Role of Peace Education in Sustainability and Development of Pakistan
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ABSTRACT

The study is based on AHP analysis to identify the feasibility of each level of schooling with respect to peace education. The AHP application presented, provided results of each relative factor or criteria to each respondent as well as the overall weightage for these criteria's given by each individual/respondent in our study. The findings of the study revealed that, the dominant alternative for academic professionals and field experts that can play impressive role in peace education is the primary schooling, while the central criteria having influence on peace education are norms/values, followed by approaches/standards and knowledge/skills with respect to teacher’s judgements. On the other hand, significant factors/criteria for student’s choice with respect to peace education is approaches and standards. Students also prefer primary education level as the most effective stage for children to learn/catch peace education skills and adopt peace values. The quantification of impacting factors-like in our study are; knowledge/skills, approaches/standards and norms/values. Decision making with respect to peace building in young generation will play a significant role in achievement of sustainability in the peace. Therefore, at the grassroots level, providing trainings on peace education to the children in primary school can reduce risk of conflicts in Pakistan. The government and policy implementers should prioritize addition of peace education in devising curriculum and its implementation.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Among the educated slot of Pakistan, it is evident from research that peace education has not been given the status as deserved as part of the curriculum. Indeed, most of them are even not aware of this term. on the other hand, conflict denotes a condition where more than one group of people are in opposition to each other, having different views or interests that may lead to a violent or non-violent activity detrimental to associates of the conflicting party (Getui, 2009). However, education has empowered the lives of people in a society where complex and diverse cultural practices exercised (Krueger and Maleckova, 2003). This study is therefore designed to elaborate peace education and its need in society. Peace is the nonexistence of violence, not only particular and direct, but also structural or secondary. The signs of structural violence are imbalanced dispersal of resources and power. Peace is about nonappearance of direct ferocity and the existence of justice (Galtung, 1996). Peace comprises training individuals to reason critically to recognize and resolve clashes through countermeasure approaches. Root causes are resolved by developing vigorous capabilities and interactive variations that arouse tolerance and admiration for all, irrespective of ethnic basis, race, gender or faith (Ahmed, 2011). Betty Reardon follows to alter the human ailment by shifting communal structures (Reardon, 1988). Understanding of peace can be apprehended by the imprint of negative and positive peace. Former mentions the nonappearance of war or physical / direct violence, latter denote presence of reasonable circumstances, as well as human and environmental goodness. Different stages of associations can be found in peace, initiating with personal peace and extending to broader spheres (Galtung,
Education can be a tool of struggle (burning complaints, stereotypes, biases and hostilities), Lederach (2003), Galtung, (1996), but can be a foundation of accumulation of “conversion of skirmishes, the linking’s amongst education and conflict is essential because skirmishes is a vital right that must be well-kept throughout the conflict”. If the idea for education has been disappeared because of the conflict, it is impairment for humanity to restore. Policies within the education structure should be scrutinized in relationships of their likelihood to deteriorate or recuperate skirmishes. Smith and Vaux, (2003) Peace is habitually unspecified, breakdowns are recurrent, so the goal of education is to inspire conflict transformation. Davies (2010) suggests that any examination of the education structure is anticipated to spot frequent zones where some fragments of the structure can wound conflicts in an extremely lobbied means, although there may be other features that attempt to craft alteration and augment conflict transformation. In disputed societies, peace education is the footing of socialization through communication of knowledge, skills, morals and boldness (Bush and Saltarelli, 2000).

Peace education is the “the course of sanctioning the knowledge, skills, approaches and standards desirable to produce social alterations to enable children, teenagers and adults to prevent and resolve skirmishes and make circumstances promising to concord in social dealings, at the countrywide or transnational level.” Fountain (1999) key areas of peace education comprises of the following; Skills reflect serious scrutiny, ability to make choices and opt for the best, thoughts, communication skills, kindness, team building. Knowledge in this regard is related to awareness about the concept of peace, conflict and violence, choices available for non-violence: demilitarization, resolving conflicts, deterrence, Human rights, harmony, democratization, and justice based development or fairness. Respect for everyone, equality, non-violence, consideration, universal and conservational concern, honesty and endurance, impartiality, communal accountability and positive image. Lenience/tolerance, morals, optimistic boldness/conduct, self-determination, candor/straightforwardness, admiration, and acceptance. Peace education is built on coaching nonaggression, deliberation, confidence, teamwork and regard for all (Ahmed, 2011).

Differentiated pious and mixed-race institutes are the unparalleled way to encounter narrow-mindedness and discernment, signifying that faith-based schools can offer a first-class and imaginative setting for long-term growth in tolerance and non-discrimination of religion and faith (McGlynn, 2005). “Ministry of Education Pakistan” (Curriculum Wing) in November 2000 settled a workshop on peace and human rights education intended for better understanding of teachers from all provinces of the country. A fictional reader called “Parh kay barh” was documented in August 1999 for student literacy titled “Each one Teach one.” Rawalpindi Grammer School works meticulously with the Ministry of Education on human rights and peace education and teacher training. Grammar School Rawalpindi (GSR) took part in a HREP movement “A piece of peace.” The International Center for Religion and Diplomacy (ICRD), working on the Islamic divine school in Pakistan (madrassas) to sanction education for peace and coaching the values of conflict resolution.

Pakistan is currently peace hungry; its values are fragmented by class differences, low economic condition, variant legislations, credence, different languages, topography, status and color. The younger age group knows their culture through families, education, and media. Bar-Tal and Rosen (2009). The future depends on our ability to thoughtlessness ferocious and aggressive passages to solve anomalies (Murithi, 2009). Pakistan has been mainly susceptible to invigorated conflict, whether it be religious, militaristic, cultural autonomy or border conflict (Ahmed, 2011). Durrani and Dunne (2009) found that the relationships between education, religion and countrywide identity inclined to construct “essential” mutual identities. Educational part in identity development can be a reason why education and schooling is the aim of attack in many conflicts. In conflict-stricken states there are four areas that justify consideration, linked to separate education systems, languages, faith and nationality.
of text books in Afghanistan in 2003 and Iraq in 2004 which was completed to eradicate substantial material that threatened peace (Novelli and Lopes Cardozo, 2008). A case study of Sri Lanka on peace education presented to settle down dogmatic and socio-economic inequalities driving prolonged skirmishes discloses educational improvements announced into universal education guidelines. Peace education was presented into all themes by the Ministry of Education as a part of a whole-approach for all in the 1997 education modifications (Orjuela, 2003). Though, a dearth of consideration was given to refining outlooks towards the advancement of peaceful relations, morals and attitudes. Accomplishment of peace education has therefore been reliant on the attitudes and skills of trainers in Sri Lanka.

In Uganda, discrepancies among the 53 publicly familiar racial clusters; categorized by massive racial, religious, and dialectal rift, date back to pre-colonial times (Broere and Vermaas, 2005). Regional solidarity has been endangered by the 20-year-old war between the government and the Lord's Army, settled by peace contract in May 2007. The war obstructed schools, abolishing education set-up broadening the gap between less-educated North and well-educated South. Few scholars identified the necessity for peace education in school syllabus. Yet, several INGO’s are vigorous in the field of peace education like peace education programmes in Uganda run by UNHCR and UNESCO (Nicolai, 2009). Massacre, peace and settlement, good governance, Human rights, gender matters and the environment are all covered in programmes in Uganda run by UNHCR and UNESCO (Nicolai, 2009). Massacre, peace and settlement, good governance, Human rights, gender matters and the environment are all covered in programmes in Uganda run by UNHCR and UNESCO (Nicolai, 2009). Massacre, peace and settlement, good governance, Human rights, gender matters and the environment are all covered in programmes in Uganda run by UNHCR and UNESCO (Nicolai, 2009). Massacre, peace and settlement, good governance, Human rights, gender matters and the environment are all covered in programmes in Uganda run by UNHCR and UNESCO (Nicolai, 2009). Massacre, peace and settlement, good governance, Human rights, gender matters and the environment are all covered in programmes in Uganda run by UNHCR and UNESCO (Nicolai, 2009). Massacre, peace and settlement, good governance, Human rights, gender matters and the environment are all covered in programmes in Uganda run by UNHCR and UNESCO (Nicolai, 2009).

As currently Pakistan has many regional and international challenges in its economic, linguistics, caste and political variances in the class of the people with in the region. Therefore, to improve these challenges faced by the country education is the only way to mobilize the society through civilized norms and values. As the geographical location of Pakistan in regional as well as international development has a significant role, but due to long conflict in bordering country such as Afghanistan and India the country should overcome on these conflicts (Murithi, 2009). However, the dynamic types of conflicts, such as extremism, sectarian violence, racial issues, domestic violence and ethical conflicts are prevailing in Pakistan (Ahmed, 2011). As currently Pakistan has more than 190 million populations in which 63% comprises of youth, has effect of conflict. However, 32% of the youth has no job opportunities and are illiterate (World Bank Statistics, 2014). Thus, the ignorant adolescence is an easy target for radicalization. However, increasing population of young people in developing countries leads to conflict and violence (Fuller, 1995). As Pakistan 1947 affianced in sectarian and religious conflicts. Therefore, the youth is brainwashed to participate in terror activities as they can easily be trapped. Thus, to transform the negative side of the youth into positive activities. Peace education can play a vital role in building sustainable peace and establishment of essential skills in life. The main objectives of the study are articulated as under: To know the opinions of academic professionals, field experts and students about the role of peace education in building sustainable peace. To analyze feasibility of peace education at primary, secondary and higher level of education with the help of analytic hierarchy process.

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This section presents the methodology adopted to provide the basic grounds for discussion and analysis and to facilitate in meeting the objectives of the research. It was intended to help paint a picture on the perception of academic professionals, field experts and students about willingness to inculcate peace education in which of the three levels of formal education system and get to know regarding their opinions about the role peace education could play towards conflict transformation. This section of study will highlight the design and method applied in studying the research objectives. In line with the objectives of the study, to get the worthy opinions of experts and academic professionals, and to analyze these opinions quantitatively, AHP has been incorporated. As it is
District Manshehra is located in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. In 2017 its population has reached to 1.55 million. However, male population is based on 0.772 million and female population is based on 0.784 million. Thus, on average annual population growth of the district is 2.47 from 1998 to 2017 (Population Census, 2017). Study area is comprised of the selected Institutes and NGO’s operating in Manshehra, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. To know the views of the experts, sample of 10 respondents purposively selected from different Institutes and NGO’s in the district.

2.1. Sample Size and Sampling Technique

10 respondents were selected, which includes 5 academic professional’s/field experts and 5 students expressively and not arbitrarily based on profound relevant acquaintance and experience in study area. Then, confirmed the factors which remained significant as far as peace education is concerned, from the view point of teacher’s/field experts and students. Finally, pairwise comparison of all significant factors was developed and comparisons were made with respect to each alternate by building (AHP) model (Saaty, 1980). Purposive sampling technique has been utilized be to opt respondents for the said task. Purposive sampling is appropriate when the key informants have relevant information or ability required in the study. For primary data collection, a pairwise comparative questionnaire is designed. The questionnaire consists of comparative questions to get to know about opinions of academic professionals and intellectuals on a quantitative scale developed by Saaty. The study relied on secondary data from books, articles, journals, newspapers, research papers and conference papers. This also includes published material from different sources such as reports published by government and NGO’s. Studies on the topic being discussed were also referred across the globe. The responses of partakers had construed quantitatively using pairwise comparative questionnaire. Quantitative data obtained from respondents by pairwise questionnaire was analyzed using AHP (Analytic hierarchy Process). AHP is used by most of the researchers, organizations and institutions to take decisions. It’s a decision-making framework on some basis or criteria. To get the significance of each criteria (Knowledge/skills, Norms/Values, Approaches/standards to Peace Education), alternative preferences (Primary education/secondary education and higher education) and priorities for other factors (including traits of peace education, course preferences) from teachers and students point of view by using AHP.

2.2. Theoretical Structure of the Study

An assumed state was shaped for the nominated respondents (teacher’s/field experts and students) as they remained tangled in diverse sorts of educational activities. So, AHP method is implemented to identify the importance of each attribute with in the substitute. At that point, each hypothetical decision is weighted by Tones approach in AHP. Then decisions were enclosed and data was placed in matrix set for additional scheming. This technique was assumed for each respondent. An all-inclusive questionnaire (MS Excel) was devised to gather the information linked to the significant elements having inordinate effect on the goal. Saaty’s pair-wise scale for evaluation from 1 to 9 in AHP (Table 1) is used to check out the significant decision weights of teachers and students and to get data for input matrix. And each alternative towards individually designated factor with in (Primary education/Secondary education/Higher Education). The schedule for interview was accordingly pre-tested on 1st March 2018 to 5th March 2018 in the field.

In our research work, we discussed peace education and its multiple criteria while considering primary, secondary and higher education as alternatives. Peace education is getting attention in Pakistan due to recent conflicted scenarios faced by Pakistan, specifically in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. Thus, the selected research area belongs to Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, methods of delivering peace education may vary in terms of higher ranks/importance given to Knowledge/skills, Norms and Values, approaches/Standards to Peace education but all the above-mentioned factors somehow contribute to strengthen the goal of inculcating peace education in the national education curriculum. This research work employs the AHP in order to evaluate through Multi Criteria Decision Making (MCMD) technique, its hypothetical condition with every decision maker in (Academic professional/field expert and students). AHP as a tool or method has been practical in education sector for many reasons (Grandzol, 2005).

2.2.1. Consistency index

Consistency index is the index of the consistency of judgements across all pairwise comparisons (Alonso and Lamata, 2006).

2.2.2. Random index

RI is the average CI of 500 randomly filled in matrices Saaty (2012).

| N | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9  | 10 |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| RI| 0.58 | 0.9 | 1.12 | 1.24 | 1.32 | 1.41 | 1.45 | 1.49 |

Source: (Saaty, 2012)

| Factors/Criteria | Definition |
|------------------|------------|
| Knowledge/ Skills | Skills reflect serious scrutiny, ability to make choices and opt for the best, thoughts, communication skills, kindness, team building. |
| Approaches/ Standards | Knowledge in this regard is related to awareness about the concept of peace, conflict and violence, choices available for non-violence: demilitarization, resolving conflicts, deterrence, Human rights, harmony, democratization, and justice based development or fairness. |
| Values/Norms | Respect for everyone, equality, non-violence, consideration, universal and conservational concern, honesty and endurance, impartiality, communal accountability and positive image. |

Source: Author’s own theoretical explanations, 2018
2.2.3. Consistency ratio
As proposed by Saaty: Consistency Ratio is comparison between Consistency Index and Random Index. CR= CI/RI. If the value of consistency ratio is smaller or equal to 10%, the changeability is tolerable. If uniformity ratio is bigger than 10%, subjective judgement is needed to be revised.

2.2.4. Lambda max
\( \lambda_{\text{max}} \) is the highest eigenvalue of the matrix to calculate unique measures for each judgement scale (Tables 2-4).

3. DISCUSSION AND RESULTS

To analyze the role of peace education in building sustainable peace and development and to identify feasibility of peace education among primary, secondary and higher levels of education using analytic hierarchy process below mentioned steps were followed. 
1. The decision is broken down into different levels, namely: goals, criteria and alternatives.
2. Priorities are derived for level 2, i.e.; criteria.
3. Preferences for alternatives choices are derived.
4. Finally, overall priorities are derived and this step is termed as Model Synthesis.
5. Based on synthesis outcome, final decision can be made.

The 1st level in this model is goal as shown in Figure 1. The 2nd level is instituted by defined criteria. This study has mentioned three criteria: Knowledge/Skills, Approaches/Standards to Peace education, and Norms and Values to peace education. The final level comprises existing choices. In this study, our alternatives include primary education, secondary education, and higher level of education. In the next step, relative priorities were derived for the defined criteria. In this case, a student may give more importance to knowledge/skills than norms and values, whereas academic professional or field experts may give more significance to norms and values than other factors. To perform the pairwise comparison, a comparison matrix of the criteria involved in the decision was created as shown in Table 5.

3.1. Results and Discussion w.r.t Opinions of Academic Professionals/Field Experts
Matrix 3.1 shows that the judgment of academic professionals/field experts for each substitute w.r.t criteria. In case of KVA, the leading weights were Norms/Values 65.5%, Knowledge and Skills 18.7% and Approaches and Standards 15.8% respectively. However, it was observed during visits to the respective institutes and NGO that the academic professionals and field experts have some power in the designing approaches and standards to achieve better outcome in implementation of peace education. The importance of human knowledge and skills is still the main source of enriching curriculum contents towards inbuilt tolerance, empathy and positive behaviors in early age children.

It was also observed that there is acute shortage of trained faculty/teachers in the respective area, i.e.; peace education. Interviews with the head of institutes revealed that there is a dire need to conduct such training sessions by the Ministry of Education, international bodies working in the area like UNESCO, UNICEF and ICRD (International Centre for Religion and Diplomacy) to bring about most pressing change in the field of education for a society that would be highly capable of tolerating, resisting and diverting the negative conflicted energies into positive ones. Therefore, the Head of Institutes want efficient workforce mindful of the notion of peace education and its approaches.

Table 2: Comparative input matrix w.r.t factors/criteria

| Comparative matrix | Knowledge/ Skills | Approaches/ Standards to P. E | Values |
|--------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|--------|
| Knowledge/Skills   | 1                |                             |        |
| App/Standards to PE| 1                |                             |        |
| Norms/Values       | sum              |                             |        |

Source: Author’s own survey, 2018

Table 3: Pairwise comparisons of scale and its relative importance (Saaty’s 1–9 scale)

| Numeric | Scaling in verbal form |
|---------|------------------------|
| 1       | Two factors contribute equally to the objective |
| 3       | Experience and judgement slightly favor |
| 5       | Experience and judgement strongly favor |
| 7       | Activity is favored very strong over another |
| 9       | Importance of one activity over another |
| 2, 4, 6, 8 | Intermediate values when compromise is needed |

Source: Saaty, 2008

Table 4: Demographics of respondents

| Classification | Total number of respondents | Field experts/academic professionals (Mean) | Students (Mean) |
|----------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Institutes/Org’s | Number of experts | Number of students | Age (years) | Edu (years) | Age (years) | Edu (years) |
| CUI, Attd Campus   | 1.000 | 5.000 | 36.000 | 21.000 | 27.000 | 18.000 |
| Punjab College     | 1.000 | 0.000 | 45.000 | 15.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Peace College      | 1.000 | 0.000 | 48.000 | 18.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Hazara University  | 1.000 | 0.000 | 50.000 | 16.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| SRSP              | 1.000 | 0.000 | 52.000 | 16.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Total             | 5.000 | 5.000 | 46.2 | 17.000 | 27.000 | 18.000 |

Source: Author’s own Survey, 2018

Figure 1: A hierarchical representation of Goal, Criteria and alternatives W.r.t both Teachers and Students

Source: Author’s own survey, 2018
The compound score specifies the concluding decisions of respondents for their knowledge/skills application by peace education implementation. Numeric value of the cells reflects relative preferences in each of the compared pairs. In this study, Teacher 1 consider that norms and values have moderately more importance than knowledge/skills, as shown by the intersection of the knowledge/skills-norms/values comparison matrix in Table 5. For that reason, the opposing comparison yield the reciprocal of this value. (Knowledge and skills/Norms and values=1/3) as shown in Table 5. By comparing the criteria with itself, knowledge and skills versus knowledge and skills; the resultant value is 1 which shows that these are equally significant according to the scale developed by Saaty, as shown in the Table 3.

For calculation of overall priorities, the approximate method is applied in the approximate method, comparison matrix is normalized by adding values in each column and then dividing each cell by the total of the column. The results in Table 5 indicates that academic professional/teacher 1 gives more importance to norms and values criterion (65.5%) followed by knowledge and skills (18.6%). The approaches and standards factor has a minimum weight 15.7%.

### Table 5: AHP matrix result for academic professionals/field experts

| Criteria | K/S | App/St | N/V | Priority weights | \( \lambda_{max} \) | CI | RI | CR |
|----------|-----|--------|-----|-----------------|-----------------|---|----|----|
| K/S      | 1.000 | 1.000  | 0.333 | 0.187           | 3.043           | 0.043 | 0.580 | 0.037 |
| App/St   | 1.000 | 1.000  | 0.200 | 0.158           | 0.118           | 0.022 |     |     |
| N/V      | 3.000 | 5.000  | 1.000 | 0.655           | 1.000           |     |     |     |
| Sum      | 5.000 | 7.000  | 1.533 | 1.000           | 1.000           |     |     |     |

### Table 5: AHP matrix result for academic professionals/field experts 2

| Criteria | K/S | App/St | N/V | Priority weights | \( \lambda_{max} \) | CI | RI | CR |
|----------|-----|--------|-----|-----------------|-----------------|---|----|----|
| K/S      | 1.000 | 0.333  | 5.000 | 0.283           | 3.097           | 0.097 | 0.580 | 0.084 |
| App/St   | 3.000 | 1.000  | 7.000 | 0.643           | 1.000           |     |     |     |
| N/V      | 0.200 | 0.143  | 1.000 | 0.074           | 1.000           |     |     |     |
| Sum      | 4.200 | 1.476  | 13.000| 1.000           | 1.000           |     |     |     |

### Table 5: AHP matrix result for academic professionals/field experts 3

| Criteria | K/S | App/St | N/V | Priority weights | \( \lambda_{max} \) | CI | RI | CR |
|----------|-----|--------|-----|-----------------|-----------------|---|----|----|
| K/S      | 1.000 | 3.000  | 3.000 | 0.632           | 3.086           | 0.086 | 0.580 | 0.074 |
| App/St   | 0.333 | 1.000  | 5.000 | 0.266           | 1.000           |     |     |     |
| N/V      | 0.333 | 0.200  | 1.000 | 0.102           | 1.000           |     |     |     |
| Sum      | 1.667 | 4.200  | 9.000 | 1.000           | 1.000           |     |     |     |

### Table 5: AHP matrix result for academic professionals/field experts 4

| Criteria | K/S | App/St | N/V | Priority weights | \( \lambda_{max} \) | CI | RI | CR |
|----------|-----|--------|-----|-----------------|-----------------|---|----|----|
| K/S      | 1.000 | 3.000  | 0.200 | 0.193           | 3.112           | 0.111 | 0.580 | 0.096 |
| App/St   | 0.333 | 1.000  | 0.143 | 0.083           | 1.000           |     |     |     |
| N/V      | 5.000 | 7.000  | 1.000 | 0.724           | 1.000           |     |     |     |
| Sum      | 6.333 | 11.000 | 1.343 | 1.000           | 1.000           |     |     |     |

### Table 5: AHP matrix result for academic professionals/field experts 5

| Criteria | K/S | App/St | N/V | Priority weights | \( \lambda_{max} \) | CI | RI | CR |
|----------|-----|--------|-----|-----------------|-----------------|---|----|----|
| K/S      | 1.000 | 1.000  | 3.000 | 0.405           | 3.036           | 0.036 | 0.580 | 0.031 |
| App/St   | 1.000 | 1.000  | 5.000 | 0.480           | 1.000           |     |     |     |
| N/V      | 0.333 | 0.200  | 1.000 | 0.115           | 1.000           |     |     |     |
| Sum      | 2.333 | 2.200  | 9.000 | 1.000           | 1.000           |     |     |     |

Source: Author’s own calculations, 2018

The compound score specifies the concluding decisions of respondents for their knowledge/skills application by peace education implementation.
3.2. Matrices for the Teacher’s Response

**Teacher 1**

Overall = 0.186 × 0.367 + 0.158 × 0.078 + 0.655 × 0.097

| Criteria | Primary Education | Secondary Education | Higher Education |
|----------|------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
|          | 0.515            | 0.144               | 0.332           |

**Teacher 2**

Overall = 0.283 × 0.367 + 0.144 × 0.078 + 0.332 × 0.078

| Criteria | Primary Education | Secondary Education | Higher Education |
|----------|------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
|          | 0.514            | 0.159               | 0.326           |

**Teacher 3**

Overall = 0.632 × 0.474 + 0.266 × 0.443 + 0.655 × 0.078

| Criteria | Primary Education | Secondary Education | Higher Education |
|----------|------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
|          | 0.487            | 0.452               | 0.123           |

**Teacher 4**

Overall = 0.193 × 0.065 + 0.083 × 0.474 + 0.724 × 0.367

| Criteria | Primary Education | Secondary Education | Higher Education |
|----------|------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
|          | 0.574            | 0.571               | 0.325           |

**Teacher 5**

Overall = 0.405 × 0.072 + 0.480 × 0.61 + 0.115 × 0.114

| Criteria | Primary Education | Secondary Education | Higher Education |
|----------|------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
|          | 0.649            | 0.426               | 0.239           |

3.3. Results and Discussion w.r.t Opinions of Students

The weights of alternatives clarify the student’s preferences for each factor in the resulting set. In case of KVA, the leading features weights were approaches and standards 75.03%, knowledge and skills 19% and norms/values 6% respectively as shown in Table 7. The important weights were 48% for primary education level, 38% secondary education and 14% weightage is given to higher education level by student 1 in the pairwise comparison.
Table 6: Overall priorities (%)

| Alternatives           | Teacher-1 | Teacher-2 | Teacher-3 | Teacher-4 | Teacher-5 |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Primary Education      | 52.20     | 51.30     | 45.20     | 57.10     | 42.60     |
| Secondary Education    | 14.40     | 15.90     | 42.50     | 31.70     | 33.50     |
| Higher Education       | 33.20     | 32.60     | 12.30     | 33.50     | 23.90     |

Criteria | Teacher-1 | Teacher-2 | Teacher-3 | Teacher-4 | Teacher-5 |
K/S       | 0.187      | 0.283      | 0.632      | 0.193      | 0.405      |
App/St    | 0.158      | 0.643      | 0.266      | 0.083      | 0.480      |
N/V       | 0.655      | 0.074      | 0.102      | 0.724      | 0.115      |

Source: Author’s own Calculations, 2018

Table 7: AHP matrix result for students

Level 1: Paired comparison matrix w.r.t goal

| Criteria | Student-1 | Student-2 | Student-3 | Student-4 | Student-5 |
|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| K/S      | 1.000     | 1.000     | 9.000     | 0.190     | 3.000     |
| App/St   | 3.000     | 1.000     | 5.000     | 0.678     | 0.046     |
| N/V      | 0.143     | 0.200     | 1.000     | 0.074     | 0.081     |
| Sum      | 4.143     | 1.476     | 13.000    | 1.000     | 1.000     |

Factor priority weights and CI for Student 1

| Criteria | K/S | App/St | N/V | Priority weights | λmax | CI | RI | CR |
|----------|-----|--------|-----|------------------|------|----|----|----|
| K/S      | 1.000 | 0.333 | 5.000 | 0.283            | 3.097 | 0.097 | 0.580 | 0.049 |
| App/St   | 3.000 | 1.000 | 7.000 | 0.643            | 0.083 | 0.018 | 0.560 | 0.096 |
| N/V      | 0.200 | 0.143 | 1.000 | 0.074            | 0.724 | 0.115 | 0.580 | 0.096 |
| Sum      | 4.200 | 1.476 | 13.000| 1.000            | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

Factor priority weights and CI for Student 2

| Criteria | K/S | App/St | N/V | Priority weights | λmax | CI | RI | CR |
|----------|-----|--------|-----|------------------|------|----|----|----|
| K/S      | 1.000 | 0.333 | 5.000 | 0.283            | 3.097 | 0.097 | 0.580 | 0.084 |
| App/St   | 3.000 | 1.000 | 7.000 | 0.643            | 0.083 | 0.018 | 0.560 | 0.096 |
| N/V      | 0.200 | 0.143 | 1.000 | 0.074            | 0.724 | 0.115 | 0.580 | 0.096 |
| Sum      | 4.200 | 1.476 | 13.000| 1.000            | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

Factor priority weights and CI for Student 3

| Criteria | K/S | App/St | N/V | Priority weights | λmax | CI | RI | CR |
|----------|-----|--------|-----|------------------|------|----|----|----|
| K/S      | 1.000 | 0.333 | 5.000 | 0.283            | 3.112 | 0.111 | 0.580 | 0.096 |
| App/St   | 3.000 | 1.000 | 0.143 | 0.083            | 0.056 | 0.018 | 0.560 | 0.096 |
| N/V      | 5.000 | 7.000 | 1.000 | 0.724            | 0.115 | 0.018 | 0.560 | 0.096 |
| Sum      | 6.333 | 11.000| 13.000| 1.000            | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

Factor priority weights and CI for Student 4

| Criteria | K/S | App/St | N/V | Priority weights | λmax | CI | RI | CR |
|----------|-----|--------|-----|------------------|------|----|----|----|
| K/S      | 1.000 | 0.333 | 5.000 | 0.283            | 3.112 | 0.111 | 0.580 | 0.096 |
| App/St   | 3.000 | 1.000 | 0.143 | 0.083            | 0.056 | 0.018 | 0.560 | 0.096 |
| N/V      | 5.000 | 7.000 | 1.000 | 0.724            | 0.115 | 0.018 | 0.560 | 0.096 |
| Sum      | 6.333 | 11.000| 13.000| 1.000            | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

Factor priority weights and CI for Student 5

| Criteria | K/S | App/St | N/V | Priority weights | λmax | CI | RI | CR |
|----------|-----|--------|-----|------------------|------|----|----|----|
| K/S      | 1.000 | 0.333 | 5.000 | 0.283            | 3.112 | 0.111 | 0.580 | 0.096 |
| App/St   | 3.000 | 1.000 | 0.143 | 0.083            | 0.056 | 0.018 | 0.560 | 0.096 |
| N/V      | 5.000 | 7.000 | 1.000 | 0.724            | 0.115 | 0.018 | 0.560 | 0.096 |
| Sum      | 6.333 | 11.000| 13.000| 1.000            | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

Source: Author’s own Calculations, 2018

Table 8: Overall priorities (%)

| Alternatives           | Student-1 | Student-2 | Student-3 | Student-4 | Student-5 |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Primary Education      | 47.80     | 49.060    | 24.300    | 47.300    | 37.300    |
| Secondary Education    | 38.300    | 12.600    | 65.100    | 36.500    | 56.400    |
| Higher education       | 13.900    | 38.300    | 10.500    | 16.200    | 6.210     |

Criteria | Student-1 | Student-2 | Student-3 | Student-4 | Student-5 |
K/S       | 0.190      | 0.241      | 0.283      | 0.193      | 0.405      |
App/St    | 0.750      | 0.678      | 0.643      | 0.083      | 0.480      |
N/V       | 0.060      | 0.081      | 0.074      | 0.724      | 0.115      |

Source: Author’s own Calculations, 2018

with in the factors (as shown in Table 8). The cumulative score shows final judgment of the students for proper implementation of peace curriculum through trained human resource in the specific area.

Table 7 demonstrates the factors comparison input matrices, priority weights, principle Eigen value and consistency indexes of 5 student’s judgments. Table 8 indicates, in case of student 2, the dominant priority weights were 49% for primary education.
level, 38% secondary education, followed by 12.6% for higher education level. The calculated priority weights for student 3 was 65% for secondary education level. In case of Student 4, the dominant alternative proved to be primary education level with 47% weightage among all. For Student 5, the priority weights were 37% primary education, 56% secondary education and 6.0% weightage given to higher education level in terms of feasibility considered for peace education to be incorporated in the curriculum.

3.4. Matrices for the Student’s Response

Student 1

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
0.481 & 0.474 & 0.515 \\
0.405 & 0.053 & 0.388 \\
\end{array}
\]

Overall = 0.190 × 0.114 + 0.750 × 0.474 + 0.060 × 0.097

Primary Education = 0.477
Secondary Education = 0.383
Higher Education = 0.139

Student 2

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
0.487 & 0.481 & 0.582 \\
0.435 & 0.405 & 0.051 \\
\end{array}
\]

Overall = 0.241 × 0.078 + 0.678 × 0.114 + 0.081 × 0.367

Primary Education = 0.490
Secondary Education = 0.126
Higher Education = 0.384

Student 3

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
0.387 & 0.188 & 0.178 \\
0.169 & 0.081 & 0.070 \\
\end{array}
\]

Overall = 0.283 × 0.443 + 0.643 × 0.731 + 0.074 × 0.751

Primary Education = 0.243
Secondary Education = 0.651
Higher Education = 0.105

Student 4

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
0.452 & 0.515 & 0.474 \\
0.476 & 0.388 & 0.053 \\
\end{array}
\]

Overall = 0.193 × 0.072 + 0.083 × 0.097 + 0.724 × 0.474

Primary Education = 0.473
Secondary Education = 0.365
Higher Education = 0.162

Student 5

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
0.178 & 0.582 & 0.188 \\
0.070 & 0.051 & 0.081 \\
\end{array}
\]

Overall = 0.405 × 0.751 + 0.480 × 0.367 + 0.115 × 0.731

Primary Education = 0.373
Secondary Education = 0.564
Higher Education = 0.062

Source: Author’s own analysis 2018

Alternative 1 has the most dominant priority weights as shown in the Table 8. Primary education is on top of the list with 48.7%, higher education 43.5%, and secondary education 7.8% respectively. Overall priority of alternative 1 is attained by adding these values/results along the row. Given the weight of each criteria (knowledge/skills, approaches/standards, and norms/values), primary education is preferable (overall priority 52.2%) as compared to higher education 32.2% and secondary education 14.4% respectively.

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The AHP application, provided results of each relative factor or criteria with respect to each respondent as well as the overall weightage for these criteria’s given by each individual/respondent in our study. Thus, the dominant alternative for teachers that can play impressive role in peace education is the primary education level while the most dominant criteria having influence on peace education are norms/values, followed by approaches/standards and knowledge/skills with respect to teacher’s judgements. On the other hand, significant factor factors/criteria for student’s choice with respect to peace education is approaches and standards. Students also prefer primary education level as the most effective stage for children to learn/catch peace education skills and adopt peace values. The impacting factors-like; knowledge/skills, approaches/standards and norms/values- contributes to decision making in inculcation of peace education and peace building in general and for the role peace education can play in conflict transformation.

It is suggested to researchers who are willing to extend their work in the area undertaken here, it is recommended to conduct AHP/any other research tool to collect and analyze data from informal education sector about inculcation of peace education and to know about the potential role of peace education in informal education sector as well. It is highly recommended to analyze contents of the national educational curriculum for courses such as Islamic studies/Pakistan studies which are under doubt about having elements that can be a source of adding fuel to aggravate violent behavior in the immature ages. It is suggested to whom willing to extend research in the area to have a meeting with the Ministry of education, Pakistan to discuss about the shortfalls of current education system, prevailing curriculum for Grades-IX-XII, strengths of Peace education, and strategies for Peace education to be incorporated in the national educational curriculum.
Data to be collected with the help of National and international bodies working over Peace education. It is recommended to opt Research area where these national and international bodies are extending their relevant project to get maximum input from the field. It is recommended for media to highlight the progress of institutes and organizations which are working over Peace education to get the attention of most of the public. It is suggested to Government of Pakistan to conduct frequent trainings, workshops, and seminars for teachers to train them regarding Peace education. Besides this, Govt. must take serious action to develop same curriculum for both Govt. and Private schools, as different type of schooling is widening the social divide, consequently, the most ignored could turn to be a source of violent conflicts.
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