subject-specific content.

**Conflict is easy, peace is a challenge**

When peace educator, Laura Finley, asked her middle school classroom pupils to draw pictures of war they immediately filled the page with guns, blood and death. Alternatively when she asked them to draw pictures of peace they asked, “What do you mean?” She realised that war and violence are so embedded in popular culture that children now find it difficult to imagine a world of peace. When they conceptualise peace it is usually negative peace, that is, the absence of war or violence, rather than positive peace, such as cooperation, respect, love and tolerance (Finley, 2011). The distinction between positive and negative peace, now considered to be two core concepts of peace education, was first made by Hicks in 1988.

Peace education is currently considered to be “both a philosophy and a process involving skills, including listening, reflection, problem-solving, cooperation and conflict resolution” (Harris & Morrison, 2003, p. 9). The focus of peace education has long been to confront indirectly the forms of violence dominating society by educating about causes and suggesting alternatives. Skills, attitudes and knowledge needed to create a safe world and build a sustainable environment are part of the curriculum as are
nonviolence, love, compassion and reverence for all life (Harris & Morrison, 2003; Harris, 2004). Peace education invests in an ideal non-violent future. Focusing on classroom practice, Cook compiled an overview of pedagogies commonly used in peace education, listing: (1) values clarification and analysis; (2) critical thinking strategies to uncover assumptions based on racism, patriarchy and post-colonialism; (3) an ethic of caring for others, the environment and structures supporting justice; and (4) skills associated with conflict management and resolution (2008, p. 894). Beyond Bali draws on all of these pedagogies - to varying degrees.

However, despite international popularity and the discipline’s tremendous growth in the 20th century, scholars such as Harris (2010) have come to the conclusion that, “peace education has not really taken hold in school systems around the world” (p. 19). Since the 1970s, peace education has become a component of the growing global studies movement, an integration, which some scholars criticise, claiming that peace education continues to struggle to find its place within this larger discipline (Cook, 2008).

Harris noted that peace education in the US is at an all-time low. He attributed the demise of peace education in Western countries to cultural and economic pressures for inclusion of more mathematics and science in curricula in order to produce graduates who can be competitive in the global economy (Harris, 2008). While all these are worthy subjects, Davies (2006) suggests that teaching subjects with value conflicts, moral dilemmas and conflict resolution, such as peace education, provides a completely different learning experience that has the potential to evoke ‘outrage’ and ‘activism’. Moreover, teachers’ abilities to confidently deliver programs that may appear controversial may be limited and teachers may be fearful of not being able to answer children’s questions, or are unsure of the legal and moral implications of giving their opinions on controversial topics (Pigozzi, 2006; Yamashita, 2006).

Additional barriers are rooted in the very structure of education systems, that is, rigid national curricula offer little scope for localised approaches to global issues (Davies, 2006; Hicks, 2003) – in other words, national curricula seldom give space for expert contributions to locally targeted programs (Hicks, 2003). In the UK, US, Canada and Australia peace education has been in sharp and steady decline (Westheimer, cited by Cook, 2008). Britain and Canada have echoed similar situations with a decline in interest in the subject since the 1980s when the discipline was criticised for its ‘leftist ideology’ (Cook, 2008).
According to Cook (2008), peace education promotes explorations of the interpersonal experience and focuses on the local and personal. Global education, on the other hand, is more interested in the international and structural dimensions of peace studies. Aspeslagh (cited in Cook, 2008) noted that the relationship between peace and global education in the schooling system is fluid whereby peace education is often inserted into the broader global education arena. In Australian schools a renewed interest in citizenship education led to the reprinting of the “Global Perspectives” framework in 2010.

Beyond Bali was designed to promote a global perspective and provide opportunities to develop knowledge skills and values about the places and societies people live in, people’s capacity to choose and shape preferred futures, peace building, collaborative action and shared responsibility, critical thinking and responsible values and attitudes (Education Services Australia, 2010, p. 4).

**Transformative learning**

When comparing educational approaches to enhance resilience to violent extremism worldwide, Davies (2010) cautioned that there is a danger of being overly optimistic about education’s impact on societal problems, “education can build resilience and opportunity for individuals, but it does not on its own create peace!” (p. 496). It is important to remember that education programs, well meaning and well planned as they may be, are still largely ‘external’ measures in many cases targeting vulnerable communities. What is important when considering educational approaches is whether or not they offer opportunities for individuals to reflect critically on taken-for-granted beliefs and values. Couching an education package within transformative learning as suggested by Mezirow (1991) provides not only ‘external’ but also ‘internal’ learning opportunities.

In a recent paper (Aly, Taylor & Karnovsky, 2014), we have suggested that rather than focus on external factors exclusively, that is, political disenchantment or alienation, it is essential to focus on individuals’ internal tendency to ‘morally disengage’. Moral agency as a remedy for moral disengagement is described as both refraining from inhumane behaviour and deliberately engaging in humane behaviour (Bandura, 2002). Its development depends upon a person’s resilience, that is, the capacity of an individual to bounce back from adversity (Fredrickson, 2009). Assuming that moral agency and resilience building are instrumental in countering violent
extremism in individuals and communities, the question arises: how can learners build moral agency, learn values and change long held assumptions whilst building resilience?

Values and moral education research has provided a wealth of knowledge - to go into detail is beyond the scope of this paper. Suffice to say that current values education draws on basic principles of Kohlberg’s and Gilligan’s theories of moral development (Kohlberg, 1996; Gilligan, 1982). Kohlberg suggested the use of ethical dilemma stories, that is, stories that contain one or more ethical dilemmas, to provide opportunities for learners to engage deeply with an ethical issue, such as, whether or not to engage in a violent act. This he assumed allowed learners to transform internally by re-assessing and changing their values – if appropriate. As a critical constructivist education strategy (Taylor, 2015a), far from indoctrination, this approach sees students take on an active role in their learning by reflecting individually on potential solutions to an ethical dilemma situation and by discussing ideas as a group. The teacher’s role is that of a facilitator. Taylor, one of the authors of this paper, has researched and published on ethical dilemma pedagogy employing strategies derived from values-education as a means to deeply engage students in a variety of contentious issues including environmental and sustainability issues (Settelmaier, 2009). Her research forms the basis of Module Three of Beyond Bali where students are invited to consider ethical dilemmas involved in relation to the Bali Bombings. Settelmaier (2009) investigated the link between values learning and transformative learning, as suggested by Mezirow (1991) and Morrell and O’Connor (2002). Transformative learning occurs when a learner is confronted with a moral dilemma that forces him/her to reconsider his/her taken-for-granted values and assumptions.

Transformative learning is grounded in critical constructivism and leads to five distinct and interconnected ways of knowing that, we believe, are essential for building resilience and moral agency: (1) cultural-self knowing - knowing our shared values and taken-for-granted ways of being; (2) relational knowing (opening to difference) - learning to connect with others; (3) critical knowing - understanding how and why (political, institutional, economic) power has structured historically our lifeworlds; (4) visionary and ethical knowing - involves discursive processes and negotiating a collective vision; and (5) knowing in action - involves a commitment to making a difference (Taylor, 2015b).

We accept Davies’s cautionary note that education is not automatically transformational and that it does not automatically create peace. However, we argue that
Beyond Bali has the potential to be transformational because it approaches building resilience to violent extremism both externally – through the curriculum materials and community engagement – and internally – through engagement in moral learning. The program was designed to afford students the opportunity to engage deeply (internally) in transformative learning by: reflecting on their taken-for-granted assumptions; engaging in deep critical self-reflection; practising mutual tolerance and empathy; and reevaluating their own understandings of the world.

**Beyond Bali: Development and evaluation**

In designing the Beyond Bali curriculum package our objectives were to: (1) develop an educational resource employing education as a means for countering violent extremism that could be linked to the Bali Peace Park, (2) comply with the Australian Curriculum, and (3) draw on victims’ and their families experiences. The overall aim of the package is to educate students about Bali (Indonesia), the Australia-Asia connection (geography), the Bali bombings and their consequences (history). An ethical learning perspective based on the first author’s research program was added later through including an ‘ethical dilemma story approach’ (Settelmaier, 2009). The final curriculum package consists of five modules aimed at Years 8 and 9 students, and draws on a variety of teaching strategies, including on-line learning.

The package is the product of a synergy between: (a) the work of a counter-terrorism expert whose research informed the initial successful grant application and provided the groundwork for developing the resource; (b) the work of the two education experts specialising in curriculum development, where one is an expert in ethical dilemma pedagogy and the other in social sciences teaching; (c) the Bali Peace Park Association connecting us to survivors and their families; and (d) two schools – a public secondary school and a private secondary Islamic school.

The original idea came from the Bali Peace Park Association and Anne Aly. The package was written by Saul Karnovsky and Elisabeth Taylor. A survivor, Phil Britten, and his wife, Rebecca, were instrumental in helping us develop Module 3 of the package by ‘lending’ their story, their authentic voices and personal experiences to the module. Through the Bali Peace Park Association and Channel Ten News’ reporter, Nick Way, we were obtained authentic video footage and original interviews with other survivors.

During the writing process, regular meetings were held between the curriculum developers, representatives of the schools and the BPPA. We engaged them in learning
activities so that they could gain first-hand experience of what it would be like to be a student working with the materials. Their feedback was used in the development process, and a draft of the curriculum materials was trialed in two secondary schools. Based on the results of the trial minor changes were made.

The final product was officially launched at one of the schools, attended by students who had studied the curriculum package. This special get-together provided an opportunity for students to hear Phil Britten, who had lent his story to the curriculum package, speak about his experiences and to ask him questions. Following his recovery, he now has many public speaking engagements where he delivers his message of moving away from revenge thinking.

**Structure of the curriculum package**

The first two modules focus on the Bali-Australia connection and the history of the Bali bombings. The third module explores moral aspects through ethical dilemma pedagogy which is designed to deeply engage students in thinking about value dilemmas, such as: revenge versus non-revenge, violence versus non-violence, peaceful co-existence versus violent extremism (Settelmaier, 2009). The fourth module involves role-play and a virtual journey to a number of peace parks around the globe. Module Five encourages students to plan and build their own peace park.

**Trialling in schools**

We trialled the curriculum package at two schools in Western Australia: a Year 10 class at a government secondary school and a Year 8/9 class at a private Islamic secondary school. At the public secondary school, the package was taught by an experienced Social Science teacher who was head of his subject area, and involved a pre-service student teacher who was completing a school placement. At the Islamic school, the package was taught by two Social Science teachers who were supervised by the school principal and the head of the Social Science department. The third author acted as liaison person between that school and the university.

To evaluate the program we designed a mixed-methods approach (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2012), including evaluative materials for each module and questionnaires for students and teachers to provide feedback on the whole package. We asked teachers to send us their feedback as soon as they had taught a module (all evaluation materials are
available on the BPPA website), however, as explained in the next section there were problems with the process.

**Evaluation results**

Despite our evaluation plans we needed to scale down our expectations. The public school cooperated with some of our evaluation requests whilst the Islamic school did so to a lesser degree. We received questionnaire responses from the public school but not from the Islamic school, despite frequent requests. We conducted a group interview with students at the public school as a follow-up to their questionnaire responses but not at the Islamic school. We sought to observe classes but there was no appetite for that at either school. Although none of the teachers completed the questionnaire, we formally interviewed one teacher and had informal conversations with others. In this paper we focus on the results from the government school (n=20 students) and touch on the results from the other school.

The questionnaire consisted of 16 questions and a three-point response scale (agree/unsure/disagree). We inquired into the appropriateness of the materials and modules in terms of perceived difficulty, interest, level of challenge and involvement. Responses to Questions 1 to 11 indicated that, overall, students found the materials and lessons interesting and challenging. Some would have preferred the tasks to be more challenging, which is not surprising given that the curriculum was intended for a younger student cohort. Here, we focus on the results of Questions 12-16 which inquired into two main issues: Had students’ thinking changed? Had they been challenged to look at other points of view?

When asked if they had learned anything new (Q11) and had been challenged to think in new ways (Q12), ninety-five percent of the students agreed. Typical student comments on these questions included, “I got a chance to see situations from a number of different angles” and “There are more things to revenge and forgiving.” Other students explained that, “It made me think about justice, revenge and our legal system!” and “I started to think about some things, particularly concepts such as the death penalty, and the morals and ethics behind it, and to reconsider what I once thought.” Another student commented that, “It helped me develop new ideas!” These responses strongly supported our overall goal for the program.

We asked about students’ overall level of satisfaction with the program (Q13) and were surprised that only sixty-five percent indicated that they were happy with the
program overall. This pattern contrasted with positive comments such as: “I enjoyed this program and I learned a lot. It fitted with what we were doing in human rights!” “I think it is something most Australians should learn!” and “It was 99% better than the original course!” However, there were also a few critical voices: “It meant we missed out of class time for politics!”

When asked if they wanted to do something similar again, a student replied, “I found this program useful and engaging and I would like to do it again!” Another student said, “Definitely – fun, immersing and intellectual!” This response was confirmed by several students, with one student commenting that, “It is always good to learn new things!” However, despite mostly positive comments, the results indicated that only sixty five percent were happy with the package and would like to do it again. We investigated this issue in a group interview, which is unpacked later in this section.

The last two questions were open-ended: (Q15) “I particularly enjoyed...” and (Q16) “If I could change anything in the materials and activities I would”. When asked what they had enjoyed about Beyond Bali, a student stated that he appreciated the way the program was set out. Another student stated, “It is important to be encouraged to learn more about the issues that the world is facing today and to look at the motivations behind terrorist actions and to look for ways for society to avoid such terrible acts!” Students seemed to value the opportunity to “…get involved and share ideas”, appreciated that, “…interesting background knowledge” was provided, and that they had opportunities for “…looking at something more recent and relevant – that was good.” Students seemed to enjoy the flexibility of the program, the global focus and the unbiased approach to the Bali Bombings, the causes of the Bali Bombings and terrorism worldwide. Many appreciated the discussions in class about terrorism and the ideas behind it, and also the opportunity to learn about the side effects of terrorism. Some commented on the value of new ideas they learned such as the various philosophical aspects and definitions. For others it was the ‘doing aspect’ they valued most: “…designing the peace park – it was really cool to be involved in that way!” Several students liked the media attention at the launch of the program, whilst others commented on how much they valued the opportunity to meet a real life survivor (i.e., Phil Britten) who had experienced the Bali Bombings first hand.

What would the Year 10 students have liked to change if they could have changed Beyond Bali? Students suggested making the materials more appropriate for their age group which is not surprising given that they were older than the intended
target group. Some suggested having more interactive aspects, more newspaper articles and first-hand accounts, more videos and less philosophy. Some suggested making it less intense, whilst others argued in favor of making it more challenging. Some students would like to have learned more about the motives of the perpetrators and about their religion, more about how the Bali Bombings affected the local population, and more about the current wars in the Middle East and how they are linked to the events in Bali. Several students stated that the program did not really need to change much, only be adapted for the older age group. Some of the comments surprised us since we were unaware that the program had as much philosophy in it as students suggested. Also, students’ suggestions to include more hands-on activities and videos were a surprise since we had designed the program to be very hands-on and had included many videos in the modules.

During the subsequent class interview, it became apparent where these discrepancies had stemmed from. We learned that the teacher and his practicum student had ‘adapted’ our program to suit the needs of the course they were teaching. This is ok, in principle but it is not helpful when one is participating in a program evaluation. It became clear during the class interview that more philosophy had been added to make the program age-appropriate for Year 10 students, and that many of the program’s hands-on activities, videos and discussion questions had been left out. Thus, when students expressed the wish to learn more about where peace parks exist globally and how they are being used, they were surprised to learn from us that there was a whole module on that topic that had not been taught to them.

The teachers
We raised these issues with the Year 10 teacher. As an experienced Social Science teacher, he explained that his aim was to ensure Year 10 students would not get bored with the less challenging program that we had designed for Years 8 and 9. Furthermore, he explained that he had made changes to fit the program into a course (Politics) that he was teaching at the time.

The teachers at the Islamic school had stated at the beginning that they needed to make changes to the materials since some of their students’ English language levels were not good enough to follow the program. However, what exactly the nature of those changes was we do not know. When asked informally if they thought the program had met their needs, the principal of the explained that they had found the program,
“wholesome and nutritious!” and that they would definitely continue using it in their school (personal communication, Ahmed, 2012).

**Reflection**

Beyond Bali has been designed for Years 8 and 9 students studying the Australian Curriculum, and is available at no cost as an online resource from the Bali Peace Park Association website: [http://www.balipeacepark.com.au/beyond-bali-education-package.html](http://www.balipeacepark.com.au/beyond-bali-education-package.html). Following the public launch of Beyond Bali in 2012, the curriculum package has been printed and distributed to 400 schools in Australia. Dr Anne Aly, one of the co-authors of this paper and the initiator of the original project commenced a longitudinal study titled “Collective action and resistance to terrorism: Construction of the Bali Peace park as counter-terrorism” in 2011. Dr Aly was awarded a three-year Discovery Early Researcher (DECRA) Award granted in 2012. The project is currently ongoing and further publications will be forthcoming. Interest in the program has been shown by Canada and The Hague, indicating the international relevance of the resource.

With this international interest in mind, Bar Tal (2002) reminds us that peace education can be elusive in nature, which makes it difficult to implement a one-size-fits-all unified global approach. He suggested that the scope of education for peace must be relative to the country it is taught in and to its local political, economic and social environment. He noted that, “…it is possible to see peace education as a mirror of the political-societal-economic agenda for a given society” (p. 28). His conclusions point to finding local strategies to tackle global issues as being necessary for an effectively targeted program. Beyond Bali was written for an Australian context and should be viewed as a seed project that will hopefully bring to fruition projects elsewhere that have been inspired by our example - projects that take into account local, cultural and historical needs and sensitivities. Anything else would be educationally naïve and disrespectful towards other nations. For us, Beyond Bali is a starting point from which many other ideas may flow.

The small-scale proof of concept study was not without problems, yet it demonstrated that many students were encouraged to engage in new ideas and view issues from new perspectives. They appreciated the flexibility, global outlook and balanced approach to the history of the Bali Bombings. Students felt challenged but not overly challenged. Problems encountered during the evaluation could be traced back to a mismatch between the ages that the program was designed for and the age of the
students it was trialled with; and teacher adaptations to the program that may have affected the evaluation results.

With a view to the future, we envisage other transformative learning programs to be developed, not only in Australia but also in other countries in the Asia-Pacific region. Whereas Beyond Bali focuses primarily on the victim’s story, future programs could focus on perpetrators’ stories, that is, people who were committed to conduct acts of terrorism yet did not go ahead with the act. For some countries this might be a more appropriate approach. It is beyond doubt that the topic of violent extremism will not go away quickly and we have to assume that education must play a prominent role in building community resilience and moral agency. We would like to conclude this paper with a quote by John Paul Lederach from his outstanding work, “The Moral Imagination”:

> Accepting vulnerability, we must risk the step into the unknown and unpredictable lands and seek constructive engagement with those people and things we least understand and most fear. We must take up the inevitable perilous but absolutely necessary journey that makes its way back to humanity and the building of genuine community (Lederach, 2005, p. 173).
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