

# Promoting Peace in the EFL Classroom

Andrew Finch  
Kyungpook National University  
Korea TESOL Journal 7(1)

## Abstract

Humanistic principles of education, which received growing attention in the 20th century, can be traced back to Aristotle and Confucius. However, they are increasingly relevant to a modern society in which competitive, individualized and intellectualized education serves only to enhance the destructive tendency of a technology-based corporate-owned world. This paper argues that the promotion of humanistic values, at all levels of education, should be a prime goal of educators, in order to develop in students interpersonal and intrapersonal skills, which, in addition to problem solving, critical thinking and responsibility, are essential if they are to make a positive and peaceful contribution to the “race between education and catastrophe” (H.G. Wells, 1920). It is the responsibility of teachers to model and promote a peaceful society in their classrooms, so that root causes of corruption, institutional aggression, poverty and sickness may be examined, and learning experiences internalized in the “safe” community that is a microcosm of world society.

Language classrooms are, however, known for promoting anxiety, stress and competition, rather than the collaboration and sensitive awareness. This paper therefore suggests how teachers might identify and address sources of negative affect in their classrooms, and how they might promote humanistic values through appropriate learning materials, and a non-threatening learning environment.

## 1. Introduction

Before investigating the rationale for peace in the classroom it is necessary to ask what is meant by peace? Why is it desirable? What does it have to do with language learning? Here are some definitions from two English Language Teaching (ELT) dictionaries:

- i) If you have peace, you are not being disturbed, and you are in calm, quiet surroundings.
- ii) If you have a feeling of peace, you feel contented and calm and

not at all worried. iii) If there is peace among a group of people, they live or work together in a friendly way and do not quarrel. (*Collins Cobuild English dictionary for advanced learners*, 2001)

i) A condition or period in which there is no war between two or more nations. ii) The state of freedom from disorder within a country, with the citizens living according to the law. iii) A freedom from anxiety or troubling thoughts. iv) In a state of quiet or calm. (*Longman dictionary of English language and culture*, 1992)

Classroom peace thus implies cooperative work without disorder, the participants being unworried, free from anxiety, calm, and not quarreling. This is obviously a description of a desirable learning environment, but is it an end in itself, or is there a deeper aspect to the issue? This paper proposes that peace is a desirable state for society as a whole, that this state has not been (and will not be) achieved by means of competitive and exclusive educational policies and methods, and that humanistic educational goals, approached in a holistic setting, offer a path to the realisation of such a state. This issue is not simply one of making life comfortable for the greatest number of people, for the current destructive potential of weapons technology and the corporate plundering of the world's resources have made it increasingly a matter of preserving the human race:

Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe.  
(H. G. Wells, 1920)

Now the whole question of the educator's role in dealing with planetary crisis becomes prominent. (O'Sullivan, 2001, p. 46)

Some type of holistic, or participating consciousness and a corresponding sociopolitical formation have to emerge if we are to survive as a species. (Berman, 1981, p. 23)

Establishing lasting peace is the work of education; all politics can do is keep us out of war. (Montessori, cited in McCarthy [Ed.], 2001, p. 35)

## **2. The Present Situation**

The society in which we live is based upon aggression: the "market economy" espouses the survival of the fittest; international politics bows to the superiority of the aggressor; and competition is a fact of life in which the winner takes all. Violence is the language of governments as they oppress weaker states, squeezing them of their natural resources in return

for dubious aid and huge debts; genocide, domestic violence (human rights abuses), pollution, and corruption, are routinely overlooked as countries rush to share the spoils of global trade; developed countries supply arms to the rest of the world (the United States supplies 75% of the weapons used in current conflicts [*The Baltimore Sun*, 1999, as cited in McCarthy, 2001, p. 92]), and defense budgets dwarf those for education and welfare (the Pentagon receives more than \$700 million a day from Congress [*ibid*]). Also in the United States, 22,000 murders are committed annually, and the leading cause of injury for women is being beaten at home by a man (*ibid*). In the Republic of Korea, official statistics tell us that one murder is committed every nine hours, and one rape every two hours (*Korea Times*, November 26, 2000). When we consider how this overall situation is mirrored in education, we find that children are continually educated for violence (*The Washington Post*, September 28, 1999). History is delineated in terms of battles, war-heroes are praised above peace-makers (Harris 2001, p. 37), and test-driven teaching promotes mutually exclusive competition. Even when they go home, children learn violence in cartoon books, movies, the news media, the internet, and family relationships.

Budding members of society learn quickly that success is about being first in the queue, gaining more than others, and preserving rights and possessions through the use of force. There is always something to be gained, and always people (competitors) to take from (before they take something from us). Educational systems preserve these “realities” by equating academic success with competition and exclusionism; students who cannot (or will not) perform the intellectual contortions demanded of them for the purposes of gate-keeping (entrance to a “good” high school, university, job, etc.) are defined as failures by society. This waste of human resources is exacerbated by the fact that most such students buy into the great deception, and see themselves as under-achievers. After all, the institutions that they have encountered for most of their lives have used education as a means of selective discrimination, glorifying intellectualism over other qualities, ensuring that only the required number of students progress to tertiary education, and that the remaining students (the majority) see themselves as failures.

This view of the role of education is pervasive in Korea, where even advanced EFL students, who have successfully jumped through all the hoops required of them by the education system, and who often go on to study in America as “straight A” students, seem convinced that they are “poor” learners. As for the high school graduates who find themselves in third-rate universities or colleges, and who see only a life of non-achievement ahead, the EFL classroom holds no promise, being simply “more of the same”, rather than an empowering experience in positive attitude change. If language educators are serious about helping such students to break out of self-confirming, negative perceptions about self and society, then language programs and syllabi must focus on promotion of self-esteem, mutual respect and social responsibility, and on the implicit promotion of these in the language learning environment, teacher/student relationships, and learning materials.

Educational success as measured by the criteria of a university entrance test or a TOEFL score is not an accurate predictor of important life skills such as problem-solving, critical thinking skills, or even teamwork. Even those who have been defined as successful by the educational system "typically do not display an adequate understanding of the materials and concepts with which they have been working" (Gardner, 1993, p. 3). Instead, the society that has preferred industrial pragmatism over the original humanistic definitions of education has produced and perpetuated a selectionist, intellectualized, competitive society in which monetary gain is the only mark of success. In doing this, education has failed even by its own standards (Gardner 1993). While technological advances have produced jetliners, cable TV, the internet, and travel to the moon, over one billion men, women, and children (more than four times the population of the United States and Canada combined) do not have safe water to drink and therefore cannot live a healthy life (*Global Water*, 2005). Almost three billion people - half the world's population - live on less than two dollars a day (Ramonet, 1998).

### **3. Peace in the Classroom**

In this situation, it is the responsibility of the EFL teacher to consider whether he/she is compounding an undesirable state of affairs through linguistic and cultural imperialism (Phillipson, 1992; Tomlinson, 1991), or whether the content and process of English language teaching can positively affect society. This paper therefore explores the concept of the EFL classroom as a non-threatening learning environment, based on the premise that the classroom is a microcosm of society (Dewey, 1966, p. 163; Lantieri & Patti, 1996, p. 46), and that the recognition and exploration of social problems and impediments to learning in the safe environment of the classroom can promote development of the social mores and qualities - positive self-images, a sense of responsibility for self and others, a capacity to trust others [Harris 2001, p. 42] which are essential for future world citizens. This premise follows from a series of assumptions:

- i) state education systems have not been successful in producing informed, responsible, creative members of society (Gardner, 1993, p. 5);
- ii) state education systems have focused on intellectualism and competition, rather than on interpersonal and intrapersonal skills (emotional management, interdependence, personal/social responsibility) (Krishnamurti, 1992, p. 2);
- iii) teachers need to teach according to their beliefs (Williams & Burden, 1997, p. 54);
- iv) teachers are agents of social change (Finch, 2002, p. 52);
- v) classrooms should model a society based on mutual respect, trust and accountability, promoting responsibility and collaboration above individuality, exclusion and competition (Harris 2001, p. 42);
- vi) a humanistic perspective on education, implicitly present in holistic syllabi, non-

threatening learning environment, and appropriate learning materials, empowers students to think about the world and their place in that world (Legutke & Thomas, 1991, p. 45);

- vii) a teacher/student (T/S) relationship built on mutual respect (T-S, S-S, S-T) impacts favorably on future relationships (long term), in addition to enhancing learning in school (short term) (Siccone & López, 2000, introduction<sup>1</sup>); and
- viii) a peaceful language-learning environment reduces affective filters in the classroom (short term), and prepares students to become responsible members of society (long-term) (Finch, 2001, p. 145);

How can a peaceful learning environment be set up? Are teachers to reject everything in the current educational system, or are they to work within the system to change it? Luckily, there are professional options besides moving to an “alternative school” such as Summerhill<sup>2</sup> or Brockwood Park<sup>3</sup>. These options involve working directly on the immediate learning environment.

Firstly, the classroom can be transformed into a non-threatening learning environment (Finch, 2001) in which students can learn to become responsible members of society. With the teacher present as counselor and mentor, students can learn social skills (e.g. collaboration) through trial and error, reflecting on their mistakes, and turning them into learning experiences. Counseling skills (Kelly, 1996, pp. 95-96), take on crucial importance for the teacher in this situation, being essential for the development of a stress-free, mutually respecting learning community. In such an environment, the growth of the “whole person” is primary, with language acquisition following naturally, as an outcome of personal and social growth, and the role of the teacher/counselor becomes one of:

- i) encouraging realistic expectations about accuracy and errors (Foss & Reitzel 1988);
- ii) offering training in affective strategies, to help students manage anxiety and improve performance (Crookall & Oxford, 1991);
- iii) reassuring students that they are not alone in their affective reactions and that these feelings are normal (Foss & Reitzel 1988; Campbell & Ortiz 1991);
- iv) showing that the teacher/evaluator understands the tension caused by being anxious about appearing anxious (Phillips 1992, p. 20);
- v) employing “alternative” evaluations involving partner and small-group work, interviews, problem-solving, and role-plays, which are usually enjoyed by students (Phillips, 1992, p. 21; Young 1990) and can reduce anxiety-raising competitiveness (Bailey 1983) and apprehension (Foss & Reitzel 1988); and
- vi) developing a stress-free climate, helping students to relax, developing peer-support

---

<sup>1</sup> The introduction to this book has no page numbers

<sup>2</sup> A. S. Neill’s “free school”, founded in 1921.

<sup>3</sup> One of the Krishnamurti Foundation’s Private Schools.

networks and promoting self-confidence (Moskowitz, 1978; Horwitz & Young, 1991; Legutke & Thomas, 1991, p. 35; Scarcella & Oxford, 1992).

Secondly, teachers can recognise that they are social, affective and cognitive role-models for their students, who pick up verbal and non-verbal signals the teacher and often discuss these outside of class. If the teacher appears distrustful, arrogant, autocratic, nervous, bored, or uncommitted, students observe this, and will react accordingly. Thus, arriving late to class, while demanding punctuality from students, is not an effective motivational strategy; strictly enforcing deadlines for assignments and then not marking them on time, does not enhance mutual respect; punishing students for plagiarism and then photocopying teaching materials in contradiction of copyright, sends mixed messages to future world citizens. On the other hand, if the teacher offers trust, respect, honest concern, and a passionate love of learning, students will react positively. A first step in the promotion of a non-threatening learning environment, therefore, can be for the teacher to perform a “peace-in-the-classroom” reflective analysis, and to thereby examine the teaching practice from a humanistic perspective (Appendix A). Thirdly, a number of learning environment deficiency analyses have been devised by researchers, and are offered here as appendices B to E. These questionnaires are designed to examine teacher/student perceptions about the learning environment and to identify differences and preferred changes. The first of these questionnaires is the *Classroom Environment Scale (CES)*, Fraser, 1986), an adaptation of which can be seen in Appendix B. The purpose of this instrument is to discover how students and teachers perceive the learning environment. Questions focus on affective aspects of classroom activities and on T-S roles. The *Classroom Learning Environment (CLE)*, Pine & Boy, 1977) (Appendix C) looks at the classroom from a humanistic perspective, focusing on personal identity, trust, love and concern, while the third deficiency analysis (Appendix D) is the *Classroom Environment Questionnaire (CEQ)*, Fraser, 1986), which is concerned more with classroom management, and is in two parts: *preferred* and *actual*. In the first part, students and teachers record the sort of learning environment they would like to experience, and in the second part, they give their perceptions of the environment as it actually is. This data can provide feedback, not only on discrepancies between the *preferred* and the *actual*, but also on differences in perception between teachers and students. Finally, Appendix E shows the *Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS)*, Horwitz et al., 1986), in which causes of student anxiety are researched.

These questionnaires focus on the learning environment itself, on the assumption that “without a positive learning atmosphere, students may well gain little or nothing from new curricular infusions” (Mantle-Bromley, 1995, p. 383), and also in view of Ely’s claim that:

[there is] considerable evidence to support the general proposition that the nature of classroom environments does have an important influence on students’

achievement of cognitive and attitudinal goals ... often beyond that attributable to student characteristics such as pretest performance, general ability or both. (Ely, 1986, p. 118)

Other needs analysis-related issues that might be examined in the language class include learning preferences (Finch & Hyun, 2000a), beliefs about language learning (Horwitz, 1988), teacher needs (Hills, 1976), and student needs (Hills, 1976). Whatever the issues, it is important that students and teachers participate equally in their examination, so that differences in perception may be identified and feedback utilized formatively.

#### **4. Peaceful Learning Materials**

In the questionnaires mentioned above, the learning materials focused on learning issues, in what might be termed a self-referential loop. Students involved in these activities were not only learning English through English, but also actively influencing the characteristics of the English classroom. This section thus examines how learning materials on any given topic (such as those that regularly appear in language-learning textbooks) might be adapted to emphasize personal identity and social responsibility. It is important to note here that a focus on humanistic ideas and methods does not mean that these must be explicitly taught before appropriate social behavior can become a criterion of membership in the learning community. Just as learner training and student autonomy can be incorporated into the EFL curriculum, so a humanistic/holistic ethos can be made implicit in everything that occurs in the language classroom. This emphasis begins with the learning environment and extends to T-S/S-S/S-T roles, self-direction, diversity, alternative (non-competitive) assessment and collaborative learning, in addition to the learning materials.

There is insufficient space in this paper to discuss principles of material-design in depth. However, it is relevant to note that appropriate materials play an important role of the promotion of peace, in terms of format, content, and underlying assumptions. In contrast, many published materials (school textbooks and language learning course books) utilize a teacher-centered format, which immediately sends a message to all participants that language learning occurs in a linear manner, that the teacher will (autocratically) lead the students through a prescribed sequence of events, and that this process will result in fluency and proficiency in the “successful” students. Such a format encourages the teacher-fronted classroom, in which the teacher micromanages every utterance, while defining and competitively assessing “acceptable” language learning. “Peaceful” language learning materials, on the other hand, are directed at the learner, and ...

- i) empower the student as an autonomous learner;

- ii) promote self-esteem;
- iii) reduce affective filters;
- iv) develop personal and social responsibility;
- v) include linguistic goals;
- vi) include learning-for-life goals; and
- vii) encourage personal reflection on cognitive, affective and social achievements.

While it can be claimed that language learning materials to date have largely ignored these factors (Sinclair, 1996, p. 149), it can also be said that humanistic learning materials *per se* have paid little attention to learning content in their “experience-activating exercises” (Legutke & Thomas 1991, p. 64). This section therefore examines how the two concerns might be brought together, combining Siccone & López’s (2000, Introduction) fourfold approach to humanistic learning materials (Figure 1), with Tudor’s (1996) three main target areas for learner training instruction: i) language learning and language learning processes; ii) language structure and language use; and iii) the learners themselves as language learners.

Figure 1. A classification of humanistic learning materials. (Siccone & López, 2000)

Others	Interdependence	Social responsibility
Self	Independence	Personal responsibility
	Experience (Internal)	Express (External)

The classification in Figure 1 is based (as with other humanistic approaches) on the general school classroom in the U.S.A., but it provides a useful framework for the EFL classroom, and will be followed in the following presentation of sample activities.

#### 4.1. Independence

The first activity to be offered here is adapted from Siccone & López (2000, pp. 34–35), and concentrates on one of the areas in Figure 1: Independence/Self/Experience. Students investigate the aspects that they like and dislike about themselves, and record these on paper. On one side of the paper they write the things that they like about themselves, using (if possible) colors that they like. On the other side of the paper they write the things they don’t like, using colors that they don’t like. In the final stage, they return to this side of the paper, writing “I love myself even when ...” above the aspects they do not like. This activity combines social and linguistic goals, with very little need for adaptation. Students are encouraged to value themselves (development of self-esteem) during the activity itself, and



they do this in the context of controlled language: “I like ...” and “I don’t like ... .” Listening comprehension is involved when the teacher tells an appropriate story, and further, when partners dictate the instructions to each other (comprehension of imperatives, plus classroom language – “What did you say?” “One more time please.” “How do you spell it?” “Like this?”). The amount of acceptable disclosure (affect) can be controlled by the students, who can work together (pair-work), or who can sit back-to-back. Finally, this activity has meaning to the students, since it focuses on an important aspect of their lives; it is more than a language activity, though it rehearses a common grammatical goal.

The second activity (“A Good Thing,” Siccone & López, 2000, pp. 42–43) recognizes that the language classroom is known for producing stress (MacIntyre, 1995, p. 90), and focuses on trust-building and relaxation, thus reducing affective filters, and easing language learning. Students practice deep breathing and “Stop-thought” techniques, and listen (with their eyes closed) to a text about transforming negative thoughts into positive ones. The student-centered instructions contain simple imperatives (linguistic goal), and can be developed into similar activities in which students examine commands and directions. Actions performed by the teacher can be reassigned to students, thus promoting collaborative learning. A similar activity (*Accentuate the Positive*) appears in Moskowitz’s excellent book (1978, p. 89). Here, affective goals are “To encourage students to think positively and to look for the good in their daily lives” and linguistic goals are “To practice the past tense” and “To practice superlatives.” Students tell their group (in no more than three sentences) about the most positive thing that happened to them last week. They then tell each other about something that they did last week that made someone feel good. Finally, students identify good events (however seemingly insignificant) that occurred today. Both these activities fall in the “Independence” section of Figure 1, though they have aspects of interdependence.

#### **4.2. Interdependence**

A more explicit examination of interdependence occurs in the “Learning Contract” (Appendix G). In this activity, students identify aspects of the learning environment that they can positively affect by their classroom behavior. In addition to promoting “a classroom community based upon shared values and respect” (Siccone & López, 2000, p. 93), along with a focus on personal responsibility within the group, this activity uses “should” in a consistent manner, and can be developed to examine modals (should, could, would, must, have to). In this case, the language is being rehearsed in a meaningful way, with appropriate learning content. Humanistic goals for this activity might include a focus on acts of friendship, with a preparatory activity also utilizing modals:

- i) What could/should/must/ought we do to make everyone feel supported in the classroom?
- ii) What could/should/must/ought we do to make the class start on time?

- iii) What could/should/must/ought we do to help the teacher?
- iv) What could/should/must/ought the teacher do to make everyone feel comfortable?

“That’s what friends are for” (Siccone & López, 2000, pp. 82–85) develops the theme of interdependence further, by examining desirable qualities of friends. Students (in groups or pairs) discuss friendship, and brainstorm what they like in friends. They choose the top six qualities that they feel are important, and write them separately on memory notes, placing the notes on their worksheet, in order of importance. They are then given situations to consider, in which different characteristics of friends might be appropriate (e.g. spending a long vacation together or visiting a friend in hospital). After further discussion, students rearrange their preferences and share these in new groups. The humanistic goal here is for students to consider the distinctions that expand the sense of self, and to receive feedback on their own values. Initial ideas are expanded in “further discussion” sessions, and students finally regroup and share their ideas, leading to a class consensus, which will minimize surface dissimilarities and focus on positive attributes. The linguistic goal (in addition to interactive use of the target language) focuses on positive adjectives which can be applied to people, these adjectives being discovered and rehearsed as students brainstorm, decide, review and share.

### **4.3. Personal Responsibility**

“What if ... ?” (Appendix H) is about decision-making and personal accountability. The activity presents “Event” words, “Response” words and “Outcome” words in a game format, encouraging students to link them in any way, using appropriate conditionals such as *If, when, whenever, then* and *and* (e.g. *Whenever I become ill, I get married, and learn to drive.*). In a possible follow-up activity, the humanistic element can become stronger, if students are asked to actively consider how outcomes are dependent upon events and responses. In this case, students can be encouraged to see that they can positively influence outcomes by modifying events and personal responses. For example, students might be asked to write down all the excuses they can think of for not doing their homework, for not coming to class on time, for not meeting someone at the agreed time, etc. These excuses (which will draw attention to the linguistic element of cause and effect statements) can then be examined, and alternative perceptions suggested.

Personal responsibility includes self-respect in addition to empowerment, and “Highlights of My Life” (Siccone & López, 2000, pp. 45, 156–160) explores this aspect by encouraging students to make a vision of their future success in life. A listening activity gets students in the mood to think about possible positive outcomes in their lives; they then draw (on a movie story-board) three events in their past, three that they would like to occur within five years, and another three which they hope for within ten years. Students are motivated to set goals for themselves, to learn the importance of envisioning success, and to realise the power of

choosing results over excuses. A final group activity debriefs students about their visions.

Self-respect, achievement and empowerment can also be promoted through an “I Can’t/Haven’t yet ...” type of activity, encouraging students to see perceived failures as steps along a path to achievement. Students are asked to write down at least five things they cannot do and then to change the sentences they have written into ones containing the phrase “I haven’t yet ...” The substitution of “I haven’t yet” for “I can’t” is also an interesting example of how a simple language exercise (substitution drill), taking the students’ immediate lives for its subject (meaningful activity).

#### **4.4. Social Responsibility**

A familiar language learning activity is one in which students are asked to choose alternatives from given options. This appears in textbooks in the guise of choosing (for example) which articles should be taken to a desert island, which patient should receive a heart transplant, and even which passenger should be thrown out of a sinking hot air balloon. This format can be successfully adopted to promote cooperation rather than competition. In “Share the Wealth” (Appendix I), the situation is again very immediate, and students are asked to decide how to allocate \$500 that has been donated to their class. This activity promotes group responsibility through the identification of ways in which students might directly affect their immediate surroundings. It also functions as an exercise in mutual respect, learning how to listen to and accept each other’s opinions (SHARE, Appendix I). Finally, the linguistic function practiced here is one of agreement and disagreement.

### **5. Action Research**

The author has been examining the effects of a collaborative, non-threatening, “peaceful” learning environment on student attitudes and perceptions, over the past three years. A number of instruments have been used to carry out this research (Finch, 2005), among which the *Classroom Environment Questionnaire* (CEQ) (Fraser, 1986; Appendix D) is a notable indicator of attitude change. In this activity, students first decide to what extent they would like the statements in the questionnaire to be true. This is done on a 1 – 5 scale, ranging from “1 = We would be happy if this never happened in class” to “5 = We would be happy if this always happened in class.” Having recorded their “preferred” version, they then examine the same statements in terms of how often they are true in actuality. Responses now range from “1 = This never happens in class” to “5 = This always happens in class.”

Since the statements on this instrument mostly describe positive, student-centred events and outcomes, it is not surprising that the “preferred” results (n = 146) showed many average scores above 4 (“We would be happy if this often happened in class”). The highest average

score (4.55) went to “1. Students come early to class,” followed by “19. The atmosphere of the room is friendly” (4.54) and “13. The teacher is friendly to the students” (4.49). The statement scoring the lowest average (1.93) was “4. The teacher decides where students sit in class.” Punctuality and friendly teacher-student relations were apparently very important to the students.

When comparing the results of the “preferred” CEQ with the “actual” version, it is to be expected that reality will not match up to desired conditions, since “the grass is always greener on the other side of the fence.” In this respect, most results did show a slight downward trend. Item 2, for example (“Students talk in English before the teacher arrives”) scored 3.99 in the “preferred” version and “2.55” in the actual version, showing that this activity did not occur as frequently as the students wished it to. Item 7 (“Students choose which tasks to do”) also moved down, from 3.51 to 2.99, showing that students would like more autonomy in choosing and sequencing tasks. These were the most extreme examples of the downward trend. Most items, however, did not show significant differences between the two versions. Thus, item 4 (“The teacher decides where students sit in class”) moved from 1.93 to 1.92. On the other hand, a number of items showed a reverse trend. Item 8 (“Students work together in groups”) moved from 3.7 to 4.07, and item 10 (“Students are responsible for the assessment in this class”) moved from 3.78 to 4.01, showing that students had been asked to work in groups and to assess each other more than they wanted to. Overall analysis of this instrument showed that students were satisfied with their actual (student-centred, non-threatening) learning environment, and that there were no significant discrepancies with their preferred learning environment.

Students who took part in this study showed a general movement away from traditional views of language learning and teaching, along with high awareness of learning needs and learning strategies. They expressed a growing comfort in and with the language classroom, were conscious of the importance of confidence and motivation, strong in intrapersonal intelligence and weak in interpersonal intelligence. An ability to reflect meaningfully and autonomously on their learning was evidenced in their individual journal reflections and in their self-directed class discussions.

Just as these results confirm Littlewood’s suggestion that “educational contexts” are more responsible for Asian learning styles than the learners themselves, it can also be said that violent learning contexts are also responsible for competitive learning styles, and that these can be “unlearned.” This in turn leads to the conclusion that if the institutional learning conditions are changed in a humanistic way, then the performance skills and preferences of the students will also change in a beneficial manner.

## 6. Conclusion

A return to humanistic guiding principles of education is essential in order to prepare students for society by developing in them qualities of personal and social responsibility, qualities that will empower them to positively address root causes of discrimination, corruption, poverty, sickness, and violence. Establishing a non-threatening learning environment is a practical and effective means of promoting such peaceful language learning; in which learning materials can be designed to incorporate both humanistic and linguistic goals.

While many would agree that a humanistic approach to education needs to be present in every aspect of the learning environment, from government policy making, to program design, syllabus considerations, T-S/S-S/T relationships, learning materials and alternative assessment, it is nonetheless easy to despair of ever realizing such goals, in view of the exam-driven lessons EFL teachers often feel required to supervise. However, governments are beginning to acknowledge recognize that education of the heart is essential for the growth of a healthy society, and official policy documents, such as the Korean 7th National Curriculum, are describing educational objectives in terms of “the ability to achieve an independent life and acquire the qualifications of democratic citizens, and to be able to participate in the building of a democratic state and promoting the prosperity of all humankind” (Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development, 2001, p. 3). The well-educated person is further defined in terms of well-rounded and wholesome development, creative ability, broad intellectual knowledge and skills in diverse academic disciplines, an understanding of the national culture, and contribution to the development of the community. Teachers can therefore take heart from such developments, and can, in addition to setting up their own peaceful learning environments, push for humanistic and holistic reforms in education, safe in the knowledge that their demands are sanctioned by Ministry policy documents.

If we are to reach peace, then we must teach peace. (McCarthy, 2001, p. 35)

- References
- Bailey, K.M. (1983). Competitiveness and anxiety in adult second language learning: looking at and through the diary studies. In H.W. Seliger and M.H. Long (Eds.). *Classroom oriented research in second languages*. (pp. 67-103). Rowley, MA: Newbury House..
- Berman, M (1981). *The reenchantment of the world*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Collins Cobuild English dictionary for advanced learners*. (2001). Glasgow: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Campbell, C., & Ortiz, J. (1991). Helping students overcome foreign language anxiety: a foreign language anxiety workshop. In E.K. Horwitz & D.J. Young, (Eds.), pp. 153-168.

- Creating a peace education class: Think it's easy? (1999, September 28). *The Washington Post*. Washington, U.S.A.
- Crookall, D., & R. L. Oxford. (1991) Dealing with anxiety: some practical activities for language learner and teacher trainees. In E. K. Horwitz & D. J. Young (Eds.), pp. 141-50.
- Dewey, J. (1966). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: Free Press.
- Ely, C. (1986). An analysis of discomfort, risktaking, sociability, and motivation in the L2 classroom. *Language Learning*, 36, pp. 238-244.
- Finch, A. E. (2001). The non-threatening learning environment. *KOTESOL Journal*, 4(1), pp. 133-158.
- Finch, A. E. (2002). The language clinic: The teacher as an agent of change. *ThaiTESOL Bulletin*, August 2002, pp. 35-52.
- Finch, A. E. & Hyun, T. D. (2000a). *The Way Ahead*. Seoul: Hakmunsa publishing.
- Finch, A. E. & Hyun, T. D. (2000b). *Tell Me More!* Seoul: Hakmunsa publishing.
- Finch, A. E. (2005). An attitudinal profile of EFL learners in Korea. (In press).
- Foss, K. A., & Reitzel, A. G. (1988). A relational model for managing second language anxiety. *TESOL Quarterly*, 22, pp. 437-454.
- Fraser, B. J. (1986). *Classroom environment*. London: Croom Helm.
- Gardner, H. (1993). *The unschooled mind: How children think and how schools should teach*. London: Fontana Press.
- Global Water*, Retrieved July 18, 2005 from <http://www.globalwater.org/>.
- Harris, I. (2001). The rigor of peace studies. In McCarthy, C. [Ed.] 2001, pp. 36-43.
- Hills, P. J. (1976). *The self-teaching process in higher education*. Croom Helm: London.
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *Modern Language Journal*, 70(2), pp. 125-132.
- Horwitz, E. K., & Young, D. J. (Eds.). (1991). *Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implications*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kelly, R. (1996). Language counseling for learner autonomy: The skilled helper in self-access language learning. In R. Pemberton *et al.* [Eds.]. (1996), pp. 93-114.
- Krishnamurti, J. (1992). *Education and the significance of life*. London: Gollancz.
- Lantieri, L. & Patti, J. (1996). *Waging peace*. Boston, Massachusetts: Beacon Press.
- Legutke, M., & Thomas, H. (1991). *Process and experience in the language classroom*. Harlow: Longman Group, U.K. Ltd.
- Mantle-Bromley, C. (1995). Positive attitudes and realistic beliefs: links to proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79(3), pp. 372-386
- MacIntyre, P.D. (1995). How does anxiety affect second language learning? A reply to Sparks and Ganshow. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79(1), 90-99.
- McCarthy, C. (1999, May 2). Violence, legal and illegal. *The Baltimore Sun*. (p.3). Baltimore, U.S.A.

- McCarthy, C. [Ed.]. (2001). *Strength through peace*. Washington, D.C.: The Center for Teaching Peace.
- Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development, (2001). *The school curriculum of the Republic of Korea*. Retrieved October 22, 2004, from <http://www.moe.go.kr/en/etc/school.html>.
- Montessori, M., cited in McCarthy, C. [Ed.] (2001), p. 35.
- Moskowitz, G. (1978). *Caring and sharing in the foreign language class: A sourcebook on humanistic techniques*. Rowley, MS.: Newbury House.
- One Murder Every 9 Hours, One Rape Every 2 Hours. (2000, November 26). *The Korea Times*. Seoul, Republic of Korea: Korea Times publishing.
- O'Sullivan, E. (2001). *Transformative learning: Educational vision for the 21st century*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Phillips, E.M. (1992). The effects of language anxiety on student's oral test performances and attitudes. *The Modern Language Journal*, 76(1), pp. 14-25.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pine, G.J. & Boy, A.V. (1977). *Learner centered teaching: a humanistic view*. Denver, Colorado: Love Publishing Co.
- Ramonet, I. (1998). The politics of hunger. *Le monde diplomatique*.
- Scarcella, R.C., & Oxford, R.L. (1992). *The tapestry of language learning: The individual in the communicative classroom*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Siccone, F., & López, L. (2000). *Educating the heart*. Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon.
- Sinclair, B. (1996). Materials design for the promotion of learner autonomy: How explicit is explicit? In R. Pemberton *et al.* [Eds.]. (1996), pp. 149-165.
- Tomlinson, J. (1991). *Cultural imperialism: A critical introduction*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Tudor, I. (1996). *Learner-centredness as language education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wells, H. G. (1920). *Outline of history*. New York: Macmillan.
- Williams, M., & Burden, R. L. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers: A social constructivist approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

#### Appendix A: Peace in the classroom: Reflective needs analysis

Perform this questionnaire twice.

- The first time, check the boxes which reflect your actual teaching practice.
- The second time, check the boxes which reflect your desired teaching practice.

1 = Yes, of course; 2 = Yes, in general; 3 = Maybe; 4 = Not really; 5 = Not at all.

In my (actual/desired ) teaching practice, it is important to ...	1	2	3	4	5
1. ... develop a stress-free climate.					

2. ... develop peer-support networks.
  3. ... help students to relax.
  4. ... promote self-esteem.
  5. ... promote social responsibility.
  6. ... offer unconditional trust.
  7. ... inspire confidence, motivation, and independent learning.
  8. ... reflect on the assumptions that I take into the classroom.
  9. ... examine the hidden agendas in the classroom.
  10. ... focus on counseling skills and management of affect.
  11. ... not focus on competence or performance.
  12. ... focus on what students can do, rather than on what they can't.
  13. ... reappraise teacher/student roles.
  14. ... act as a language resource and counselor.
  15. ... promote interaction as learning content.
  16. ... promote alternative assessment.
  17. ... design or choose learning materials which treat the learners and their perceptions as valid and meaningful.
  18. ... design or choose learning materials which allow students to direct their own learning.
  19. ... promote a non-threatening "workshop" learning environment.
- ... reflect a holistic, socio-cultural view of language-learning as education.

#### Appendix B: Classroom Environment Scale (CES). Adapted from Fraser, 1986.

① = I strongly agree; ② = I agree; ③ = No comment; ④ = I disagree; ⑤ = I strongly disagree	① ② ③ ④ ⑤
--	-----------

This class is well organized.

Information for this class is easily available on the home page.

This class is student-centred.

Students are responsible for much of the assessment in this class.

(self-assessment, peer-assessment, portfolios, etc.)

Students put a lot of energy into the class.

Students get to know each other very well.

Students often talk about English class.

Students daydream in class.

Students decide what to do in class.

Students always want to leave early in this class.

Students pay attention to the teacher.

Students do a lot of study outside of class.

The teacher takes a personal interest in every student.

The teacher spends time talking with the students individually.





The teacher spends time talking with the students in groups.

The teacher is like a friend.

The teacher tries to help the students.

Many friendships have been made in this class.

The class is often noisy.

The atmosphere in the room is friendly.

### Appendix C: Classroom Learning Environment Scale (CLE). Adapted from Pine & Boy, 1977

**Y** = Yes; **M** = Maybe; **N** = No; **?** = No opinion - we've never thought about this before.

Our learning environment ...	Y	M	N	?
1. ... encourages us to be active.				
2. ... encourages us to discover our personal meanings of ideas.				
3. ... emphasizes the uniquely personal nature of learning.				
4. ... encourages differences as good and desirable.				
5. ... recognizes our right to make mistakes.				
6. ... tolerates ambiguity (allows for apparent contradictions).				
7. ... views evaluation as a cooperative and personal process.				
8. ... encourages openness of self rather than concealment.				
9. ... encourages us to trust ourselves.				
10. ... is one in which we feel respected.				
11. ... is one in which we feel accepted.				
12. ... permits confrontation.				
13. ... allows the teacher to lose the teaching function.				
14. ... attempts to meet individual needs, interests and abilities.				
15. ... provides meaningful and relevant learning materials.				
16. ... promotes personal interests and exploration.				
17. ... provides materials that need interaction and investigation.				
18. ... does not promote competitiveness.				
19. ... allows us to make mistakes and still feel competent.				
20. ... helps us to grow socially, emotionally and intellectually.				
21. ... nurtures respect, trust, love and concern for one another.				
22. ... views the teacher's role as facilitator.				

### Appendix D: Classroom Environment Questionnaire (Actual/Preferred)

① = This never/I would be happy if this never happens/ed in class.

② = This rarely/I would be happy if this rarely happens/ed in class.

③ = This sometimes/I would be happy if this sometimes happens/ed in class.

④ = This often/I would be happy if this often happens/ed in class.

⑤ = This always/I would be happy if this always happens/ed in class.

<i>How often do you want these things to happen in class?</i>	①	②	③	④	⑤
Students come early to class.					
Students talk in English before the teacher arrives.					
The teacher comes early to class.					
The teacher decides where students sit in class.					
The teacher decides which students should work together.					
Students choose their partners for group work.					
Students choose which tasks to do.					
Students work together in groups.					
Students work at their own speed.					
Students are responsible for much of the assessment in this class.					
The teacher explains how to do tasks.					
The teacher explains grammar.					
The teacher is friendly to the students.					
The teacher talks and the students listen.					
The teacher helps students who are having problems.					
The teacher joins in class activities.					
The teacher considers students' feelings.					
The teacher talks with students individually.					
The atmosphere of the room is friendly.					
The room is a comfortable temperature.					
Adapted from Fraser (1986).					

Appendix E: Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS). Adapted from Horwitz, 1986.

① = I strongly agree; ② = I agree; ③ = No comment; ④ = I disagree; ⑤ = I strongly disagree	①	②	③	④	⑤
I am nervous when the teacher speaks to me in English class.					
I am embarrassed when I answer the teacher in English class.					
I worry about making mistakes in English class.					
I get nervous when speaking in English in class.					
My heart pounds when I do something in class.					
I feel self-conscious when speaking in English with my classmates.					
I am afraid that others will laugh at me when I speak English.					
I feel that the other students are better than me at speaking English.					
I get so nervous in class that I forget everything.					

- I get nervous if I haven't prepared for English class.
- I feel anxious even if I have prepared for English class.
- I worry if the teacher corrects me in class.
- The more I study English, the more I get confused.
- I worry if I can't understand every word the teacher says.
- In pair-work, I worry if my partner is better than me at English.
- In pair-work, I worry if my partner is worse than me at English.
- I worry about English tests.
- I worry about failing English class.
- The English class makes me most nervous (more than other classes).
- I often daydream in English class.

Appendix F: My Learning Preferences. Finch & Hyun, 2000a.

<i>How do I like to learn English?</i>	No	Maybe	Yes
1. I like to learn by reading in class.			
2. I like to listen to language cassettes in class.			
3. I like to play language games in class.			
4. I like to learn by speaking in class.			
5. I like to learn by watching English-caption movies.			
6. I like to have a textbook.			
7. I like to write in the textbook.			
8. I like the teacher to explain everything.			
9. I like the teacher to tell me my mistakes.			
10. I like to study in pairs in class.			
11. I like to study in groups in class.			
12. I like to study outside of class.			
13. I like to study grammar.			
14. I like to study new words.			
15. I like to study pronunciation.			
16. I like to study writing.			
17. I like to watch TV in English.			
18. I like to talk to native speakers.			
19. I like to study western culture.			
20. I like to go to English clubs.			
21. I like to think about my progress.			
22. I like to visit the teacher in his/her room.			
23. I like to find foreigners to talk to in English.			
24. I like to ask the teacher for help.			

25. I like to ask other students for help.

Appendix G: Learning Contract. Finch & Hyun, 2000a.

In our English classes ...

1. We should .....
2. We should .....
3. We should.....
4. We should.....
5. The teacher should.....
6. The teacher should .....
7. We should not .....
8. We should not .....
9. The teacher should not .....
10. The teacher should not .....

Appendix H: What if? Adapted from Finch & Hyun, 2000b, p. 57.

- Choose an “Event” word, a “Response” word and an “Outcome word”.
- Make a sentence, using the words at the bottom of the worksheet.

E.g.: “If I go to China, then I will buy new clothes, and I will get married.

Event	Response	Outcome
Go to China	Buy a Car	Go on a diet
Become famous	Become a monk	Change my job
Go to a disco	Have a party	My teacher will be angry.
Live alone	Lose weight	Get restless
Become ill	Make new friends	Get married
Sell everything	Study hard	Eat no meat
Become a movie star	Never study	Learn to drive
Get fat	Start the car	It starts to rain.
Take it easy	Buy new clothes	Go to hospital
Go to sleep	Watch TV	My boss will get angry
Lose my job	Get a new hairstyle	Emigrate to Australia
If   If I ever   If I don't   When   Whenever   As soon as   By the time   Unless   Then   And		

Appendix I: Share the Wealth. Adapted from Siccone & López, 2000, pp. 191–194).

- Your class has received a \$500 donation from a wealthy member of the community.
- Your group must decide on how to spend that money, from the options listed below.

- You have 20 minutes to decide, or the money will be given to another class.
- The group must agree 100% on the choice.

During this activity, practice effective listening skills:

**S:** Be Still; be Silent

**H:** Hear what others are saying; Hear what they mean.

**A:** Allow others to speak. Accept what they say as true for them. Pay Attention.

**R:** Restate what you heard the other person say, to be sure you understand.

**E:** Encourage others to speak.

**Options:**

1. Divide the money equally among all the class members.
2. Use the money to pay for a field trip for a class project.
3. Give the money to the Education Department for more educational resources.
4. Use the money to buy toys for local poor children and orphans.
5. Donate the money to an organization that provides meals for beggars.
6. Use the money to buy blankets and give them to homeless people.
7. Use the money to set up a recycling program to help save the environment.
8. Use the money to set up a scholarship for poor students.
9. Spend the money on a fun party for the class.