

MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF PEACE EDUCATION AND IMPLEMENTATION IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN UASIN GISHU COUNTY, KENYA

Rose Kemunto Momanyi

Department of Curriculum Instruction and Educational Media, School of Education,
Moi University, Kenya

©2018

**International Academic Journal of Social Sciences and Education (IAJSSE) | ISSN
2518-2412**

Received: 16th November 2018

Accepted: 19th December 2018

Full Length Research

Available Online at: http://www.iajournals.org/articles/iajsse_v2_i1_168_180.pdf

Citation: Momanyi, R. K. (2018). Monitoring and evaluation of peace education and implementation in primary schools in Uasin Gishu County, Kenya. *International Academic Journal of Social Sciences and Education*, 2(1), 168-180

ABSTRACT

Kenya has experienced occasional times of conflict where members of various Kenyan communities have turned against one another. In an effort to address the issue of peace among Kenyan people, Peace Education (PE) was introduced in primary schools in Kenya. This study therefore sought to assess the implementation of peace education in Uasin Gishu County. The study utilized the curriculum development and implementation theories by Gross et al (1971) and Fullan (1991). The study was guided by the following objective: to determine the relationship between monitoring and evaluation of peace education and implementation of peace education. A survey research design was used and the mixed method approach was utilised to collect data. The target population included primary school head

teachers, teachers and pupils. The study used questionnaires, interview schedules, focused group discussions and document analysis to collect data. Multiple regression models were used to construct models that were used to explain the relationships. The study established that teacher monitoring and evaluation ($\beta=0.510$, $P<0.05$) was significant determinant of implementation of peace Education in public primary schools in Uasin Gishu County. The finding that were established can be used by curriculum developers, teachers of peace education, and by the Ministry of Education that can use the knowledge obtained to develop appropriate policies of peace education programmes and in service programmes for teachers of peace education.

Key Words: *monitoring, evaluation, implementation, peace education*

INTRODUCTION

The concept of peace education remains complex and difficult to conceptualize. It is multifaceted and is defined variedly by different scholars. Harris (2004), for instance, defines peace education from a teacher's perspective by examining actions of teachers charged with teaching peace education, understanding why peace is absent, and the possibility of achievement. In essence, Harris views peace education as the avenue through which constraints to achievement of peaceful relationships, and development of non-violent skills can be eliminated. Peace education is the process of acquiring the values, the knowledge, skills and developing the attitudes, and behaviours that make one to be in harmony with oneself, with others, and with the natural environment.

Ian Harris and John Synott, peace education is defined as a series of 'teaching encounters' that draw from people. Their desire for peace, non violent alternatives for managing conflict and skills for critical analysis of structural arrangements that produce and legitimize injustice and inequality (Harris, 2003) thought of as 'encouraging a commitment to peace as a settled disposition and enhancing the confidence of the individual as an agent of peace and informing the students(s) on the consequences of war and social injustice, and further informing the student(s) on the value of peace and social structures. The student should be encouraged to love the world and to imagine a peaceful future; and as caring for the student and encouraging the student to care for others. (Galtung Johann (1975).

Harris (2004) views peace as the absence of war. Consequently, peace education is the ability to overcome, manage and avoid any kind of violence whether cultural, structural or direct. Differently, put, He regards peace education as the abilities to break communication barriers, use conflicts to create opportunities, and to adapt to diverse settings. This argument here is that through peace education, relationships between people are improved.

Peace education is also defined from the human rights perspective. According to Kant (as cited in Goodlad (1970), legal systems can be constructed through which humans are able to moderate civil violence. Such systems if well internalized (through education) could provide checks and balances ratified by trials in courts (peace through justice). However the success of such systems according to Goodlad (1970) rests on rationality of human minds.

One field that has emerged in relation to the securing of peace is that of peace education. Peace education has been viewed as a means of achieving a culture of peace (Ban Kimoon, 2013) as of fundamental importance to the mission of UNESCO, and the United Nations (Matsuura, 2008) and as a right (Reardon, as cited in Ragland, 2015). According to Caireta (2013), peace education has the potential to empower persons with the ability to analyze problems critically and hence foster harmony and cooperation among them. Moreover, Caireta argues that through peace education, people are provided with tools to understand their immediate surroundings and those of the world at large.

Peace education is central to Kenya's realization of a cohesive and integrated society. Through peace Education, principles such as social justice, equality, inclusiveness, non-discrimination and human rights as enshrined in the constitution of Kenya, 2010 can be realized. In recognition of the potential education has in promoting peace and exacerbating conflict, the Government through the Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MOEST) introduced the peace Education Programme in Kenya in 2008 (MOEST, 2008).

The Government of Kenya has consequently continued to propagate the need for peace in enhancing socio-economic development. The national anthem for instance underscores the need for peaceful coexistence among the citizenry for purposes of national building. Besides, the national goals of education advance promotion of peace, respect for diversity responsibility, sustainable development, social justice, national unity, moral and religious values and international consciousness (MOEST, 2014). Through the vision 2030, the Government further identifies social institutions and particularly those charged with education and training as avenues for inculcating a culture of peace.

Despite the central role education plays in peace initiatives, it appears that implementation of peace education remains a global challenge. Many scholars while appreciating the contributions of peace education towards peace initiatives in various contexts also point out several challenges (Alberto, 2015; Garza, 2014; Sakade, 2009; Salomon, 2010, Tina, 2016). In recognition of challenges to peace education implementation, Alberto (2015) argues that music can be used as a tool for building peace. Alberto through an article focusing on perspectives and challenges to Peace Education in Spanish schools posits that challenges to peace education through music is basically a result of expressive and conceptual change. In a

study on education for peace conducted in the Mexican context, Garza (2015) acknowledges that education for peace provides the best strategy for the prevention of crime. Garza however, finds that the main challenge lies with stakeholders who rather than determine the root cause of violence, they are pre-occupied with fighting the symptoms of violence.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Peace remains a fundamental concern of the human kind as manifested by religious scriptures and ceremonies that remain committed to the cause of peace and the absence of war. In contemporary times however, peace ethos have been threatened by among others terrorism, ethnicity and civil strife. The clamant under the aegis of the United Nations has therefore focused on trying to secure peace. Among initiatives that have been undertaken by the UN is popularization of peaceful means of conflict – resolutions, promotion of consciousness of the need for peace as opposed to war, and enhancing ability of crisis management. At independence, Kenyans aspired for a peaceful United Country in which every Kenyan was free to live and work anywhere. This was true for much of the three decades after independence, during which period, the country was regarded as a beacon of stability, economic hub in East Africa, a growing democracy and an Island of Peace in the war torn greater Horn of Africa and Great Lakes Region. From the early 1990's the country has however, experienced cases of conflict pitting some Kenyan communities against one another. These ethnic conflicts have slowly grown and expanded to the extent that after the elections of 2007, the magnitude of ethnic conflicts almost reached insurmountable proportions and led to great loss of life, property and displacement of people, a situation that attracted International attention. Several other conflicts among Kenyan communities for varied reasons ranging from cattle rustling, conflicts over pasture, water and land resources have been reported. School unrests have also become rampant with some resulting in the death of students and destruction of school property. As a long-term solution to these conflicts, which greatly disrupt peaceful co-existence between Kenyan people and result in loss of life and property, the country through the Ministry of Education, launched Peace Education Programme (PEP), which was introduced in primary schools, first on a pilot basis in selected schools in 2009, and later in 2012, the peace education programme was introduced to all Kenyan primary schools. Questions about peace and peaceful co-existence among the Kenyan people are still issues of concern despite several efforts to promote peace among Kenyans and the teaching of peace education in all schools. No reference is being made to the peace education programme that is expected to be ongoing in all schools. This situation is worrying particularly as the country strives to attain vision, 2030 through which the country hopes to transform itself into a globally competitive, prosperous and harmonious nation (Republic of Kenya, 2005). This study therefore sought to assess the relationship between monitoring and evaluation of peace education and implementation of peace education in primary schools in Uasin Gishu in Kenya.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the study was to assess the relationship between monitoring and evaluation of peace education and implementation of peace education in primary schools in Uasin Gishu in Kenya.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

To determine the relationship between monitoring and evaluation of peace education and implementation of peace education

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Concept(s) of Peace and Peace Education

Peace is a very elusive but connotes more than a mere absence of war or hostilities, but the presence of justice. Derived from the Latin *pax*, peace in the Western world is generally considered a contractual relationship that implies mutual recognition and agreement. Understandings of peace throughout the world often disclose a much deeper comprehension of peace in relation to the human condition, which also includes inner peace. The term ‘peace does not merely imply the absence of overt violence (sometimes referred to as negative peace). It also encompasses the presence of social, economic and political justice which are essential to the notion of “positive peace” Hicks, (as cited in Alimba (2013) ‘structural violence is a term that is used to refer to injustice such as poverty, discrimination and unequal access to opportunities which are at the root of much conflict. Structural violence is perhaps the most basic obstacle to peace, which by definition cannot exist in a society in which fundamental human rights are violated.

Peace Education encompasses the key concepts of peace and education. It is an interdisciplinary area of education whose goal is teaching about and for peace. Peace education aims to help learner’s acquire skills for non-violent conflict resolution and to reinforce these skills for active and responsible action in the society for the promotion of the value of peace. Peace education aims to prevent a conflict by educating individuals and a society for a peaceful existence on the basis of non violence, tolerance, equality, respect for differences, and social justice (Dugan & Carey, as cited in Bush & Duggan, 2014).

The concept of Peace Education is multifaceted as it is an outcome of different educational approaches that are linked together in the culture of peace. Peace Education is the idea of promoting knowledge, values, attitudes and skills that promote peace and non-violence, active commitment to the development and sustenance of co-operation and democracy. Peace education can be defined on the basis of the knowledge component as a multi – disciplinary academic and moral quest for solutions to the problem of war and injustice with the consequential development of institutions and movements that will contribute to a peace that is based on justice and reconciliation (Regan, 1993 as cited in Masoud-ul-Hassan; Azhar; & Taimoor Hassan, 2014).

Reardon (as cited in Ragland, 2015) sees peace education as a process that prepares young people for global responsibility; enables them to understand the nature and implications of global interdependence and helps them to accept responsibility to work for a just peaceful and viable global community. Hicks (as cited in Alimba (2013 p.340), defines peace education as activities that develop the knowledge, skills and attitudes needed to explore concepts of peace, enquire into the obstacles to peace, to solve conflicts on a just and non-violence way and to study ways of constructing just and sustainable alternative futures. Peace education is more effective and meaningful when it is adopted according to the social and cultural context and the needs of a country. It should be enriched by its cultural and spiritual values together with the universal human values. It should also be globally relevant (Selby, 1997). Kenyans are religious people. The cultural and spiritual values that are taught during the social studies and religious studies lessons should be used to enrich the peace education programme.

According Laing (as cited in Kartar, 2015), peace education is an attempt to respond to problems of conflict and violence on scales ranging from the global and national to the local and personal level. It is about exploring ways of creating more just and sustainable futures. Peace education is holistic. It embraces the physical, emotional, intellectual, and social growth of children within a framework deeply rooted in traditional human values. It is based on philosophy that teaches love, compassion, trust, fairness, co-operation and reverence for the human family and all life on our beautiful planet (Fran & Friedman, as cited in Kartar, 2015).

Based on the practical experience of United Nation Children Fund (UNICEF) as it deals with peace education programmes in developing countries, peace education is conceptualized as the process of promoting the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values needed to bring about behaviour changes that will enable children, youth and adults to prevent conflict and violence, both overt and structural, to resolve conflict peacefully, and to create the conditions conducive to peace, whether at an intrapersonal, interpersonal, inter-group, national or international level. The basic concepts embedded in the above definitions are that peace education is a remedial measure to protect children from falling into the ways of violence in society. It aims at the total development of the child. It tries to inculcate higher human and social values in the mind of the child. In essence, it attempts to develop a set of behavioral skills necessary for peaceful living and peace-building from which the whole of humanity will benefit.

Monitoring and Evaluation of Peace Education

Evaluation of peace programmes are most commonly carried out in non-experimental contexts. There are a number of different types of evaluation methods that are widely used (Fountain, 2002). Surveys tend to be used both before and after peace education/ conflict resolution has been implemented, with conclusions being drawn from a comparison results. They are used by student to assess their own learning, by teachers to assess students learning and by parents to assess their children's behaviour. Surveys have been used to assess knowledge of conflict resolution concepts, ways of building a hypothetical conflict, self-image and school climate. These appear to be used primarily after a peace education

programme has been implemented, though they could also be used in a pre-intervention situation. Interviews may be carried out with students, teachers or parents to assess the impact of the programme. Many different kinds of knowledge, skills and attitudes can be assessed through interviews.

Focus groups which are similar to interviews, are carried out with groups of five to ten people, rather than on an individual basis. Debus, as cited in Escalada & Heong, (2017), and (Fateem, 1993). They are run by a moderator who develops a discussion guideline appropriate to the group, and ensures that each person has a chance to speak. The interactions between the participants can stimulate rich discussion insights, yielding qualitative data on the impact and effectiveness of the programme. Focus groups can usually be carried out more quickly than in-depth interviews. They have been used to examine the types of concepts and values that children and adults have about peace education, ideas about how to deal with violence, and suggestions for how best to promote peace in schools and communities. Fateem as cited in (Escalada & Heong, 2017).

Observation as a method of monitoring and evaluation tend to focus on changes in the behaviour of children and young people, and are usually carried out both before and after a programme is implemented, with conclusions being drawn from a comparison of the frequency of observed behaviour. Many different types of behaviour can be subjects of observation, for example ability to co-operate, methods used to resolve conflict, incidences of name-calling or other biased behaviour and use of mediation skills. Review of school records is also a common method of monitoring and evaluating the progress of implementation of peace education programme. School records provide quantitative information on variables that may relate to the effects of a peace education programme such as student grades, attendance, drop-out rates, and number of student conflicts referred to the school administration, or number of school suspensions for fighting. When reviews of school records are used to provide data on student behaviour, they are generally carried out before and after any intervention, to allow for comparisons (Hicks, 1988 as cited in Emah et al (2008).

An experimental approach to monitoring and evaluating peace education is also used but less commonly. This method is primarily used in academic settings where focused educational research is carried out. An experimental approach to evaluation may involve placing children in a situation of simulated conflict, recording their behaviour before exposure to peace education programme and repeating this procedure after the peace education intervention. The pre- and post-intervention programme results would be compared and contrasted with results from a control group that did not receive the intervention (UNICEF Rights of the Child Report, 2002). In this study efforts were made to evaluate the implementation status of peace education by use of survey method using questionnaires, interviews, and secondary data from the ministry of education and schools records.

Hicks (1985), observes that it is difficult to evaluate the achievements of peace education, since its objectives pertains mainly to internalization of values, attitudes, skills and patterns of behaviours. Reardon (1988) noted that, tests and exams normally used in schools are unsuitable for the evaluation of peace education outcomes. This is because they do not

evaluate state of the mind, but the level of acquired knowledge. The evaluation of peace education requires special techniques adapted to measure a different outcome. This implies a special call to educators to come up with a creative and original solution since evaluation is an essential aspect of implementing an educational programme such as peace education. Evaluation allows the selection of those programs and methods that are effective and have proved capable of achieving the special objectives of peace education. This study, sought to investigate the methods used to evaluate peace education and the difficulties they encounter.

Implementing of Peace Education programme at School Level

A general assumption held by many educators is that once a curriculum is developed, it could subsequently be utilized in educational practice and would be effected or implemented in the fashion intended by developers. Goodlad and Klein (1970) however, discovered that some of the most noted and recommended curricula were either dimly conceived or not properly realized in the institutions claiming their use. It was further realized that, it appeared as if the novel features seemed to be blunted in an effort to twist the curricular innovations into familiar conceptual frames or established patterns of learning. Verspoor (as cited in Barrett et al (2006) observed that education is littered with the remains of programmatic innovations that have not been appropriately implemented. The question that begs to be answered is why such promising curricular innovations fail to be implemented as intended.

This view is espoused by Fullan (1982), who observed that what happens during the implementation process can make or break even carefully planned and generally accepted curricula. Fullan (1982) produced a list of factors affecting implementation of curriculum innovations, which is frequently quoted in the literature. These factors refer to attributes of innovation or change. He outlines characteristics of change such as the need to and relevance of change, clarity, complexity, quality and practicality of the programme. He outlines the characteristics at the school level as staff development (in-service training) and participation. Central support and involvement, time-line and information system (evaluation), board and community characteristics. Characteristics of the school level are outlined as the principal, teacher – teacher relationship, teacher – student interaction, teacher characteristics and orientations.

Applying Fullan's views on the Peace education programme at school level, it means that what needs to be taught in peace education should be well known by the teachers, together with the appropriate methods and approaches of teaching the same. This can be possible by in-servicing the teachers so that they see the need and relevance of both the proposed content and various teaching/learning experiences. The peace education teachers need to be extremely clear on the objectives of peace education and the role he/she needs to play to be able to realize those objectives. The instructional objectives of peace education should be developed in the light of the national objectives of peace education.

Fullan (1982) advocates for staff-development (in-service training) for teachers once a new curriculum is to be implemented. Teachers of peace education require in-servicing once a curriculum innovation is to be implemented. Right from the teacher training institutions, the

teacher training programmes must foster healthy interactions among and between staff members and students, that will promote the realization of objectives for peace education programme. This study sought to establish whether the teachers of peace education are clear about the objectives of peace education. The study further sought to examine whether the peace education programme was given its due attention as would be expected.

Gross (1971) as cited in Kipngetich and Osman (2016) argue that the degree to which a curriculum is implemented is a function of the extent to which five conditions are present during the process of implementation. These conditions include: the attitude of users as well as other stakeholders of the new curriculum, the availability of appropriate resources, facilities and equipment; the degree to which members of the school organization are clear and aware about the scope and content of the curriculum; the extent to which members of the school organization possess the capabilities and competencies needed to carry out the process of curriculum implementation; existing organizational arrangement and the willingness to expend the time and effort to implement the curriculum.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The study utilized the curriculum development and implementation theories by Gross and Fullan. The theories spell out the steps that should be observed in implementing a curriculum. This study sought to investigate the relationship between monitoring and evaluation of peace education and implementation of peace education Uasin Gishu County, Kenya. . A survey research design was used and the mixed method approach was utilised to collect data. The target population included primary school head teachers, teachers and pupils. The factors that facilitate implementation of peace education were taken as the independent variables while peace education implementation status was the dependent variable. The target population was stratified into three strata: head teachers, peace education/social studies teachers, and standard seven pupils. Purposeful and simple random sampling was used to obtain the respondents from each stratum. The study used questionnaires, interview schedules, focused group discussions and document analysis to collect data. The results obtained were analysed and presented in frequencies, percentages and tables. The relationships between the study variables were established using correlation coefficients. Multiple regression models were used to construct models that were used to explain the relationships.

RESEARCH RESULTS

Monitoring and Evaluation of Peace Education

Monitoring and Evaluation was assessed via eight items carefully selected to reflect elements of monitoring and evaluation. Respondents were asked to indicate agreement/disagreement as to whether the suggested practices were in place. A 7-point scale similar to those used in other determinants was used to get the responses to the items. Based on the results, it was established that monitoring and evaluation of peace education in the study area was lukewarm. The mean response scores indicated that most respondents were not sure of the practices and resorted to remain neutral in their responses. Key among the responses cited were as follows, respondents tended to disagree that the curriculum support officers are often

in the field to check on the progress of teaching peace education ($M=3.26$, $SD=1.223$) and that monitoring and evaluation of the teaching of peace education is frequently done ($M=2.11$, $SD=0.311$).

Other notable results are that respondents remained neutral as to whether peace education questions form part of the items in national exams ($M=3.53$, $SD=1.246$); whether grasp of content taught is evaluated after teaching the subject ($M=4.26$, $SD=1.389$) and whether evaluation of the subject is given emphasis by the school administration ($M=4.32$, $SD=0.933$).

All in all, these results paint a bleak picture on monitoring and evaluation of peace education in schools. Results showing that monitoring and evaluation of the programme is not frequently done coupled with results showing that curriculum support officers are hardly in the field to check on the progress of the teaching of peace education implies that this subject is not given the seriousness it deserves. Besides, the revelation that an evaluation of the grasp of the content is hardly done together with the fact that administration do not seem to lay emphasis on evaluation of the programme leads to the observed negative attitude among teachers and pupils towards the subject.

Implementation of Peace Education

The status of implementation of Peace Education was conceptualized as the dependent variable in the present study. In this regard, eleven questionnaire items were used to examine implementation of peace education in the study area. Respondents were asked to indicate their agreements/disagreements to the items selected to show whether peace education has been or is being implemented in the schools. A 7-point scale was used to report responses to the proposed items. Mean response scores together with associated standard deviations were computed. On the basis of the mean response scores, it was established that peace education in schools drawn from the study area was being poorly implemented. Other than peace education teaching being part of the curriculum ($M=6.33$, $SD=0.340$) and peace education questions appearing in national exams ($M=5.38$, $SD=0.486$) which drew agreements from respondents, the general consensus exhibited through small standard deviation values was that most of the other indicators of implementation were lacking. Respondents tended to consistently disagree with the following items; that peace education is taught and examined at all levels in the schools ($M=2.69$, $SD= 0.510$); that peace education has made pupils more accommodative of others ($M=2.46$, $SD=0.617$); that peace education lessons are well attended to ($M=2.11$, $SD=0.623$); that the programme has been successful ($M=2.03$, $SD=0.652$); that pupils are doing well in the subject at school level ($M=1.57$, $SD=0.647$); that the objectives of peace education have been met ($M=1.57$, $SD=0.747$); that the subject receives positive ratings among pupils ($M=1.46$, $SD=0.738$); that all stakeholders are aware of the objectives of peace education ($M=1.43$, $SD=0.742$); and that the teaching of peace education has led to tolerance among the members of different communities ($M=1.00$, $SD= 0.000$).

The implication of these results is that despite the efforts put into the programme such as making teachers and pupils aware of peace education objectives and provision of an enabling environment by the administration, implementation of the programme remains wanting. It is apparent from these results that the expected outcomes of peace education have yet to be realized in schools within the study area. More worrying is the fact that not all stakeholders are aware of the objectives of this programme. Also worrying is the results that intolerance among members of different communities still persists despite the steps being put forth by the schools management. From the data analysed, it shows clearly that the subject is hardly examined at school level.

Testing the relationship between Monitoring and Evaluation of Peace Education and its Implementation

The research hypothesis postulated a lack of significant relationship between monitoring and evaluation of peace education in schools and its implementation. Table 1 presents results of the correlation analysis

Table 1: Relationship between monitoring and evaluation of peace education and its implementation

		Monitoring and Evaluation	and Implementation of peace education
Monitoring and Evaluation	Pearson Correlation	1	.808**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
Implementation of peace education	Pearson Correlation	.808**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

On the basis of Table 1 the results show that, the correlation coefficient was found to be 0.808 while the significance was 0.000. Once again the hypothesis was rejected prompting the researcher to conclude that there is a very strong positive relationship between monitoring and evaluation of peace education and its implementation. Results of the correlation analysis show that monitoring and evaluation like teacher competence is a crucial exercise in overseeing the successful implementation of peace education in schools. Frequent monitoring and evaluation is therefore likely to boost levels of implementation of peace education without necessarily causing the implementation.

DISCUSSION

Descriptive analysis of teacher responses revealed that monitoring of peace education is not frequently done and that Curriculum Support officers (CSOs) hardly visit schools to assess the peace education programme. Despite the poor monitoring and evaluation revealed, the study established that monitoring and evaluation correlates positively with implementation of the peace education programme (r=0.808, p<0.05).

The finding that monitoring and evaluation was rarely conducted explains in part the lukewarm implementation of the programme. This finding contradicts the ethos of monitoring and evaluation. Baratz-snowden (2009) observes that teacher evaluation is often used both for the improvement of teaching and learning and for accountability. In the event that is absent as in the case of the findings in this study, expectations of successful implementations would be wide off the mark. Lack of frequent monitoring and evaluation bring into question the quality of teaching in this sensitive area, and the school systems in the study context. Research suggests that the best school systems do not allow ineffective teachers to remain in classroom for long (Gordon, Kane and Stanger 2006, Kane, Rockoff and Stanger 2006, Mckinsey et al, 2007).

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the above findings, the following conclusions were made in line with the research objective; implementation of peace education is positively influenced by the presence of monitoring and evaluation. The variable has a positive effect on the implementation of any curricula innovation such as peace education. The institution needs to set out procedures for monitoring and evaluating the curriculum, and supply of technical support to teachers who need help.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the analyzed, discussed and concluded findings on the implementation of peace education programme in Uasin Gishu County, the study made the following recommendations:

1. This study recommends integration of peace education concepts and their corresponding pedagogies in all subject areas and a requirement to teach peace concepts across the curriculum. Examinations should have items on peace education.
2. The Ministry of Education (MOE) should make it mandatory for institutions to ensure total support of new curricula innovations in schools, and strengthen the monitoring and evaluation of programmes they roll out in schools.

REFERENCES

- Adballa, M. (2012). Human Needs and Women in Peace building in Lebanon: *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 37–51.
- Alimba N.C (2013) Peace Education, Transformation Of Higher Education And Youths Empowerment For Peace In Africa. *International Journal Of Scientific & Technology Research* Volume 2, Issue 12, December 2013 Issn 2277-8616.
- Bush, K. D. & Duggan, C. (2014) How can research contribute to Peace building? *Peace building*. pp. 303-321. ISSN 2164-7267
- Escalada, M & Heong, K.L. (2017). Focus Group Discussion 1.
- Emah, I.E., Etudor-Eyo, E., Akpanumoh, U.D., Akpan, E.G., & Jude, W.I. (2008). Peace Education and Gender Equity among Nigerian South-South Youths. *Educational Research Network for West and Central Africa*

- Fateem, A (2000) Review of Research on Curriculum Implementation Ontario: OISE.
- Fisas, Y.F. (2011). Doing Mixed methods research pragmatically: Implications for rediscovery of pragmatism as a research paradigm. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 4(1):6 – 16.
- Fullan M. (1982) *The Meaning of educational change*. Toronto: OISE press.
- Fountain, S. (2002) *Education for conflict resolution: Training for trainers manual*. New York UNICEF
- Fountain, S. (1995). *Education for development: a teacher's resource for global learning*. London: Hodder & Stoughton
- Gordon, Kane and Stanger, (2006). 'The Evolution of Sectarian Conflicts in Pakistan and the Ever-Changing Face of Islamic Violence', *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 127–143.
- Galtung, J., and Ikeda (1995). *Choose Peace*. London: Pluto press
- Galtung, J. (1990). 'Cultural Violence', *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 291–305.
- Galtung, J. (1976). Three Approaches to Peace: Peacekeeping, peacemaking and peace building', in *Peace, War and Defence: Essays in peace research: vol. 2*, edited by J. Galtung, Christian Ejlertsen, Copenhagen, pp. 282–304.
- Goodlad, J.I and Klein, M.F. (1970). *Behind the Classroom Door*. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A Jones Publishing Company
- Gross, N. Glacuinta J.B. and Bernstein M. (1971) *Implementing organizational Innovations*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Harris I. (2004) *Environmental Peacemaking, Peacekeeping, and Peace building*. Encyclopedia of Peace Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. <http://www.tc.edu/centers/epe>
- Harris, I and Morrison, M. (2003). *Peace Education*. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland and Company, Inc.
- Hicks, D. (1985). *Education for peace: issues, dilemmas and alternatives*. Lancaster: St. Martin's College.
- Kartar, S. (2015). Concerns of School in Nurturing Peace Education *Techno LEARN* Vol. 5: Issue 1-2
- Ragland, D. (2015). Betty Reardon's philosophy of peace education and the centrality of justice. *Journal of Peace Education*, 12(1).
- Regan, C. (1993). 'Peace education: a global imperative'. In Cremin, P., ed., 1993, *Education for Peace*. Educational Studies Association of Ireland and the Irish Peace Institute.
- Selby, D., 1997. 'Globalizing the curriculum: infusion, integration and innovations for life skills and science learning. Toronto, International Institute for Global Education, University of Toronto.
- UNESCO (1993). *World Education Report*. Paris UNESCO