© 2025 Isufaj. This article follows the Open Access policy of CC BY NC under CC v 4.0.

Submitted: 12/10/2025 - Accepted: 08/11/2025 - Published: 29/12/2025

Education, State Ideologies, and International Conflict: A Sociological Framework for Peacebuilding and Social Cohesion

Mentor Isufaj
Department of Justice, Faculty of Political Sciences and Law, Aleksandër Moisiu University, Albania
isufajmentor@gmail.com

DOI: 10.26417/ xt8fxt85

Abstract

This article examines how state ideologies and the conflictual structure of the international system interact with social processes that shape war and peace, and it explains why education is a central mechanism for mitigating international conflict. Using a qualitative, theory-driven synthesis of international relations, political sociology, and sociology of education, the paper identifies key pathways through which conflict is produced and reproduced: strategic insecurity under anarchy, ideological polarization, nationalism, and identity-based mobilization especially during political transitions. The analysis shows that schooling can amplify these dynamics through selective historical memory, exclusionary civic narratives, and segregated learning environments, but it can also reduce conflict risks by strengthening social cohesion, democratic competencies, and critical media literacy. The article concludes that conflict-sensitive education and peace-oriented social science curricula are not "add-ons" but institutional strategies that can reshape intergroup relations and increase resilience to ideological manipulation. The study contributes to social science education by linking macro-level conflict theories to concrete curricular and pedagogical interventions.

Keywords: peace education; conflict-sensitive education; political sociology; civic and citizenship learning; collective memory; media and information literacy; social cohesion; democratic transition

1. Introduction

International conflict is often explained through strategic competition, power asymmetries, alliance behavior, and institutional failure. Yet war also has social

foundations: identities are politicized, ideologies justify violence, and narratives of historical grievance shape public consent for confrontation. A sociological perspective therefore asks not only why states fight, but also how societies learn to accept conflict, and how they might learn to resist it.

Education is a key site where these processes unfold. Schools transmit civic identities, interpret national history, legitimate institutions, and shape how young people understand "us" and "others." In conflict-affected or geopolitically exposed societies, education can become an arena of securitization, where curriculum and pedagogy reinforce threat perceptions and exclusionary nationalism. At the same time, education can serve as a long-term peace infrastructure: it can build civic trust, democratic skills, and social cohesion, while cultivating the critical capacities needed to identify ideological manipulation and disinformation.

This article responds directly to the need especially in social science education research to connect macro-level conflict explanations with meso- and micro-level mechanisms of social reproduction. While classic international relations scholarship emphasizes anarchy and state interests (Waltz, 1979), and constructivist approaches emphasize identity and norms (Wendt, 1999), education research demonstrates that identities and norms are learned, practiced, and normalized within institutions schools among the most influential. International conflict in this article is understood broadly as interstate war, militarized crises and escalation dynamics, and internationalized conflicts where external powers shape violence and settlement.

"Social reproduction" refers to the routine institutional processes through which societies transmit meanings, identities, and hierarchies across generations especially through schooling, public memory, and civic rituals. This matters because contemporary conflict escalation increasingly depends on public consent and everyday legitimacy, which are shaped not only by material conditions but also by narratives, information environments, and moral framing. A sociological approach therefore treats education as a strategic site where conflict logics can be normalized or interrupted over the long term.

Accordingly, the paper advances three guiding questions:

1. Which state-level and systemic conditions most reliably generate international conflict?
2. How do ideology, identity, and nationalism operate as social drivers of conflict escalation?
3. Through which curricular, pedagogical, and institutional mechanisms can education reduce conflict risks and strengthen social cohesion?

To answer these questions, the article develops an integrative framework that links international structure, including anarchy, security dilemmas, and institutional constraints, with state strategies such as ideology, legitimacy seeking, nation building, and transition politics, and with educational processes that can reproduce or

transform conflict logics through curriculum, pedagogy, governance, and media literacy.

The paper's contribution to social science education research is twofold. First, it clarifies how conflict logics enter education systems (through identity projects, civic narratives, and institutional incentives). Second, it synthesizes evidence-informed approaches conflict-sensitive education, peace education, and social cohesion strategies into a coherent set of policy and curricular recommendations grounded in political sociology and contemporary education research.

2. Conceptual Framework: From International Anarchy to Social Reproduction

A multi-level explanation of international conflict requires moving across three analytic layers: systemic pressures, state and institutional mediation, and social reproduction through meaning-making institutions, including schools.

2.1 International Structure and the Security Dilemma

Realist theory treats the international system as anarchic: there is no central authority to guarantee security, so states must rely on self-help, military capabilities, alliances, and deterrence (Waltz, 1979). Even when a state claims defensive intentions, others may interpret armament as threatening, generating spirals of mistrust and escalation. This security dilemma does not mechanically cause war, but it creates persistent incentives for competitive behavior, especially where territorial disputes, unresolved border issues, or regional power imbalances exist.

2.2 The state, ideology, and legitimacy

Political sociology highlights that states do not pursue security only externally, they also pursue legitimacy internally. Historically, war and state-building have been intertwined; coercion, extraction, and national consolidation frequently developed together (Tilly, 1990). In modern contexts, elites may use external threat framing to unify populations, marginalize opponents, or redirect grievances. Ideology becomes crucial here: it supplies a moral language that portrays conflict as necessary, inevitable, or righteous.

2.3 Constructivism, identity, and nationalism

Constructivist approaches argue that state interests are not fixed; they are shaped through identity narratives, norms, and social meaning (Wendt, 1999). Nationalism is a particularly potent political technology because it constructs a shared imagined community and defines who belongs (Anderson, 1983). National identity may be civic and inclusive or ethnic and exclusionary. Exclusionary nationalism is especially conflict-prone because it defines security in terms of demographic dominance, historical entitlement, and territorial myths (Gellner, 1983).

2.4 Education as an institution of social cohesion or polarization

Sociology of education adds a further layer: identities and ideologies are not abstract forces; they are transmitted through institutions. Education can support cohesion by strengthening shared civic norms and inclusive belonging. But it can also intensify conflict by reproducing stereotypes, segregating groups, or teaching a one-sided history. The central insight is that education has "two faces": it can be peacebuilding or conflict-amplifying depending on curriculum design, governance, teacher practices, and the broader political environment (Bush & Saltarelli, 2000).

To operationalize education's peacebuilding role, this article draws on two complementary frameworks:

1. *Conflict-sensitive education***,** which emphasizes analyzing how education interacts with conflict and acting to minimize negative impacts while maximizing peace-supporting effects (INEE, 2013).
2. *The 4Rs framework* redistribution, recognition, representation, reconciliation which links education policy to social justice as a foundation for sustainable peace (Novelli et al., 2017).

To make the multi-level logic explicit, the framework assumes a sequence of connected mechanisms. Systemic insecurity and institutional constraints shape state strategies of legitimacy and threat framing; these strategies activate identity boundaries and nationalist narratives; those narratives then enter education through curriculum selection, commemorative rituals, governance arrangements, and classroom norms. Over time, schooling influences student dispositions such as out-group perceptions, trust in institutions, tolerance of dissent, and susceptibility to disinformation which in turn affects how societies interpret crises and whether publics support escalation, restraint, or compromise.

3. Methodological Approach

This article uses a qualitative, theory-driven synthesis (conceptual analysis) rather than a single-country dataset or statistical model.

The analysis proceeds in three steps. First, it integrates theory by synthesizing realism, liberal institutionalism, constructivism, and political sociology in order to identify core drivers of international conflict. Second, it maps mechanisms by examining how those drivers are socially reproduced through ideology, identity, nationalism, and institutional incentives. Third, it links these dynamics to education by specifying how curriculum, pedagogy, school governance, and media literacy can either reproduce conflict logics or mitigate them, drawing on conflict-sensitive and peace education scholarship (Bush & Saltarelli, 2000; INEE, 2013; Novelli et al., 2017; International Alert, 2020; UNESCO, 2023).

Illustrative examples (e.g., humanitarian intervention debates, post-conflict societies, democratic transitions) are used to clarify mechanisms, not to claim comprehensive empirical coverage of each case.

4. The State and the Conflictual Nature of the International System

4.1 Sovereignty, anarchy, and strategic uncertainty

Since the emergence of the modern state system, sovereignty has defined the state as the primary actor in war-making and diplomacy. In an anarchic system, uncertainty is structural: states cannot be fully sure of others' intentions, and security dilemmas persist (Waltz, 1979). This uncertainty encourages military preparedness, alliance formation, and balancing behavior especially when regional orders are fragile. Contemporary regional spillovers illustrate how wars reshape security perceptions beyond the battlefield. The war in Ukraine has had ripple effects across the Western Balkans, intensifying public and elite threat perceptions, increasing attention to alliance alignment and deterrence, and re-activating concerns about instability in a geopolitically exposed region (Dedej & Stasa, 2022).

These dynamics show how 'anarchy' is experienced socially: not only through military planning, but through heightened uncertainty, rumor environments, and politicized narratives about external influence. In such contexts, the security dilemma is reinforced by information competition, energy vulnerability, and polarization around foreign-policy orientation. This matters for education because regional insecurity often increases political pressure for unity narratives and simplified "friend/enemy" framing in civic and history education. A conflict-mitigating curriculum should therefore help students distinguish legitimate security concerns from escalatory narratives, and build skills to evaluate claims about threats, alliances, and responsibility using evidence.

From an education perspective, this matters because "security thinking" often spills into civic narratives. When societies perceive the international environment as permanently threatening, schooling can become oriented toward defensive patriotism, heroic militarized memory, and simplified depictions of external enemies. This does not mean civic education is inherently militaristic; rather, international insecurity increases the political demand for unity narratives, sometimes at the cost of pluralism.

4.2 International institutions: limiting war, not eliminating conflict

Liberal institutionalism argues that organizations and legal norms reduce uncertainty, facilitate cooperation, and raise the costs of aggression. Yet institutional designs reflect power realities. This aligns with accounts of globalization-era governance arguing that IO influence and effectiveness particularly the UN are frequently shaped by great-power strategies and geopolitical constraints, while strategic alliances (e.g., NATO) may become more decisive in practice (Muskaj, 2023). The United Nations system, for instance, established rules limiting the use of force

and created collective security mechanisms (United Nations, 1945). However, great-power vetoes and divergent strategic interests can produce paralysis particularly in high-stakes crises. This gap between legal norms and political constraints creates contested zones where legitimacy, morality, and legality collide.

This institutional tension is pedagogically significant. Social science education often teaches "international law" and "global governance" either as idealized systems or as purely cynical power politics. A conflict-mitigating curriculum should teach both: (1) how law constrains behavior and shapes legitimacy, and (2) why institutions fail under power competition. Students need the conceptual tools to understand legitimacy debates without internalizing fatalism.

4.3 Humanitarian intervention, legitimacy, and contested norms

Contemporary conflicts have repeatedly raised questions about intervention, sovereignty, and human rights. The Kosovo intervention, for example, became a reference point for debates over legality and legitimacy (Independent International Commission on Kosovo, 2000). Later, the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) doctrine sought to reconcile sovereignty with protection from mass atrocities (ICISS, 2001). Yet Responsibility to Protect (R2P) remains politically contested and inconsistently applied. Relatedly, the Ukraine/Crimea case shows how core legal norms territorial integrity and the prohibition on the use of force collide with competing claims framed in the language of self-determination, producing persistent contestation over legality and legitimacy. (Musa & Shehaj, 2023)

The authors use this case to illustrate how these principles are argued and prioritized in practice, and why the UN response becomes central yet politically constrained. For social science education, the goal is not to prescribe a single moral answer but to build deliberative competence: the ability to evaluate competing claims sovereignty, human rights, proportionality, institutional authority using evidence and ethical reasoning. This is a concrete way education can reduce conflict escalation: by reducing susceptibility to absolutist ideological arguments that frame violence as the only option.

5. Social Factors: Ideology, Identity, and Nationalism and Their Educational Transmission

5.1 Ideology as justification and mobilization

Ideologies provide simplified worldviews that can legitimize aggression or resistance. They define moral boundaries, identify enemies, and justify extraordinary measures. Totalizing ideologies are particularly dangerous because they demand comprehensive control over society and treat opposition as existential threat (Arendt, 1951).

Education is one of the most effective delivery systems for ideology when it becomes politicized. In such contexts, ideological influence can operate through selective

curricula that determine what is included or excluded, through symbolic rituals such as national ceremonies, through textbook narratives that define who is portrayed as heroic or blamed, and through disciplinary norms that shape which viewpoints are treated as acceptable.

5.2 Identity construction and "the other"

Collective identity is socially constructed through narratives, symbols, and shared memory (Anderson, 1983). Conflict becomes more likely when identity is defined against a threatening "other," turning difference into antagonism (Wendt, 1999). This is not only a political elite strategy; it can become embedded in everyday life through media, family narratives, and schooling.

Schools matter because they shape the first "official" account of national history and civic belonging. When the curriculum uses a single-perspective narrative especially in post-conflict settings students may learn inherited grievances as unquestioned truths. Conversely, multiperspective history education and critical inquiry can reduce essentialism and humanize out-groups.

5.3 Nationalism, Memory, and Post-Conflict Education Challenges

Nationalism is often strongest during state formation or political transition, when identities are renegotiated and institutions are fragile (Gellner, 1983; Tilly, 1990). In divided societies, schooling can become segregated along ethnic, religious, or linguistic lines, reinforcing separate memories and limiting intergroup contact. This directly undermines social cohesion.

Recent research on post-conflict contexts shows that education's governance arrangements how schools are managed, how communities participate, how fairness is perceived can either rebuild trust or deepen division (Komatsu, 2024). This is a sociological insight: cohesion is not only about what is taught, but also about how institutions distribute dignity, voice, and opportunity**.**

6. Political Transitions, Democratization, and the Democratic Peace: Educational Dimensions

6.1 The promise and limits of the democratic peace

The democratic peace proposition argues that democracies rarely fight each other due to institutional constraints, accountability, and shared norms (Doyle, 1986). Contemporary work suggests the empirical pattern is robust in many specifications but still subject to important methodological and causal debates (Imai & Lo, 2021). Moreover, democratization does not automatically produce liberal constitutionalism, minority protections, or nonviolent political culture.

6.2 Transition risk and elite strategies

Political transitions are vulnerable periods. External democratization pressures can also shape transition dynamics. In Albania, EU candidate-country status and the

Copenhagen criteria have functioned as a reform framework aimed at strengthening democracy, rule of law, human rights, and minority protection. (Medici & Dedej, 2023)

They argue that despite moderate democratic progress since candidate status, persistent weaknesses remain especially underdeveloped political culture, low political participation, and civil-rights concerns such as media censorship and pressure on the opposition. This illustrates a key transition mechanism: reforms can advance procedurally while democratic culture and rights protections lag. For education, the implication is that citizenship education and media/information literacy are not "soft" add-ons but necessary supports for democratic consolidation and resilience during politically polarized periods.

Periods of transition are also moments when education becomes a symbolic and institutional battleground. Competing elites often struggle over history curricula, civic narratives, and the boundaries of legitimate identity, because these shape future political loyalty and the public's sense of who belongs. At the same time, teachers may face heightened pressure, self-censorship, or politicized scrutiny, making it harder to sustain open discussion and pluralism in the classroom. This is precisely why transition contexts require not only formal democratic reforms but also educational safeguards that protect deliberation, minority rights, and professional autonomy.

Weak institutions, polarized competition, and contested legitimacy can incentivize elites to use nationalism or external confrontation to consolidate support. Under such conditions, misinformation and symbolic politics can spread rapidly, and conflict narratives may be used to delegitimize opponents.

Education is a stabilizing resource during transitions when it strengthens constitutional literacy and democratic norms, promotes nonviolent political participation, teaches legitimate dissent and pluralism, and builds trust through fair and inclusive institutions.

But education can be destabilizing when it is captured by partisan agendas or when civic education becomes propaganda. This is why education reform cannot be treated as neutral technocratic change; it is inherently political.

6.3 Citizenship Education in Divided Societies

Empirical work on citizenship education in divided societies illustrates how fragile peace-oriented curriculum reforms can be. Even well-designed programs may be marginalized by exam-driven cultures, uneven implementation, or insufficient teacher preparation (Worden, 2023). This finding is crucial for policy: peace-oriented curricula must be supported by assessment alignment, teacher education, and institutional incentives or they remain symbolic.

7. Economic Interdependence and Globalization: Geo-economics, Inequality, and Schooling

7.1 Interdependence: Cooperation and Vulnerability

Economic interdependence can raise the costs of war and create incentives for cooperation. Yet interdependence is often asymmetric; dependency can become leverage (Keohane & Nye, 2012). Economic shocks, sanctions, and supply disruptions can intensify domestic grievances, fuel scapegoating, and destabilize transitions. These dynamics show that globalization can become securitized: economic instruments (sanctions, energy dependency, strategic commodities, supply chains) are increasingly treated as tools of pressure and bargaining rather than neutral market relations.

As interdependence becomes a source of vulnerability, political actors may frame economic pain as external hostility, which can strengthen nationalist blame narratives and deepen polarization. Social science education can mitigate these risks by helping students analyze how economic interdependence intersects with security dilemmas, and by building the capacity to evaluate claims about "economic enemies," responsibility, and policy trade-offs using evidence rather than propaganda.

7.2 Inequality, Redistribution, and Conflict Risk

Conflict research consistently shows that political instability, weak governance, and social fragmentation create fertile ground for violence (Fearon & Laitin, 2003). From a sociological standpoint, inequality matters not only as material deprivation but also as perceived injustice and humiliation.

Education intersects with these dynamics through distribution: who gets access to quality schools, language rights, recognition of identity, and representation in governance. These are precisely the "redistribution" and "recognition" dimensions emphasized in education-and-peacebuilding frameworks (Novelli et al., 2017).

7.3 Information Globalization and Ideological Manipulation

Globalization is not only economic; it is informational. Ideological narratives and disinformation circulate rapidly, including in times of crisis. Recent evidence suggests media literacy interventions can improve critical engagement with information, though effects vary and long-term societal impacts require stronger research designs (Anstead et al., 2025). In conflict contexts, information resilience is directly relevant to peace because propaganda and dehumanization are often precursors to violence.

Therefore, conflict mitigation today requires not only civic and historical education but also media and information literacy integrated into social science curricula.

8. Education's Role in Mitigating International Conflict

Education mitigates conflict when it disrupts the social reproduction of hostility and strengthens the social foundations of peace. The literature suggests four broad

mechanisms: (1) narrative transformation, (2) skills for democratic life, (3) institutional trust and cohesion, and (4) resilience against manipulation.

8.1 Curriculum: From Nationalist Myth to Critical Civic Understanding

A conflict-mitigating curriculum does not erase national identity; it reconstructs it in inclusive ways. Key shifts include:

- *From single-story history to multiperspectivity:* teaching how different groups experienced the same events, and how memory is shaped.
- *From glorification of violence to ethical and legal inquiry:* exploring limits on force, war crimes, humanitarian dilemmas, and peace processes.
- *From "enemy images" to human security:* focusing on civilians, displacement, trauma, and reconstruction, not only on military outcomes.

UNESCO's updated global guidance emphasizes education's role in peace, human rights, and global citizenship as part of sustainable development (UNESCO, 2023). This supports integrating international norms into national curricula without idealizing institutions. Human rights education is particularly relevant under contemporary global challenges such as war and displacement, climate-related pressures, pandemics, and inequality. (Lusha, 2023)

Lusha argues that these interconnected pressures can undermine rights protections and that a human-rights framework supported by state civil society international cooperation helps protect vulnerable groups and build more resilient, inclusive societies. This supports treating human rights not as abstract ideals, but as a practical lens for analyzing contemporary crises in social science curricula.

8.2 Pedagogy: Dialogue, Deliberation, and Critical Thinking

Content alone is insufficient because pedagogy shapes how students process difference. Peace-oriented social science education therefore emphasizes structured dialogue, evidence-based argumentation, deliberation on controversial issues, and practices of respectful disagreement.

These approaches reduce polarization by lowering the social rewards of extremism and increasing competence in nonviolent conflict resolution. They also develop empathy without requiring political conformity.

8.3 School Governance and Social Cohesion

Social cohesion is institutional as well as cultural. Schools build cohesion when students experience fairness, voice, and shared belonging. Research on post-conflict and divided societies highlights that governance arrangements community participation, inclusive decision-making, and equitable resource distribution are central to rebuilding trust (Komatsu, 2024).

From the 4Rs perspective (Novelli et al., 2017), education strengthens peace when it advances:

1. *Redistribution:* equitable access to quality learning, not segregated opportunity structures.
2. *Recognition:* dignity and legitimacy for minority identities and languages.
3. *Representation:* meaningful participation in school governance and education policy.
4. *Reconciliation:* opportunities to process past violence, build shared civic futures, and support intergroup contact.

8.4 Conflict-sensitive education: minimizing harm, maximizing peace

Conflict-sensitive education begins with analysis: understanding the conflict context and how education interacts with it. The INEE Guidance Note stresses a two-way relationship: education is affected by conflict, but it also affects conflict dynamics (INEE, 2013). Practical implications include ensuring that curriculum does not incite hatred, avoiding discriminatory school practices, protecting learning spaces from political intimidation, and training educators to manage controversy and trauma safely.

This approach is particularly relevant for societies facing unresolved interethnic tensions, fragile democratic consolidation, or external geopolitical pressures.

8.5 Peace education in formal schools: what it adds

Peace education is often misunderstood as moral messaging. Evidence-oriented approaches frame peace education as a structured effort to develop social-emotional skills, empathy, nonviolent conflict resolution, and inclusive civic values. A major review of peace education in formal schools emphasizes that programming must be context-sensitive, supported by teachers, and integrated into curricula rather than treated as a short-term project (International Alert, 2020).

8.6 Media and information literacy as conflict prevention

Modern conflict involves information warfare, rumor cascades, and digital dehumanization. Media literacy supports conflict mitigation by helping students evaluate sources and evidence, recognize manipulation and emotional targeting, distinguish opinion from verified claims, and understand how algorithms can amplify polarization.

Recent synthesis research indicates media literacy interventions can promote more conscious engagement with content, though outcomes vary and require robust evaluation (Anstead et al., 2025). Integrating this into social science education is therefore not optional; it is a contemporary peace capacity.

8.7 Teacher education and professional responsibility

Teachers are frontline actors in conflict mitigation, and they need preparation to teach controversial issues without inflaming tensions, facilitate dialogue ethically,

recognize trauma and refer students appropriately, and protect students from discrimination.

A peace-oriented education strategy therefore requires investment in teacher professional development and in institutional protections for academic freedom and pluralism.

9. Discussion: Implications for Social Science Education and Research

9.1 What this Framework Adds

This article's central sociological claim is that international conflict is not only "out there" in the global system it is also produced and reproduced through domestic narratives, identity projects, and institutional routines. Education is a major pathway for that reproduction, which means education is also a major pathway for transformation.

By linking international relations theory to education systems, the paper reframes conflict mitigation as partly an educational governance and curriculum problem. This does not replace diplomacy, deterrence, or institutional reform, but it strengthens them by addressing the social foundations of legitimacy, cohesion, and public consent.

9.2 Research Agenda for Education and Conflict Scholars

To strengthen the manuscript's fit with social science education research, future empirical work could test the framework through textbook and curriculum analysis focused on national narratives, enemy images, and human rights framing, through classroom ethnography examining how controversy is handled and how identities are negotiated, through student attitude surveys measuring out group tolerance, democratic norms, and misinformation susceptibility, and through policy process studies investigating who influences curriculum decisions in transition contexts.

The 4Rs framework provides a structured way to connect these studies to peacebuilding outcomes and social justice (Novelli et al., 2017).

9.3 Policy alignment and implementation realism

Education reforms fail when peace-oriented goals are not matched by institutional incentives. Citizenship education initiatives can be marginalized by exam priorities, uneven teacher preparation, or shifting political support (Worden, 2023). Therefore, peace education must be implemented through curriculum standards, teacher training requirements, assessment alignment, and governance reforms that institutionalize inclusion.

Implementation also depends on enabling conditions that are often missing in reform plans. Peace-oriented goals require teacher professional development that is sustained (not one-off), assessment practices that reward inquiry and deliberation rather than memorization, and institutional protections that allow educators to address controversial issues without intimidation. Curriculum bodies also need

procedural legitimacy transparent processes, stakeholder representation, and safeguards against partisan capture so that reforms are durable across political cycles. Finally, monitoring and evaluation should track not only academic outcomes but also indicators of cohesion and civic resilience, such as perceived fairness, student voice, out-group tolerance, and misinformation susceptibility.

Recent OECD work also emphasizes that education systems shape trust and social cohesion, which are foundations of democratic resilience. This reinforces the argument that education policy is part of societal security architecture.

10. Conclusions and Recommendations

This study demonstrates that international conflict emerges from interacting forces: systemic insecurity under anarchy, state legitimacy strategies, ideological polarization, identity construction, and institutional fragility especially during political transitions. These forces do not operate only at the level of diplomacy, military power, and elite bargaining; they also operate through social reproduction, where narratives of belonging, threat, and historical entitlement are normalized. Education is one of the most consequential institutions in that process because it shapes how young people learn to interpret the international environment, how they define "us" and "others," and how they evaluate the legitimacy of violence, law, and political authority.

The article's core conclusion is that education can either normalize conflict or help societies resist it. When curricula promote exclusionary nationalism, simplify history into victim–enemy binaries, or tolerate discrimination and segregation, schooling can deepen polarization and increase susceptibility to securitized thinking. When education is conflict-sensitive, inclusive, and oriented toward critical civic competence, it can strengthen social cohesion and reduce vulnerability to ideological manipulation, dehumanization, and disinformation. In this sense, education functions as a form of long-term peace infrastructure: not by replacing diplomacy or deterrence, but by strengthening the social foundations that make peaceful conflict management politically and culturally viable.

A further implication is that international institutions and globalization do not automatically reduce conflict risks. Institutions can constrain behavior and shape legitimacy, yet their effectiveness is often conditioned by power politics, selective enforcement, and contested norms. This creates an educational challenge: students need to understand both the promise and limits of global governance, and to develop the deliberative capacity to evaluate competing claims about sovereignty, territorial integrity, humanitarian protection, and human rights. Human rights education and media and information literacy therefore become central to conflict prevention because contemporary escalation often involves moral polarization and information warfare as much as troop movements.

Finally, the paper underscores implementation realism. Peace-oriented curriculum goals fail when they are not matched by institutional incentives and protections. Assessment regimes, uneven teacher preparation, political interference, and unequal governance arrangements can marginalize peace education or turn civic education into propaganda. For conflict-mitigating education to be durable, reforms need to be institutionalized through curriculum standards, teacher education requirements, and governance arrangements that protect pluralism and professional responsibility, particularly in contexts marked by transition pressures or intergroup mistrust.

In practical terms, aligning social science education with conflict mitigation requires integrating multiperspective history and civic inquiry into curriculum standards in ways that emphasize historical thinking, evidence evaluation, and awareness of how memory is socially constructed. It also requires institutionalizing peace education not as moral messaging or a short project, but as a cross-curricular competency built through classroom dialogue, structured deliberation, empathy development, and nonviolent problem-solving.

Conflict-sensitive education tools should be applied systematically to curriculum design, school governance, and teacher training to ensure that education minimizes harm while maximizing peace-supporting effects (INEE, 2013). Equity and inclusion must be treated as core peace conditions, using the 4Rs framework to ensure reforms address redistribution, recognition, representation, and reconciliation in both policy and everyday institutional practice (Novelli et al., 2017).

Because contemporary conflicts are increasingly shaped by disinformation and emotional manipulation, media and information literacy should be embedded across social science learning outcomes to reduce vulnerability to propaganda and hate mobilization (Anstead et al., 2025). Finally, social cohesion depends not only on what is taught but on how institutions feel to students and communities; strengthening school governance and equity policies that build trust, fairness, and participation is therefore essential, particularly in divided or post-conflict contexts (Komatsu, 2024).

By connecting international conflict theory to educational practice, this article contributes to social science education research and offers a structured agenda for peace-oriented curriculum development and institutional reform. It also sets a research direction: future empirical work can test the proposed mechanisms through curriculum and textbook analysis, classroom studies of controversial-issue pedagogy, and student outcomes research on civic trust, out-group tolerance, and misinformation resilience.

Declaration: The author acknowledges the financial support provided by "Aleksandër Moisiu" University, Durrës, Albania.

References

[1] Anstead, N., Edwards, L., Livingstone, S., & Stoilova, M. (2025). The potential for media literacy to combat misinformation: Results of a rapid evidence assessment. *International Journal of Communication, 19*, 2129–2151.
[2] Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Verso.
[3] Arendt, H. (1951). *The origins of totalitarianism*. Harcourt, Brace.
[4] Bush, K. D., & Saltarelli, D. (Eds.). (2000). *The two faces of education in ethnic conflict: Towards a peacebuilding education for children*. UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre.
[5] Dedej, A., & Stasa, I. (2022, May 20). *The impact of the Ukraine war on the security of Western Balkan countries* [Conference paper]. International Scientific Conference "Security in Western Balkan", University "Aleksandër Moisiu", Durrës, Albania.
[6] Doyle, M. W. (1986). Liberalism and world politics. *American Political Science Review, 80*(4), 1151–1169.
[7] Fearon, J. D., & Laitin, D. D. (2003). Ethnicity, insurgency, and civil war. *American Political Science Review, 97*(1), 75–90.
[8] Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research, 6*(3), 167–191.
[9] Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and nationalism*. Cornell University Press.
[10] Imai, K., & Lo, J. (2021). Robustness of empirical evidence for the democratic peace: A nonparametric sensitivity analysis. *International Organization, 75*(3), 901–919.
[11] Independent International Commission on Kosovo. (2000). *The Kosovo report: Conflict, international response, lessons learned*. Oxford University Press.
[12] Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies. (2013). *Guidance note on conflict sensitive education*. INEE.
[13] International Alert. (2020). *Peace education in formal schools: Why is it important and how can it be done?* International Alert.
[14] International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. (2001). *The responsibility to protect*. International Development Research Centre.
[15] Keohane, R. O., & Nye, J. S. (2012). *Power and interdependence* (4th ed.). Longman.
[16] Komatsu, T. (2024). *Education and social cohesion in a post-conflict and divided nation: The case of Bosnia and Herzegovina*. Springer.
[17] Lusha, E. (2023). *Human rights in the face of global challenges*. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research and Development, 10*(1, S1), 118–124.
[18] Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The tragedy of great power politics*. W. W. Norton.

[19] Medici, L., & Dedej, A. (2023). *Democratic evolution in Albania in the aftermath of candidate country status*. In *Proceedings of the Seventh International Scientific Conference "The state, society and law: social, economic, political challenges and conditions to peace and security"* (pp. 242–246). Faculty of Political Sciences and Law, "Aleksandër Moisiu" University of Durrës.
[20] Morgenthau, H. J. (1948). *Politics among nations: The struggle for power and peace*. Alfred A. Knopf.
[21] Muskaj, B. (2023). *How the international organizations have influenced the era of globalization*. *Acta Universitatis Danubius. Relationes Internationales, 16*(2), 15–26.
[22] Musa, E., & Shehaj, J. (2023). *Territorial integrity of Ukraine in the view of international law*. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research and Development, 10*(1, S1), 77–88.
[23] Novelli, M., Lopes Cardozo, M. T. A., & Smith, A. (2017). The 4Rs framework: Analyzing education's contribution to sustainable peacebuilding with social justice in conflict-affected contexts. *Journal on Education in Emergencies, 3*(1), 14–43.
[24] Tilly, C. (1990). *Coercion, capital, and European states, AD 990–1990*. Basil Blackwell.
[25] UNESCO. (2015). *Global citizenship education: Topics and learning objectives*. UNESCO.
[26] UNESCO. (2023). *Recommendation on education for peace, human rights and sustainable development*. UNESCO.
[27] United Nations. (1945). *Charter of the United Nations*. United Nations.
[28] Waltz, K. N. (1979). *Theory of international politics*. Addison-Wesley.
[29] Wendt, A. (1999). *Social theory of international politics*. Cambridge University Press.
[30] Worden, E. A. (2023). *Citizenship education in a divided society: Lessons from curricula and practice in Northern Ireland*. Routledge.