

## Thought of War and Literacy of Peace: A Comparison between US and Turkey

Ali Altıkulaç\*

Faculty of Education, Çukurova University, Sarıçam, Adana, Turkey

Corresponding author: Ali Altıkulaç, E-mail: aaltikulac@yahoo.com

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history

Received: January 17, 2023

Accepted: April 09, 2024

Published: April 30, 2024

Volume: 12 Issue: 2

Conflicts of interest: None

Funding: The research is financed by TÜBİTAK (The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Türkiye)

### ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this research is to comparatively examine the views of social studies teacher candidates in Turkey and the USA towards war and peace, and to reveal the similarities and differences. In parallel with the increasing violence and wars in the world, literacy of peace has become a concept that attracts more and more attention. Each country includes war and peace issues in its curriculum in different ways. Literacy of peace has become one of the basic elements of citizenship education in democratic societies. Social studies is one of the most powerful components of citizenship education. In the social studies course, while trying to raise patriotic individuals by teaching about the wars of the past, they are also trying to raise democratic citizens who have gained peace awareness. The research is a descriptive study in which quantitative and qualitative research methods are used together. As a quantitative data collection tool, The Attitude Inventory Regarding Peace and War developed by Bizumic et al., was used. Moral dilemma stories were used as a qualitative data collection tool. Qualitative and quantitative analysis techniques were applied together to transform the obtained data sets into findings. Working group of the research is 60 teacher candidates in total, 30+30 each studying at state universities in Türkiye and the USA. Descriptive analysis method was used to analyze the data. A comparative analysis of participants' perspectives on war and peace can give us an idea about how war and peace can be included in the teaching process. According to the results of the research, it was seen that the attitudes towards peace of the participants from both countries were high and when compared, the attitudes of the participants from the USA towards peace were higher than the participants from Turkey. The findings of the qualitative analysis also support this conclusion.

**Key words:** Peace, Literacy, War, Education, Comparison

### INTRODUCTION

"Peace is not an absence of war, it is a virtue, a state of mind, a disposition for benevolence, confidence, justice."

B. Spinoza

In parallel with the increasing violence and wars in the world, peace has become an increasingly popular and valuable concept. Nowadays, it is seen that there is an increase in the amount of negative behaviors such as tendency to violence, wars, conflicts and intolerance at national and international levels. Especially recent developments have shown the whole world that it is only a matter of time before the war begins. Education emerges as the most effective tool in eliminating the possibility of war and maintaining peace. Peace education arose from the aim of preventing war (Hakvoort, 2010). Peace education aims to create a more optimistic world (Haas, 1986). Peace education is very important in terms of ensuring tolerance, understanding, respect and avoiding war (Souza, Sperb & McCarthy, 2006). In this respect, educational institutions play one of the most important roles in ensuring social change, creating equality, justice, tolerance,

empathy and democracy among individuals and developing a culture of peace. Throughout the twentieth century and until today, peace education has been included in different countries and different education systems of the world (Aspeslagh and Burns, 1996; Hermon, 1988; Bar-Tal, 2001). When peace education programs in different countries are examined, it is seen that they differ significantly in terms of ideology, goals, emphasis, curriculum, content and practices (Bjerstedt, 1988; Haavelsrud, 1974; Wulf, 1974). For example, peace education in Australia focuses on combating ethnocentrism, cultural chauvinism and violence, as well as promoting cultural diversity, nuclear disarmament and conflict resolution (Burns, 1985; Lawson and Hutchinson, 1992). In Japan, peace education often targets issues such as nuclear disarmament, militarism, and the nature of responsibility for past acts of violence (Murakami, 1992). In South America, peace education engages with structural violence, human rights, and economic inequality (Garcia, 1984; Rivera, 1978). In the United States, peace education often deals with prejudice, violence, and environmental issues (Harris, 1996; Stomfay-Stitz, 1993).

Before discussing the content of war and peace education, it is necessary to define what these concepts are. Peace, in its classical definition, can be expressed as the absence of war and/or the absence of any form of organized physical violence. The concept of peace, included in scientific definitions, appears as negative and positive peace. According to Galtung's distinction, which is still valid today, peace not only means the absence of war and direct violence (the negative definition of peace), but should also be understood as the reduction of structural violence and the production of social justice (the positive definition of peace). According to this understanding of peace, education should not only address war and direct violence between nations and ethnic groups, but also address the underlying conditions of violence in society (Galtung 1973; Wulf, 2013). The definition made by Johnson and Johnson (2005) suggests that peace has two dimensions: "imposed peace" and "consensual" peace. Under imposed peace, those in power use their existing economic or military power to establish peace by forcing the weak group to comply with the rules; Reconciliatory peace is defined as ending violence and hostility and reaching a consensus in harmony in line with common goals. War, according to the definition of Von Clausewitz (2008), is nothing more than a very extended duel. It would be more useful if we visualize two people dueling instead of thinking of a union consisting of many individual duelists. Each of them tries to impose his will on the other with his physical force: his first aim is to defeat the enemy and thus put him in a situation where he will not be able to offer any resistance afterwards. War, then, is an act of using force to force the enemy to accept our will. Violence may be military or it may manifest itself as verbal, emotional, physical and sexual violence. The abuse of state power to subjugate the people, the oppression of personal/social freedoms, and ultimately the violence that occurs in the event of war will have large-scale harmful effects (Yemenici, 2016).

Despite the positive developments of the past centuries, a large part of human life is still determined by the direct and structural forms of violence that shape European society today. This culture of violence constantly takes hold in human interaction and is perpetuated by the images of violence that constantly appear before us in our daily lives. As a result of repeated exposure to these images, the paradigm of violence becomes stronger and pushes people to think that there is no alternative to this approach. This paradigm makes war or violence a normal tool to manage conflicts within society and between states (Ascenso et al., 2014). According to Betty Reardon (1981), militarism (war system) is a belief system that arises from a worldview based on the natural assumption that humans are by nature violent, aggressive and competitive, and that social order must be maintained by force. According to this worldview, authority has the right to use force to achieve social control and control human behavior. The peace paradigm designed by Reardon is the transformative reaction against the war paradigm. The peace paradigm consists of an interconnected network of values and understandings that promote the universal realization of human dignity, including human rights and security. This

integral network is seen by Reardon as fundamental to the development of a worldview necessary for the transformation of a social system prone to violence and injustice, the full realization of human dignity, and a worldview that fosters just peace (Snauwaert, 2019). So, is it really possible to achieve peace? Or is war an inevitable fate that continues to befall humanity? Don't our history class and the evening news teach us that war has always been around the world and is still with us? Trying to create a culture of peace and find peaceful solutions to conflicts... This is all well and good: but what if others don't want to agree? If the underlying causes of war are not investigated, it does not seem possible to eliminate war from the lives of humanity. However, once the cause of a disease is discovered, a focused and effective method can be found to combat it (Matthews, 2002).

It is seen that in democratic societies, citizens' opinions play a very important role in making decisions on war and peace issues (Doyle, 1997). In these societies, the purpose of teaching democratic values is to ensure that citizens gain democratic awareness and live together in peace. In the curricula of these countries, on the one hand, patriotism, national consciousness and wars are taught, while on the other hand, they try to teach respect for cultural differences, human rights and peace. Research shows that although most children have concrete ideas about what war is, peace as a concept is often unclear to children, and peace is simply seen as the opposite of war. Additionally, peace is often thought of as weak, passive, dull, and boring. Most students have little knowledge of peacemaking processes and often express little hope for lasting peace (Matthews, 2002).

Peace education or peace teaching takes place in out-of-school, non-formal and formal education environments as an important part of lifelong learning. The challenge for peace education is the inability to adapt to contextual conditions that contribute to violence, as well as the inability to develop knowledge that supports alternatives to violence that may occur in out-of-school, non-formal and formal education settings. A state can impose restrictions on the content and form of peace education for formal and non-formal education, but it cannot control out-of-school education, where family, friends and daily life are influential (Cabezudo and Haavelsrud, 2013). UNICEF consultant Susan Fountain (Fountain, 1999) defines peace education as: "The process of promoting the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values required to bring about changes in behavior that enable children, youth and adults to prevent conflict and violence both explicitly and structurally." Moreover, peace education is about resolving conflict peacefully and creating conditions conducive to peace at the personal, interpersonal, intergroup, national or international level."

Johnson and Johnson (2006) state that an effective peace education program in schools consists of five steps. These steps are: (1) establishing a compulsory education system to hold together social diversity, (2) establishing interdependence as the foundation of a peaceful society and helping students develop the competencies and attitudes necessary for cooperation, (3) helping students when making some difficult decisions to teach students how to hold peaceful

conversations, (4) to teach students how to display peaceful attitudes, and (5) to convey citizenship values to students. Bar-Tal and Rosen (2009) propose two models for healthy peace education in schools: direct model and indirect model. The indirect model of peace education means helping individuals develop competencies such as creative thinking, tolerance, ethno-empathy, human rights and conflict resolution. The direct peace education model includes war and peace, the peace process, knowing the enemy, the history of war, and the emotions and effects of war, which are necessary for the creation of a peace environment and support the direct peace education model.

Because young people in the twenty-first century live in an interconnected and interdependent world, events abroad affect them both directly and indirectly. Therefore, to develop democratic awareness in students and provide practical citizenship skills, perhaps the goals of current citizenship education programs should include promoting a more sophisticated vision of citizenship beyond educating “good citizens.” Being a patriot does not simply mean that a citizen must support his or her government’s war policies. True patriotism requires citizens to do what they think is best for different nations and peoples. When necessary, patriotic citizens also exercise their right to dissent by participating in non-violent civil disobedience rallies (Ahmad, 2003). In order to move from a culture of war to a culture of peace, a culture of sharing based on principles such as freedom, justice, democracy, tolerance and solidarity should be created (Galtung, 1969; Harris, 2004). Harris and Morrison (2003) mention that in order to know what peace means, it is necessary to know the reason why war still prevails. This situation requires countries to reconsider their education programs in terms of peaceful conflict resolution, dialogue and conciliation elements. In addition, to increase ongoing economic and social development, especially to empower women, to take special measures for groups with special needs, to reduce inequality by ensuring social justice, to ensure democratic participation, to increase understanding, tolerance and solidarity in society, to free flow of information and supporting participatory communication are indispensable elements of peace culture (UNESCO, 2005).

The final, and indeed the most critical, component of democratic citizenship education is peace education. Peace education is identified as a vital component of the citizenship education curriculum that includes content knowledge and pedagogy that identify the roots of violence, teach skills for the peaceful resolution of conflicts, and inspire students that they can live peacefully with diverse individuals and communities everywhere (Ahmad, 2003). According to Biton and Salomon (2006), another goal of peace education is to prevent people’s feelings and perceptions from deteriorating on issues such as independence, equality, cooperation and harmony. Historically, “peace education” can be traced back to the London Peace Conference in 1843, where the importance of instilling “peace principles” in the minds of children was discussed. The pacifist movement grew alongside the public education movement in Europe and North America; its proponents discussed the role of education in rooting out prejudice, attitudes of hatred, and the ignorance

that led to war. As early as 1893, historians such as Jules Prudhommeaux criticized the dominance of history teaching by a textbook that glorified the state and memorized wars. In the early twentieth century, peace educators highlighted the issues of how to create a responsible history curriculum that reconciled patriotism with love for humanity, what historical events to present, and how to portray heroism and sacrifice (Grossi, 2000).

It can be said that peace education as an official subject first emerged in the Western world. However, this does not mean that peace education developed only in the West. It means that the field of mainstream peace education has developed on assumptions based on Western traditions (Reardon, 1997a). Today, in the USA, peace education is seen as a part of “democratic citizenship education”. Educators crafted this vision by drawing on the work of philosophers such as Kant (1957; 1795) and Tocqueville (1956), who praised forms of civil democracy in American life. Accordingly, people governed by a republic are more likely to oppose war than autocratic state rulers. The popular paradigm of civic education in the United States emphasizes imparting knowledge about the structure and functions of government; although it is important for students to have knowledge about the American Constitution and the basic organs of the state, this alone is not enough to raise them as thoughtful, caring and peace-loving citizens. For example, state-centered citizenship education programs represent a politically traditionalist worldview and have been deemed inadequate to meet students’ educational needs (APSA, 1996). Reardon (1988; 1997b), one of the leading experts on peace education in the United States, analyzed more than a hundred peace curricula used in the United States at the time, from preschool through high school. Through his analysis, he identified nine current areas that constitute key focuses of contemporary peace education curricula in the United States. These areas include conflict resolution, cooperation, nonviolence, multicultural understanding, human rights, social justice, world resources, and the global environment. All of these areas have a cognitive component as well as attitudinal and behavioral components. Since the early 2000s, peace education has been one of the areas with the most rapid reforms in the United States. Accordingly, in postmodern societies, peace educators should convey to students the skills necessary for healthy communication; Skills that will enable students to work collaboratively should be imparted to them by eliminating their prejudices (Shapiro, 2002).

The problem statement of the research was determined as follows: “How do the attitudes of social studies teacher candidates towards peace in Turkey and the USA differ?” and “What are the decision-making processes and justifications of social studies teacher candidates in Turkey and the USA regarding war and peace?”.

## METHOD

### Research Design

This study is a descriptive study in which quantitative and qualitative research techniques are used together. The

combined use of qualitative and quantitative research produces more precise and complete information regarding theory and practice (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2014). The reason for needing a quantitative data set in the research is to reveal the general thoughts of the participants on the subject and to create a basis for the main purpose of the research. The reason why qualitative data is needed is that it is appropriate to focus on and understand the opinions of participants in different countries on the subject. This will allow obtaining a holistic view of the research context and creating analysis and patterns within this context.

### Study Group

While determining the study group of the research, sampling that ensures comparability, one of the purposive sampling methods, is used. Purposive sampling can be defined as the process of selecting units (such as individuals, a group of individuals or institutions) based on certain purposes associated with the main problem of the research (Teddlie and Yu, 2007). The research is structured in two separate parts. The first part was held in Turkey in the 2021-2022 academic year, and the second part was held in the United States in the 2022- 2023 academic year. 60 teacher candidates were determined as the study group of the research. It was determined as 30 people each from the USA and Turkey on a voluntary basis. When the gender of the participants was examined, 16 women and 14 men from the USA, 14 women and 16 men from Turkey took part in the research. All participants are social studies teaching students studying at public universities in both countries.

### Data Collection Tools

In the research, the Attitudes towards Peace and War Inventory (Bizumic et al. 2013) was used as a quantitative data collection tool. This inventory was applied to participants in selected working groups from both countries. Attitude Inventory on Peace and War, Bizumic et al. (2013) is a nine-point Likert type scale created to measure individual's attitudes towards peace and war. According to Bizumic et al.'s analysis of the original scale, Cronbach's alpha for the attitude towards peace scale was reported as 0.83 and for the attitude towards war scale was reported as 0.90 (Bizumic et al., 2013). Turkish standardization of the scale was made by Güler (2014). In terms of the standardized form of the inventory to measure individual's attitudes towards peace and war in Turkish culture, Cronbach's alpha for the attitude towards peace scale was reported as 0.79 and Cronbach's alpha for the attitude towards war scale was reported as 0.85. The test-retest reliability coefficient for the Turkish form of the inventory was reported as 0.78 (Güler, 2014). Sample items from the Attitude Inventory Concerning Peace and War are as follows: "There is no reasonable justification for war.", "In general, I am not very worried about world peace.", "There are more important things in life than peace.", "War has also some benefits, although it is terrible..."

Moral dilemma stories were used when collecting qualitative data from the study groups. The reason why this is preferred is to reveal the real thoughts and value judgments

of prospective teachers, instead of asking them to make conceptual definitions about the concepts of war and peace. Themes related to moral dilemma stories were determined by the researcher in order to be compatible with the quantitative data collection tool. These are war and peace, terrorism, revenge, dictatorial ideological oppression, military domination, unethical political behavior as a means of maintaining power, ethnic hatred and vandalism. Three moral dilemma stories were used to administer to the participants. In preparing the stories, help was received from a Social Studies Education field expert and a language expert.

### Analysis of Data

In this research, the relationships between variables and attitude levels were examined comparatively. Qualitative and quantitative analysis techniques were applied together to transform data sets into findings. For quantitative data, t-test for independent samples and descriptive statistics were applied. Descriptive analysis was applied to analyze qualitative data. The findings obtained from the quantitative and qualitative data sets were interpreted comparatively in an integrated manner. Comparative research method can be defined as a research methodology in which various aspects of life or social sciences are examined across different cultures or countries. It is a qualitative approach or form of analysis in which researchers use different methods, such as case analysis, to highlight similarities and differences between communities or countries. The comparative research method combines theory or theoretical concepts with data collection (Given, 2008).

## FINDINGS

In this section, the analysis of the data collected from the participants from Turkey and the USA, who constitute the study group of the research, in order to test the research problem, and the comments regarding these analyzes are included. For the analysis of the first part of the main problem of the research, it was investigated whether there was a significant difference between the attitude levels of participants from Turkey and the USA towards war and peace. The test scores, standard deviation values and t-test results that the participants received from the attitude inventory towards war and peace are shown in Table 1.

According to Table 1, a statistically significant difference was detected between the attitude score averages towards peace of social studies teacher candidates from Turkey and the attitude score averages towards peace of social

**Table 1.** The t-test results for the attitude scores relating peace and war of the participants from Turkey and USA

Attitude	Groupn	tdf	p	MSD			
Peace	Turkey	30	2.77	0.95	36.43	29	000*
	USA	30	4.13	0.66			

\* $p < 0.05$

(A high average score from the scale indicates a positive attitude towards peace.)

studies teacher candidates from the USA in the study group [ $t(29) = 36.43; p < .000$ ]. While the average score of the participants in the US study group from the peace inventory was ( $M = 4.13$ ), this value was realized as ( $M = 2.77$ ) in the Turkish study group. Accordingly, it can be said that the teacher candidates from the USA in the study group are more prone to attitudes towards peace.

For the analysis of the second part of the main problem of the research, examples of the answers and justifications of participants from Turkey and the USA to moral dilemma stories were given comparatively. Moral dilemma stories used in data collection are given in the appendix. Moral dilemma stories used in the qualitative data collection phase are given below. Examples of participants' answers and reasons from the USA:

US15. (Story 1) "When considered, this situation could be a good opportunity for both countries. There should be no attack, there should be an agreement. Maybe friendship, not hostility, can emerge from this situation."

US21. (Story 2) "If it were me, I would not start producing this substance. However, I would not allow this substance to be used for weapons and its derivatives. Because science has no meaning unless it is for the benefit of humanity."

US30. (Story 3) "If it were me, I would never shoot. Nothing can be more important than the life of a child."

US14. (Story 2) "It would be selfish to only think about my own interests and my academic life. That's why I would never produce a substance that could be dangerous in the future."

US16. (Story 3) "If it were me, I would never shoot, I would tell the child to take his toy and leave. He is just a child and has no idea about the violence of war. There can be no explanation for shooting at a little child who is unaware of war."

US17. (Story 2) "If it were me, I would not put this substance on the market in order to guarantee the future of the world. Because if I, as an individual, live in society, I cannot act selfishly."

US8. (Story 3) "I would rather lose everything than shoot at a child. The greatest goal of the people of the world should be to live together in peace."

US3. (Story 1) "If it were me, I would not declare war on country X. Because war can never be the solution to a conflict."

US1. (Story 1) "I wouldn't attack. War, attack and occupation result in the death of people. Nothing can be more important than human life. Whatever the reason, once war and aggression begin, it continues for whatever reason. We can see many examples of this in the world."

US10. (Story 2) "Money and fame are not everything. If the substance it produces is so effective and harmful that it could change the world, I would stop producing it. I wouldn't want to contribute to anything that could endanger human lives."

Examples of participants' answers and reasons from Turkey:

TUR21. (Story 1) "If it were me, I would take revenge and capture the fertile lands of the other country. Because cruel countries must pay the price for their attacks. In this way, justice will be ensured."

TUR12. (Story 1) "If it were me, I would declare war to seize the fertile lands in country X. Because my people and my country are more important to me."

TUR23. (Story 2) "I think wars should not only result in death. I do not find gun production healthy. In other words, gains can also be achieved through other technological means."

TUR14. (Story 3) "I would probably have a moral conflict within myself not to shoot at Mary. If there was no one controlling me at that time, I would warn Mary to quickly go to her border again. "If there were other soldiers with me, I would try to persuade them too."

TUR25. (Story 1) "From a humanitarian standpoint, I could help. But when it comes to governing the state and expanding the borders, I would prefer it to expanding the borders of my country. The state and its interests are above all else."

TUR5. (Story 1) "If it were me, I would use the opportunity I had. I would provide the necessary aid to country X, but as a result of this aid, I would also obtain the resources necessary for the development of my own country from country."

TUR2. (Story 2) "Wealth or poverty? I can make this decision considering the situation of the world. If there is no real chaos in the world, I will choose to be rich."

TUR6. (Story 3) "If it were me, considering the training I received in the past and the situation I was in, I would shoot to another side as a warning, not to the side where the child is."

TUR11. (Story 1) "If it were me, I would not provide the necessary aid to country X. I used to think about what this enemy country did in the past, and that's why I couldn't stop my feeling of revenge."

When the answers given by participants from the USA and Turkey are examined comparatively, it is seen that the participants from the USA have a stronger level of rejection of war and are more willing to protect and maintain peace than the participants from Turkey. It can be said that this difference arises from the difference in the cultural environments in which the study groups participating in the research grew up and the education they received.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In terms of attitudes towards peace, a statistically significant difference was found between the attitude scores of participants from Turkey and the USA, in favor of the USA study group. This finding shows that the attitude of participants from the USA towards peace is more positive than the participants from Turkey. When the answers and justifications of the participants from the USA and Turkey to the moral dilemma stories are examined comparatively, it is seen that the participants from the USA have a stronger level of rejection of war and are more willing to protect and maintain the peace than the participants from Turkey. From this perspective, it can be seen that the quantitative data set and the

qualitative data set support each other. It can be said that this difference arises from the difference in the cultural environments in which the study groups participating in the research grew up. The education they receive and the cosmopolitical structure of the country may affect the participants' attitudes towards peace.

Recommendation on Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace and Education in Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (UNESCO, 1974), Declaration on Education for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy and the Integrated Framework for Action (UNESCO, 1995). The 1974 recommendations are as follows: Education at all levels should include a global perspective. Young people should be taught that, in addition to human rights, they have responsibilities towards people of other nations. Peace education should teach communication skills. It should ensure that young people can apply problem-solving skills on a regional, national and international scale. The 1995 recommendations went one step further and stated that the entire educational process should be handled with an international approach. He stated that young people should be taught about forms of conflict, their causes and effects, human rights and international standards, democracy and civil participation, decolonization and globalization, the United Nations and international organizations. Some of the results of Harding's (2010) research on children's and adults' thoughts about moral dilemmas are as follows: Decisions made regarding dilemmas may be based on the principle of justice, consideration, or individual interest. Decisions, at least when looking at their justifications, appear to vary depending on the age of the children, the development of their cognitive structures, and their ability to put their emotions, especially compassion, into action; It has been observed that the decision-making process has changed through education and that solving moral dilemmas has become more effective through education. Altıkulaç (2014) concluded that moral dilemmas are appropriate and effective course activities that can be used in the Social Studies course, as they allow students to question the rationales of the decisions they make and provide the opportunity to experience complex mental processes. The findings of this research have shown that moral dilemma stories can also be used as a teaching technique in conflict reduction, peace education, moral reasoning, deciding to go to war, and maintaining peace.

When we look at the studies on the concept of peace and peace education in Turkey, Bayram and Aslan (2008), Bedir and Demir (2008), Bedir and Arslan (2014), Demir (2011), Gazioğlu (2008), Kamaraj and Kerem (2008). 2006), Tapan (2006), Yemenici (2008), Akgül (2015), Aktaş and Safran (2013), Cihan (2014), Coşkun (2012), Öztaşkın (2014), Sağkal (2015). In general, these researches have been conducted on the literature review, the level of attitudes towards the concept of peace, program development studies on peace education and the effectiveness of the implemented programs. When all education levels are examined, it is seen that the course with the most intense content for teaching the concepts of war and peace is the social studies course. In the Social Studies curriculum being implemented, "war"

is included in the list of concepts to be directly taught, and "peace" is included in the list of values to be directly taught (MEB, 2018). The thoughts and practices of social studies teachers, who try to instill an understanding of democratic management and awareness of human rights and responsibility (MEB, 2008) and are models in this regard, significantly affect the students in the classroom. Although this study does not establish such a cause-effect relationship statistically, it is aimed to comparatively examine the teaching of war and peace through social studies in Turkey and the USA, within the context of teachers and curriculum, and the views of participants in both countries towards war and peace. The research, which is an original study in this sense, can be considered as a needs analysis that gives an idea about the current situation in peace education in the context of social studies teaching and reveal the needs in this regard. A comparative analysis of social studies teacher candidates' perspectives on war and peace in the context of peace education programs in both countries gives us an idea about how war and peace can be included in the teaching process without fostering militarism.

As a result, the wars that continue in the world even now and the inhumane practices that arise due to war clearly show us how important and valuable peace is. Ensuring that all nations in the world correctly understand the distinction between war and peace and choose peaceful means can only be achieved through education. Peace, which is a value that must be taught for a democratic society, can be transferred to students within the scope of citizenship and social studies courses. Lessons and activities that will promote peace and peaceful attitudes at every stage of the educational process should be introduced for students with a democratic and constructive approach.

## REFERENCES

- Ahmad, I. (2003). Education for Democratic Citizenship and Peace. U.S. Department of Education. Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) Doc. No: ED475576.
- Akgül, N. S. P. (2015). Barış Çalışmaları: Başlangıçtan Günümüze Değişimi. *Barış Araştırmaları ve Çatışma Çözümleri Dergisi*, 3(1), 85-106.
- Aktaş, Ö., & Safran, M. (2013). Evrensel Bir Değer Olarak Barış ve Barış Eğitiminin Tarihçesi. *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 17(2), 131-150.
- Altıkulaç, A., & Uslu, S. (2014). Teaching Values through the Moral Dilemma Approach in Social Studies Course. *Journal of Theoretical Educational Science*, 7(3), 383-407.
- APSA. (1996). Citizenship education for the next century: A taskforce to initiate Professional activities. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 4, 755-758.
- Ascenso C. S., Coulardeau T., Gonzalez E., Kalan E., Ortiz-Quintilla G. R., Schweitzer S., Veeneman I., & Villanueva M. (2014). Barış Eğitimi Yaygınlaştırma Metodolojiler, Yaklaşımlar ve Vizyonlar: Uygulama Kılavuzu. *European Intercultural Forum E. V. Almanya*. İstanbul: Habitat Kalkınma ve Yönetişim Derneği.

- Aspeshlagh, R., & Burns, R. J. (1996). Approaching Peace through Education: Background, Concepts and Theoretical Issues. In R. J. Burns & R. Aspeshlagh (Eds.), *Three Decades of Peace Education around The World* (pp. 25-69). Garland.
- Barber, J. P., & Walczak, K. K. (2009). *Conscience and critic: peer debriefing strategies in grounded theory research*. The meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), California.
- Bar-Tal, D. (2002). The elusive nature of peace education. In G. Salomon and B. Nevo (Eds.), *Peace education: The concept, principles, and practices around the world* (pp. 27-36). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bar-Tal, D., & Rosen, Y. (2009). Peace education in societies involved in intractable conflicts: Direct and indirect models. *Review of Educational Research* 79(2), 557-575.
- Bayram, D., & Aslan, C. (2008). An analysis on theme of "Peace" in primary Turkish curricula. *Proceedings for WCCI, 13<sup>th</sup> World conference in education on Creating a Global Culture of Peace: Strategies, for Curriculum Development and Implementation*. Antalya, Turkey.
- Bedir, G., & Arslan, M. (2014). Designing an Educational Program Model towards Furnishing Secondary School Students with Positive Attitudes for 'Peace Education'. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 1(3), 237-249.
- Bedir, G., & Demir, S. (2008). Primary school students' metaphors about the concept of "peace". *Proceedings for WCCI, 13<sup>th</sup> World conference in education on Creating a Global Culture of Peace: Strategies, for Curriculum Development and Implementation*. Antalya, Turkey.
- Bengtsson, M. (2016). How to plan and perform a qualitative study using content analysis. *NursingPlus Open*, 2, 8-14.
- Biton, Y., & Salomon, G. (2006). Peace in the eyes of Israeli and Palestinian youths: Effects of collective narratives and peace education program. *Journal of Peace Research* 43(2), 167-180.
- Bizumic, B., Stubager, R., Mellon, S., Linden, N. & Iyer, R., & Jones, B. (2013). On the (in)compatibility of attitudes toward peace and war. *Political Psychology*, 34(5), 673-693.
- Bjerstedt, A. (1988). Peace Education in Different Countries. Malmö: Educational Information and Debate, No.81.
- Burns, R. J. (1985). Teachers and Peace Education in Australia: Whose task?, In C. Alger & J. Balazs (Eds.), *Conflict and Crisis of International Order* (pp. 467-476). Budapest; Centre for Peace Research Coordination at The Hungarian Academy of Sciences.
- Cabezudo, A., & Haavelsrud, M. (2013). Rethinking Peace Education. *Journal of Conflictology*, 4(1), 279-296.
- Cihan, N. (2014). Okullarda Değerler Eğitimi ve Türkiye'deki Uygulamaya Bir Bakış. *Electronic Turkish Studies*, 9(2), 429-436.
- Crabtree, B. F., & Miller, W. L. (1999). *Doing qualitative research*. Sage publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Sage.
- Coşkun, Y. (2012). *İlköğretim Programlarında Barış Eğitimi ve Barış Eğitimi İlişkin Öğretmen Görüşleri* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans). Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi.
- Demir, S. (2011). Türkiye'de Barış Eğitimiine Bakış: Tanımlar, Zorluklar, Öneriler: Nitel İnceleme. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 11(4), 1727-1745.
- Doyle, M. (1997). *Ways of war and peace: Realism, liberalism and socialism*. Norton. Fountain, S. 1999. Peace Education in UNICEF, (working paper, UNICEF, June 1999).
- Forster, N. (1995). The analysis of company documentation. In C. Casell and G. Symon (Eds.). *Qualitative methods in organizational research: A practical guide* (pp. 83-106). Sage.
- Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, Peace and Peace Research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6(3), 167-191. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/422690>
- Galtung, J. (1973). Gewalt, Frieden und Friedensforschung. In Senghaas, D. (Ed.), *Kritische Friedensforschungun* (pp. 55-104). Suhrkamp.
- Garcia, C. (1984). Latin America Traditions and Perspectives. *International Review of Education*, 29 (3), 369-390.
- Gazioglu, G. (2008). The effect of peace and conflict resolution education on emotional intelligence, self-concept, and conflict resolution skills [Unpublished master's thesis]. Boğaziçi University, İstanbul.
- Given, L. M. (2008). *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*. SAGE Publications.
- Grossi, V. (2000). Peace Education: An Historical Overview (1843-1939). *Peace Education Miniprints* No. 101. U.S. Department of Education, Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) Doc. No.: ED445990.
- Güler, E. (2014). Barışa yönelik tutumlar: Dehşet yönetimi kuramı ve bazı sosyo-politik değişkenler açısından bir inceleme, Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Haas, E. B. (1986). *The United Nations and Collective Management of International Conflict*. United Nations: UN Inst. Train. and Res.
- Haavelsrud, M. (1974). *Education for Peace: Reflection and action*. IPC Science and Technology.
- Hakvoort, I. (2010). The conflict pyramid: A holistic approach to structuring conflict resolution in schools. *Journal of Peace Education*, 7(2), 157-169.
- Harding, C. G. (2010). Intention, Contradiction and the Recognition of Dilemmas. In C. G. Harding (Ed.), *Moral Dilemmas and Ethical Reasoning* (pp. 43-55). Transaction Publishers.
- Harris, I. M. (1990). Principles of peace pedagogy. *Peace and Change* 15(3), 254-271.
- Harris, I. M. (1996). From world peace to peace in the 'hood'. *Journal for a Just and Caring Education*, 2, 378-398.
- Harris, I. M. (2004). Peace Education Theory. *Journal of Peace Education*, 1(1), 5-20.
- Harris, I. M., & Morrison, M. L. (2003). *Peace Education* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Mcfarland & Company, Inc., Publishers.
- Hermon, E. (1988). The International Peace Education Movement, 1919-1939. In C. Chatfield & P. Van der Dungen (Eds.). *Peace Movements and Political Cultures* (pp. 127-142). University of Tennessee Press.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2005). Essential components of peace education, *Theory into Practice* 44(4), 280-292.

- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2006). Peace education for consensual peace: The essential role of conflict resolution, *Journal of Peace Education* 3(2), 147-174.
- Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), 14-26. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X03300701>
- Kamaraj, I., & Kerem, A. E. (2006). Erken Çocukluk Dönemi "Barış" Değerine Evrensel Bir Bakış I. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 19, 93-104.
- Kant, I. (1957). *Perpetual Peace*. The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.
- Karasar, N. (1995). Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi. *Araştırma Eğitim Danışmanlık*.
- Kuş, E. (2003). *Nitel-Nitel Araştırma Teknikleri*. Anı Yayıncılık.
- Lawson, M., & Hutchinson, F. (1992). Peace Education in Australia: The Legacy of the 1980s. *Peace, Environment and Education*, 3(1), 22-32.
- Matthews, I. (2002). Helping teachers teach a conflict resolution method. In A. Verdiani (Ed.), *Best Practices of Non-Violent Conflict Resolution in and out-of-school some examples* (pp. 29-32). Published by the United Nations Education Science and Culture Organisation. Paris.
- MEB (2018). *Sosyal bilgiler öğretim programı*, <http://mufredat.meb.gov.tr/ProgramDetay.aspx?PID=354> adresinden 01/06/2021 tarihinde erişilmiştir.
- MEB (2008). Öğretmen Yeterlikleri Öğretmenlik Mesleği Genel ve Özel Alan Yeterlikleri. Devlet Kitapları Müdürlüğü.
- Merriam, S. B., & Grenier, R. S. (2019). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*. Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Murakami, T. (1992). *Peace education in Britain and Japan*. Office of Sociology of Education, University of Education.
- Öztaşkın, Ö. B. (2014). Barışa Yönelik Tutumlar ve Günümüz Dünya Sorunlarına Yönelik Tutumlar Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. *Turkish Journal of Study*, 3(3).
- Plano Clark, V. L., & Ivankova, N. V. (2016). *Mixed methods research: A guide to the field*. Sage.
- Reardon, B. A. (1981). Militarism and Sexism: Influences on Education for War. *UME Connexion*, 9(3), 1-29.
- Reardon, B. A. (1988). *Educating for global responsibility: Teacher designed curricula for peace education*. Teachers College Press.
- Reardon, B. A. (1997a). *Tolerance – The Threshold of Peace: Primary-School Resource Unit*. Washington, DC: UNESCO Publishing.
- Reardon, B. A. (1997b). Human Rights as Education for Peace", In: A. George & R. Pierre Claude (Eds.), *Human Rights Education for the Twenty-First Century* (pp.21-35). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Rivera, D. (1978). A Brief Approach to the Violence of Knowledge. *International Peace Research Newsletter*, 16(3), 38-48.
- Sağkal, A. S. (2015). *Barış Eğitimi Programının Dokuzuncu Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Şiddete Yönelik Tutumları, Sosyal Problem Çözme Becerileri ve Sınıf İklimi Üzerindeki Etkisi* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, İzmir.
- Shapiro, S. (2002). Toward a critical pedagogy of peace education. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo (Eds.), *Peace education: The concept, principles, and practices around the world* (pp. 63-71). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Snauwaert, D. T. (2019). Introduction: The Peace Paradigm. In D. T. Snauwaert (Ed.), *Exploring Betty A. Reardon's Perspective on Peace Education: Looking Back, Looking Forward* (pp. 14-30). Springer Press.
- Souza, L. Sperb T. M., & McCarty S. (2006). Brazilian Children's Conceptions of peace, war and violence. *Peace and Conflict. Journal of Peace Psychology*, 12(1), 49-63.
- Stomfay-Stitz, A. (1993). *Peace Education in America 1828-1990*. Scarecrow.
- Tapan, Ç. (2006). *Barış eğitimi programının öğrencilerin çatışma çözme becerileri üzerindeki etkilerinin incelenmesi* [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir.
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (1998). *Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches*, *Applied Social Research Methods Series* (Vol.46). Sage.
- Teddlie, C., & Yu, F. (2007). Mixed Methods Sampling: A Typology with Examples. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(1), 77-100.
- Tocqueville, A. (1956). *Democracy in America*. Mentor.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (1974). *Uluslararası Anlayış, İşbirliği ve Barış için Eğitim ile İnsan Hakları ve Temel Özgürlüklerle ilgili Eğitime İlişkin Tavsiye Kararı*. <http://www.unesco.org.tr>
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (1995). *Barış, İnsan Hakları ve Demokrasi Eğitimi Beyannamesi ve Entegre Hareket Çerçevesi*. <http://www.unesco.org.tr>
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2005). *Framework for teachers*. India: New Delhi.
- Von Clausewitz, C. (2008). *On war*. Princeton University Press.
- Walker, K., Myers-Bowman, K. S., & Myers-Walls, J. A. (2003). Understanding War, Visualizing Peace: Children Draw What They Know. *Art Therapy: Journal of The American Art Therapy Association*, 20(4), 191- 200.
- Wolcott, H. F. (1990). On seeking-and rejecting-validity in qualitative research. In E. W. Eisner & A. Peshkin (Eds.), *Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate* (pp. 121-152). Teachers College Press.
- Wulf, C. (1974). *Handbook of Peace Education*. Frankfurt: International Peace Research Association.
- Wulf, C. (2013). Human Development in a Globalized World. Education towards Peace, Cultural Diversity and Sustainable Development. *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, 71(254), 71-86.
- Yemenici, A. (2008). A peace education model: Cellular, peace. *Proceedings for WCCI, 13<sup>th</sup> World conference in education on Creating a Global Culture of Peace: Strategies for Curriculum*.
- Yemenici, A. (2016). Peace Education: Training for an Evolved Consciousness of Non-violence. *All Azimuth*, 5(1), 5-25.
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2011). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri* (8. Basım). Seçkin Yayınları.



## APPENDIX

Moral dilemma stories used in the qualitative data collection phase are given below:

### MORAL DILEMMA -1

*“In ancient times, there were two neighboring countries named X and Y. Although country X has large forests, rivers and fertile lands, the neighboring country Y has steep mountains, large deserts and barren lands. That’s why country Y is economically and militarily weaker than country X. Country X, taking advantage of this, frequently attacks country Y, causing loss of property and life. After a while, an epidemic broke out in country X. Country Y prevented the epidemic from spreading to its territory with the measures it took. Country X was very badly affected by the epidemic, its economy collapsed and it became vulnerable to attacks. So much so that he even asked for help from country Y. Now the rulers of country Y have an opportunity. They could wage war against X, take revenge for years of attacks and capture fertile lands. – What would you do if it were you? Please state the reason for your decision.”*

### MORAL DILEMMA -2

*“During the years of the great war, a scientist was working in his laboratory in one of the countries. He devoted most of his life to the production of an artificial substance. This substance he was trying to produce would bring him and his country great prestige in the world and open the doors to wealth. But at the same time, if this substance was produced, it could be used to make weapons and increase the destructive effect of weapons hundreds of times. In this case, it was inevitable that deaths would increase and damage*

*would be done to the whole world in the world war. The scientist was about to complete his work. He was worried and couldn’t decide whether what he was doing was right or not. Now, should he cause more people to die by producing this substance and putting it on the market, or should he put aside the work he has done throughout his life and ensure the future of the world? – What would you do if it were you? Please state the reason for your decision.”*

### MORAL DILEMMA -3

*“Countries A and B have been in conflict for many years. Mary is a little girl living in country A. His house is in a small town on the border of country B. Tom, on the other hand, is a very patriotic soldier who grew up in country B and works at the border police station. One day, Mary decides to take a short trip without getting permission from her family. After a while, Mary moves away from her home and comes to the place where the wire fences are located on the border. Mary drops the doll in her hand, and due to the strong wind, the toy is blown behind the wire fences. Mary wants to get her toy, but she has to pass the fence to do so. At that time, Tom, who was on guard duty on the other side of the border, gave all his attention to Mary. Tom has received rigorous military training. In this training, he was taught that the borders within his country’s military sovereignty should not be violated by anyone, no matter what, and in case of any violation, he was ordered to fire without hesitation. Mary somehow got over the fence and is now in the territory of country B. Tom has never shot a person in his life, and the person in front of him is just a child. However, he also thinks that he must obey the order unconditionally due to his principles. – What would you do if it were you? Please state the reason for your decision.”*