The multiple faces of education in conflict-affected and fragile contexts

Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) Working Group on Education and Fragility

Contents

Acknowledgements

1.0   Introduction

For years, debate has raged in academic circles over the principal causes of conflict and fragility. Policymakers, academics and practitioners continue to dispute the influence of a wide variety of factors ranging from ethnicity, grievance and rebel greed to topography or venal leadership. Beyond full-blown conflict, drivers that entrench and perpetuate dynamics of fragility (be it pre- or post-conflict) are being considered in relation to security, economic, governance, social and environmental conditions.

It has been widely documented that fragility[1] has a major, negative impact on service delivery, given the potential lack of capacity and/or will to provide basic services in extremely difficult circumstances. Insecurity and risk inevitably affect decision-making at all levels, exacerbated by the presence of fighting forces and the breakdown of rule of law, and underfunded, disjointed service delivery can leave the education system vulnerable to endemic corruption, systematic exclusion, neglect and poor management. Thus, the broad social patterns of fragility are accordingly "mapped" in the delivery of education services; educational systems may be interpreted as representative of fragility dynamics at play at the local and national level, reflecting political as well as technical constraints or patterns of resilience.

In fragile contexts, delivering education may provide an entry point for donors to address political and governance issues. Within a given context, education can help produce the benefits of inclusive and constructive integration of individuals and communities, socially, politically and economically, which can contribute to conflict prevention and long-term peacebuilding (Dupuy, 2008). Conversely, education can perpetuate or entrench dynamics of fragility depending on the nature of its design and implementation.

In any case, education's potential to either mitigate or exacerbate conflict and fragility will be a result of nuanced interfaces between education policies, planning and programming and the drivers and dynamics of conflict and fragility. Understanding this nuance means grappling with the subtle ways in which the details of education design and implementation can impact on the range of drivers and dynamics of conflict and fragility in a context. The specific gradated meanings that those impacts will have in a given context will be based on the unique arrangement of specific characteristics of education and of fragility in that context. Nuance then refers to the subtlety, the detail and the context-specific nature of the relationship between education and conflict/fragility that results in and from complex interfaces.

The question of linkages between education and conflict/fragility and the nuanced interfaces of these relationships is being probed through macro-level and micro-level analysis aimed at informing us about the qualitative and quantitative linkages between the two. The purpose of this paper, therefore, is to frame the debate around education's role in conflict and fragility, recognizing the impacts of conflict and fragility on education service delivery as well as the influences that education has on conflict and fragility. In considering the key policy messages that will be propagated by the forthcoming World Bank 2011 World Development Report (WDR) and the EFA 2011 Global Monitoring Report (GMR), the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) Working Group on Education and Fragility takes this opportunity to review the new and emerging literature on education's interfaces with conflict and fragility and provide recommendations for key policy messages that the WDR and GMR may

---

[1] The definition of fragility used by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)–Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Fragile States Group emphasizes the lack of capacity and willingness of a government to perform key state functions for the benefit of all. The effects of fragility stretch beyond poor services to include conflict, state collapse, loss of territorial control, extreme political instability, clientelist policies and repression or denial of resources to subgroups of the population. The level of state capacity and will is categorized by the following phases of fragility: arrested development, deterioration, post-conflict transition, and early recovery. Organized violence, corruption, poverty, exclusion, and poor governance are all common conditions and indicators of fragility. (See *Service Delivery in Fragile States: Key Findings, Concepts and Lessons,* OECD-DAC (2008).)

incorporate into their reports. The paper will consider education not only as a service to be delivered, but also specifically in terms of the 'who,' 'what,' 'how' and 'why' of that delivery; in other words, it will consider the nuances. A range of studies provides us with new evidence; these are the sources on which this paper draws.

This paper is not a comprehensive review of all existing literature on the interfaces between education and conflict or fragility. The INEE Working Group chose to focus in on a small range of sources that represent a) the most recent thinking about these interfaces (e.g. approximately half of the sources have been produced in the last 2-3 years or are forthcoming) and b) the contributions of the Working Group on Education and Fragility to the discourse (e.g. the case studies of Afghanistan, Bosnia, Cambodia and Liberia that represent the group's Situational Analyses of Education and Fragility). Any omissions in the paper are a result of this more narrow focus on sources.

2.0   Conflict and fragility: potential barriers to education provision

Conflict and fragility are typically associated with a combination of economic, governance, security and social conditions that can have devastating impacts on education provision. At a very minimum, these factors impinge on basic service delivery: of the 72 million children of primary school-age estimated to be out of school globally, over 25 million are found in conflict-affected countries (UNESCO, 2010); millions more youth and adults find themselves with few meaningful opportunities to access education in such contexts. Even when education services are made available, the dynamics impacting the 'who', 'what', 'how' and 'why' associated with their delivery can further complicate and negatively impact the quality of what children and youth experience in the classroom. Conditions linked to conflict and fragility – including poor governance, violence, repression, corruption, inequality and exclusion – may affect quality, relevance, equity and management in ways which not only reduce education and peace dividends and reverse development gains, but which can also further entrench or exacerbate economic, social or political instability.

The **economic and financial impacts** on education delivery are numerous. Economic stagnation or decline, often characteristic of fragile or conflict-affected contexts, may leave states unable or unwilling to fund high capital or recurrent education expenditures. This can result in a degradation of quality, a dramatic decrease or complete cessation of education provision and/or imbalanced investment at different levels or geographic areas of the education system. Moreover, funds normally allocated for education may be funneled into increased military expenditure (United Nations, 2005) or diverted to serve the personal interests of those in power. Conversely, education budgets may surge after conflict only to decline due to reprioritization or slow progress in donor funding, and implementation and spending may be impacted by low absorption capacity. Additionally, funding might be slowed by limited fulfillment of donor commitments as a result of unmet conditionalities. Where schools still function, learners may be forced to reduce attendance or drop out entirely to pursue income-generating activities, given prevailing social and economic insecurity. Limited economic opportunity may also have implications for the relevance of education for a significant majority of young people, who find themselves unable to translate skills acquired into material gain.

In addition to limited investment and availability of economic resources, uncoordinated and/or disconnected service delivery and the lack of transparency and accountability in conflict-affected and fragile situations can leave education systems vulnerable to corruption, neglect and poor management. Funds and other education resources may be misused or unevenly distributed, and introduce inequities that may reinforce or deepen ethnic, socioeconomic and/or geographic divides. Lack of capacity may contribute to less than robust systems of checks and balances or even lack of use of available funds. Teachers and administrators may be recruited, promoted or certified based on bribes or sexual favors,

while sex, cash or work may often be exchanged for school fees, grades and exam results (Miller-Grandvaux, 2009).

Endemic violence, breakdown of rule of law, government repression and/or active presence of armed groups and/or state security forces introduce serious **protection threats**, leaving students, personnel and education facilities vulnerable to attacks, recruitment and abuse. During the period from January 2007 to July 2009, education was disrupted by targeted attacks on infrastructure, learners and personnel in at least 31 countries (O'Malley, 2010). Curfews and checkpoint closures, landmines and overt violence prevent provision and may induce fear that makes it difficult for learners and/or teachers to concentrate even when physically able to access education. In addition, education facilities may be used as a means for indoctrination and/or recruitment, or as military bases which prevent their functioning as schools and make them legitimate military targets. Research also demonstrates that, in some contexts, gender-based violence in school occurs daily during periods of war (Miller-Grandvaux, 2009).

Such violence – both directed against and occurring within the education process - has long-lasting consequences for education systems as well as individual learners, which in turn hinder development and stability. Impacts may include, though are not limited to:

- loss of life;
- the destruction and damage of buildings, materials and resources;
- the closure of schools and universities for days or even years;
- reduced attendance and enrolment;
- absenteeism and flight of teachers, academics and administrators;
- teacher shortages and difficulty in recruiting qualified replacements;
- halted investment;
- degradation of quality and decreases in learning outcomes;
- possible evacuation of humanitarian and development workers;
- and psychological distress and fear, which affect the trust, attention, motivation and attendance of both students and staff (O'Malley, 2010).

Similarly critical, the impacts of violence can result in a narrowing of the vision for education, with constraints on innovation and the loss of ideas and contributions of knowledge to social and economic development (O'Malley, 2010).

Social conditions associated with conflict and fragility further affect the delivery of education services in nuanced ways. Communities may rally around an education system to sustain it during conflict or degradation as a result of fragility; on the other hand, increased tensions and divisions may dramatically decrease public participation and, thereby, engagement in the education system. Unequal access to education along religious, cultural, ethnic or linguistic lines is a common grievance contributing to and resulting from conflict and fragility; as are the irrelevance or exclusionary nature of curricula which privilege the history, culture, religion and language of one culture over another (Wedge, 2008). Other impacts on the quality, relevance and equity of education service delivery include biased curriculum and textbooks; overt acts of discrimination or intimidation in the classroom; discriminatory fees and geographical preference for school sites; and favouritism in the distribution of resources that mirror and reinforce social cleavages. Furthermore, conflict and fragility may disrupt the social fabric of society in ways which increase the vulnerability of particular groups; for example forced migrants, women and girls, learners with disabilities or marginalized youth. Conflict undermines their protection and well-being and poses challenges to their equal and meaningful participation and achievement in education.

3.0   Education's macro-level links to fragility and the risk of conflict: emerging evidence

The impact of education on conflict and fragility is visible at both a macro-level and via context-specific case studies. Macro-level evidence demonstrates links between education and the causes of conflict and fragility, particularly related to intersections of poverty and conflict. Within the debates about causes of conflict, one recent stream of debate has centered on the greed and grievance literature which posits that poverty and conflict are linked: recent academic research on the causes of conflict demonstrates compellingly that countries with low income per capita are at increased risk of civil conflict (Rice, Graff, and Lewis, 2006). Two dominant explanations exist about the link between low income per capita and conflict – the first emphasizes opportunities for rebellion, while the other focuses on state capacity. Education, in particular, plays a role in each of these explanations. Collier and Hoeffler offer perhaps the strongest argument concerning the role of education in the relationship between poverty and conflict: they find that a 10 percent increase in enrollment rates in secondary schools can reduce the average risk of conflict by three percentage points, and that male secondary school rates are negatively related to the duration of conflict (Collier and Hoeffler, 2004, p. 563-595.) Their explanation for this relationship is that as educational attainment rises, the potential income that rebel recruits would have to forgo in order to join a rebellion rises, making it less likely that rebellion will occur. This is a critical 'economic opportunity cost' argument about the link between education and civil war.

Regarding state capacity, Thyne finds strong evidence, which seems to support prior research, that a state's failure to provide access to education creates grievances, which can lead to conflict. As Thyne explains, "we should expect a poorly funded system of education to generate poverty and inequality, each of which has been found to increase the likelihood of civil war" (2006, p. 735). Specifically, Thyne argues that primary enrollment rates are a strong proxy for equitable educational investment. His research shows that "an increase in primary enrollment from 1 standard deviation (SD) below the mean to 1 SD above results in a 73% decrease in the predicted probability of civil war onset" (2006, p. 743). Therefore, if increased and sustained investment in education with increased enrollments became a priority for conflict prevention, there is a likelihood of significant reductions in civil wars. In short, Thyne finds strong cross-country evidence that an overall "strong system of education, directed at both males and females, has a pacifying effect on civil war" (2006, p. 743).

Beyond general investment and enrollment in education, the specifics about who is enrolled and at what level of education are significant. Research suggests that, in many contexts, those who join rebellions are overwhelmingly young males who haven't received education; the hypothesis is that this group is easily manipulated by propaganda and finds the power of possessing and using arms alluring (Collier et al, 2003, p. 68). Dixon finds that the highest correlation between conflict and education indicators is a decrease in risk of conflict as secondary male enrollment increases (2009). Bilal Barakat and Henrik Urdal confirm that low secondary male enrollment increases conflict risk, especially in low- or lower-middle income countries with a youth bulge (2009). Thyne also finds that "secondary male enrollment has the strongest marginal effect when values are very low," which supports Collier and Hoeffler's (2004) rebel recruitment argument, suggesting secondary male enrollment is more relevant than primary enrollment and secondary male and female enrollment rates (2006, p. 744). The Political Instability Task Force also finds that secondary school enrollment has a statistically significant, negative relationship with conflict risk but is not as highly correlated as other measures, especially trade openness, countries in democratic transitions and infant mortality (Goldstone et al, 2000: p. 39).

Again, the nuances are important. Spending on education is not as strongly correlated to conflict risk as primary enrollment. Post secondary enrollment is not strongly correlated with a decreased probability of conflict as secondary enrollment, and increasing adult literacy and expenditures on education only has a marginal effect on civil war risk. Educational expenditures are often distributed unequally to the

university level, which disproportionately helps the wealthy, especially in poor societies. Increased education expenditures, therefore, could actually foment rebellion because they perpetuate (or intensify) existing social and economic inequality. While "efforts to improve education will have the strongest effects in countries where enrollment levels are extremely low. Once enrollment nears the 100% mark, increases in the variable will produce very little change in the probability of civil war" (Thyne, 2006, p. 744).

Overall, a number of statistical trends become visible regarding education's links to conflict and fragility. Primary and secondary enrollments matter, both as an indicator of state commitment to its population and as a minimizing effect on opportunity costs for joining a rebellion. Male secondary enrollments have an increased impact on reducing the likelihood of conflict. As these cross-country studies demonstrate, education is an important factor at the macro-level.

4.0   Evidence of education's context specific links to fragility and the risk of conflict

Similar to emerging evidence at the macro-level, we can extrapolate lessons from new context-specific evidence that is emerging as a result of increasing emphasis on expanding the base of qualitative, case study-focused evidence of the interfaces between conflict and fragility (Tebbe, 2008). All in all, a broader, deeper and more nuanced picture of education's influences on conflict and fragility is taking shape, providing knowledge about education's role in service delivery in conflict-affected and fragile contexts, as well as further analysis of the specifics of education's content, relevance, and quality in exacerbating or mitigating fragility in these contexts.

At a minimum, we know that delivery of education services plays a role in conflict and fragility with access, to various different types and levels of education, being a critical component in this relationship. Access as a quantitative measure that encompasses enrolling in, regularly attending and remaining in the education system until a certain phase of schooling has been completed, has proven itself as a contributing structural factor both exacerbating and mitigating conflict (Dupuy, 2008, p. 30). As Dupuy describes, there is now an extant body of evidence demonstrating that the lack of access to education contributed to the outbreak of conflict in places including Rwanda, Kosovo and Sierra Leone by serving as a grievance among fighting parties (2008, p. 33). The case of Liberia serves as an example where patterns of mass exclusion from the formal education system of indigenous children, comprising the bulk of the population, were widespread in the century prior to the outbreak of conflict in 1989. Cross-cutting exclusion in education – across gender, income and geographic lines – reflected broader patterns of social, economic and political exclusion in Liberian society which entrenched grievances contributing to civil war. Limited access to education is cited specifically in the Government of Liberia's Truth and Reconciliation Commission report as a "major root cause of the conflict" (cited in Williams, forthcoming). Informants in Liberia interviewed in September 2009[2] made a clear connection between the lack of education and the civil war with a common view "that the war was fought by uneducated people who had been manipulated by self-interested politicians and warlords" (Williams, forthcoming).

Though access is one critical component of the relationship between education and conflict/fragility, the range of other dimensions of education – including quality, relevance, management and equity – are of equal importance. Understanding the complex interfaces of education and conflict/fragility requires going beyond service delivery as a mitigating or exacerbating factor in conflict and fragility. While delivery of education has a structural role in conflict-affected and fragile states, education service delivery is not simply a black box, for which the components and mechanics are unimportant. In fact,

---

[2] These interviews took place as part of the data collection by the INEE-commissioned research team undertaking development of the Liberia study of the INEE Situational Analyses of Education and Fragility.

the "who," "how," "what" and "why" of services delivered are the often overlooked aspects of education delivery which interface with contexts of conflict and fragility in nuanced and subtle, but potentially exacerbating, ways. In other words, basic delivery of education is a necessary but insufficient factor in mitigating conflict and fragility; understanding the real interfaces of education and conflict/fragility requires attention to the range of other education dimensions listed above.

The interfaces of education and conflict/fragility

Education is a public good generally considered to be provided by the state. As such, education systems have the symbolic value of (re)establishing state legitimacy in the eyes of the population given their role as a site for daily interaction by the population with the state and as a barometer of the state's commitment to its people (Dupuy, 2008; Barakat, Karpinska and Paulson, 2008). At a national level, education underpins the maintenance and reproduction of political, economic and social structures (Dupuy, 2008, p. 29). In doing so, education can alter or entrench structural patterns and contradictions, socially, economically and politically, be they constructive or destructive. Additionally, education is a highly symbolic indicator of equity, linked to income earning potential and the ability to diminish or perpetuate inequalities. At the same time, the perception of inadequate educational service can often become a grievance that exacerbates fragility (Barakat, Karpinska and Paulson, 2008).

For individuals and communities, education can impact behavior and attitudes in a multitude of ways that may interface with conflict and fragility. Schools and classrooms can provide the space in which people of different origins can be brought together and taught how to live and work together peacefully (Thyne, 2006). For example, participatory processes both in classrooms and within school management practices have potential to build practices of cooperation and reciprocity both within and beyond schools (Wedge, 2008). Additionally the content and methods of imparting education have a role in mitigating fragility – peace education can have positive effects on students' attitudes, and teachers have the ability to impart values of tolerance of cultural differences and acceptance of diversity as well as fostering critical thinking and interactive skills among learners (Wedge, 2008; Barakat, Karpinska and Paulson, 2008). Education systems, and schools themselves, serve as locations where combined interests and objectives from a wide range of groups are addressed in attempts to establish agreement on the details of schooling but also common understandings of citizenship that the school system promotes (Thyne, 2006).

Equity and inclusion

Interfaces between educational equity and inclusion and fragility occur at individual and community levels as well as the national level. Equity encompasses not just equitable access to educational institutions and opportunities but also the equitable distribution of resources within the system itself (Dupuy, 2008, p. 37). Massively skewed distribution of educational – among other – resources in Liberia prior to the conflict perpetuated elitism and exclusion from larger society through differential access to and quality of educational opportunities to different groups. These entrenched deep divisions between those who were "modern, urban [i.e. based in and around the capital, Monrovia], schooled, advantaged, and employed in the formal economy [as opposed to those who were] traditional, rural, unschooled, disadvantaged, and engaged, if at all, in the informal or agricultural economy" (Williams, forthcoming). These divisions, which run between Americo-Liberians and indigenous Liberians were the main fault line for deep-seated grievances that exploded into civil war. This discrimination remains a feature of education in Liberia, despite state commitment to overcome prior segregation. Resources continue to be highly centered around the capital (for example, Liberia has only one tertiary institution outside of Monrovia) and systems are not yet in place to accommodate a more equitable system geographically (for example, many teachers outside of the capital have to travel to Monrovia to claim their monthly pay) (Williams, forthcoming). These continuing patterns of social exclusion pose major challenges to the post-war government to integrate marginalized sectors of the population and equalize opportunities to them.

Education policies or practices that exclude groups of citizens, contribute to broader patterns of exclusion, cutting individuals and groups off from the economic and social life of their communities and countries (Dupuy, 2008, p. 28). Equity and inclusion require efforts to reach marginalized and vulnerable populations of different age groups with educational services of equal quality and contextualized relevance. In post-war Liberia, there is a focus on primary education within the Ministry of Education and planning departments, which when combined with donor funding to ensure basic skills to a majority of the population, cross cuts geography, gender and income groups. However, given Liberia's past experience with engagement in violent conflict by young people who haven't received education, a lack of attention to post-primary may exacerbate fragility. This is especially true given that access at the secondary level is even more skewed by geography, income and gender than at the primary level (Williams, forthcoming). Given the documented and broadly recognized potential for the youth population to either strongly contribute to recovery or to become disillusioned with the process, the education system's inability to address youth issues is a serious concern that is currently not being addressed. For example, implementation of a youth policy has long been delayed and the policy is not in place yet. Liberia is a prime example of what national and international education communities are learning – that to focus only on access to basic or primary education is not sufficient to bring about long-term stability and development.

Identity is often intertwined with dynamics of equity and exclusion. Identity issues play out within education systems via language of instruction, curriculum, pedagogy, teaching of history and religion, among other areas. Where identity issues within education interact with social relations there is space for constructive nation-building around shared, common identities or incitement of identity politics and entrenchment of grievances, which has been the case in Bosnia-Herzegovina. While linguists consider Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian to be one language with three dialects, the constitution of Bosnia-Herzegovina recognizes them as three languages, and also enshrines the right of all children to be educated in their own language. This outward expression of respect for linguistic rights has in fact been used by each of the three major ethnic groups to justify the continuation of separate and segregated education, with results such as the infamous situation of "two schools under one roof" (Magill, forthcoming). Where language is so closely tied to ideas of identity, education has been manipulated by identity politics as "nationalistic efforts to differentiate the common language of BiH into three separate languages have 'become an excuse for the lack of cooperation in developing new curricula, textbooks and educational materials'" (cited in Magill, forthcoming, p. 19). The educational segregation exacerbates intolerance via entrenched conceptions of difference among the ethnic groups, and the impact of identity politics has meant that efforts at a shared curricula and materials have been hindered.

Education's contributions to broader patterns of exclusion can have immediate impacts or take shape over time. In Cambodia, for example, where political, social and economic disenfranchisement creates grievances among all but the most privileged, educational inequity in terms of access and quality can entrench this over time. Enrollment is already differentiated by wealth; "the percentage of children not in school by wealth quintile shows 35% (poorest quintile), 26%, 20%, 13% and 6% (richest quintile not enrolled. Furthermore, inequalities widen progressively by wealth quintile as children progress" to higher levels of education within the system" (cited in INEE/IIEP UNESCO, forthcoming). The role of wealth in equity in education runs deeper than enrollment though, by contributing to wealthy Cambodians' sense of entitlement. Tense social disparities are cemented by the rush of upper class Cambodians towards private educational institutions out of the reach of the vast majority of the population. Additionally, a tendency among this group "to receive education in English at the expense of Khmer (which some wealthy do not speak well) serves to further distance them from the majority of the population" (INEE/IIEP UNESCO, forthcoming).

Relevance via content and quality

Education's role in socialization is well-recognized. Schooling impacts on individuals' ability to think critically, manage and resolve conflict, and form interpersonal relationships. Violence can also be

learned, in contexts where violence is taught (for example, via messages in curriculum and textbooks) or used against others (such as through corporal punishment), and made to seem acceptable. En masse, these individual impacts affect "interpersonal and intergroup relationships through the transmission of beliefs, behaviors, values and attitudes to students" (Dupuy, 2008, p. 44).

Messages in curriculum and textbooks are an often-cited example of education's interface with conflict and fragility, but there are differential effects of this in different contexts. In Afghanistan, for example, the Ministry of Education missed a window of opportunity during the 2002-2003 UNICEF Back to School campaign to remove messages of hate and intolerance from the curricula. According to Sigsgaard, "while most explicit incitements to violence were removed, references to mistrust of descendants of Ali (that is, prejudicial references to Shi'a Muslims) were not. Millions of children were thereby introduced to a culturally-insensitive curriculum that did not represent non-Pashto, non-Sunni histories and culture" (2009, p. 20). These textbooks were printed and are still in use (Sigsgaard, 2009). There is a risk that socialization towards intolerance of difference will exacerbate social tensions over time in Afghanistan given that these messages were not removed. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, however, the international community's focus on removal of hate messages from textbooks after the war resulted in the politicization of education reform discussions, entrenching "intractable questions about political control over education resources and content" (cited in Magill, forthcoming). In this case, the attempts to enhance messages of tolerance and diversity in textbooks had the unintended consequence of politicizing education and thereby exacerbating political and identity divisions.

Similar to its socialization role education interfaces with fragility in regard to economic relevance in a myriad of important ways. The ability of education to link to livelihoods, economic opportunities, mobility and increased standards of living is critical to avoid entrenching disparities and development of grievances. When education cannot meet these expectations, the results among various sectors of the population can be frustration and disillusionment. In Cambodia in the years leading up to the genocide under the Khmer Rouge, for example, the expansion of education created a newly educated cadre without economic opportunities. The irrelevance of their formal education skill-set, ill-suited to a majority agrarian economy and coupled with unrealistic but historically ingrained expectations that graduates would obtain jobs in the civil service, helped contribute to resentment and eventual radicalization amongst some graduates because of the massive unemployment issues they faced (INEE/IIEP UNESCO, forthcoming).

Macro-level economic growth and development, which require educated and trained populations, are necessary for reducing horizontal disparities in a country (Dupuy, 2008, p. 70). Without linking education systems to economic development and employability, among other things, education can stunt development, decreasing the likelihood of reducing disparities which contribute to grievance and increasing unemployment, which is highly destabilizing (Dupuy, 2008, p. 71). In Liberia, for example, the post-conflict Accelerated Learning Program (ALP) have not led to livelihoods for many participants, who instead became part of a large, unemployed youth population. Graduates of the ALP programs themselves have complained that the training they receive does not get them jobs because the ALP curriculum doesn't include vocational or technical components. At the same time, lack of youth livelihood training is recognized as a major contributor to fragility (Williams, forthcoming). The opportunity costs of joining a rebellion lessen when there is a lack of job opportunities and even those with high levels of education cannot be guaranteed a living wage (Dupuy, 2008, pg. 72-3).

Management, structures and participation

Structures of education systems, the management of them and the participation of stakeholders within them similarly interact with fragility at individual, community and national levels. The way in which the management functions and processes of education systems are laid out, and how stakeholders' participation is facilitated within them can foster constructive interactions and relationship building, or promote distrust and entrench intolerance. Participation in school management processes have the potential to be a means for building relationships outside of the school built on trust, cooperation and

reciprocity (Dupuy, 2008, pg. 59). In a constructive scenario, such participation can promote citizenship skills and social inclusion, developing positive social relationships at a local level that can be mirrored in wider social inclusion practices (Dupuy, 2008, p. 61-63). However, ill-judged and managed participation can also be restrictive, tokenistic and destructive. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, for example, school management is delegated to school boards which, through government instruction, must include at least one minority board member for schools with 10% minority students (Magill, forthcoming). Implementation of this instruction has been problematic, however, with tokenistic representation or even disregard for the governmental instruction, which has led to resentment. These problems are compounded by political pressure exerted on school boards by members of government, education officials and political parties trying to influence day-to-day running of schools (Magill, forthcoming).

Decentralization policies and practices have the potential to increase equity, improve relevance and help solve a range of other local-level educational challenges, particularly by fostering better linkages between the government and communities. However, depending on how decentralization is implemented, it can work against participation and have negative effects on local relationships (Dupuy, 2008, 65). In the case of Cambodia, decentralization policies put in place over recent years have questionable results for the increased participation of communities; for benefit of improved education at local levels; and for the potential of decentralised management processes to foster practices and relationships that can contribute to mitigating fragility. Efforts have been made to promote community participation and decision-making with the introduction of decentralised budgeting through Priority Action Plans (PAP) and Programme-Based Budget (PB). However, a culture of fear, silence and distrust is prevalent in communities, which hinders effective participation. Most respondents to interviews in Cambodia (in June 2009) were reluctant to discuss community issues, impacts of programmes on the community and the potential challenges. Additionally, it is not clear whether these policies of decentralization have in fact decentralised power and influence (i.e. control over budgets and decision-making) or have simply decentralised tasks and activities (e.g. monitoring and reporting responsibilities) (INEE/IIEP UNESCO, forthcoming).

A focus on nuance

The ways in which education impacts on fragility as demonstrated above just begin to scratch the surface of complexity of the inter-relationships between education and fragility. In fact, the interactions between education and fragility cannot be neatly organized within the range of educational aspects (such as equity, relevance, management, etc.), or even within frameworks of fragility (e.g. domains of fragility including security, governance, social, economic and environment). The most critical interfaces between education and conflict or fragility are the most subtle, where the education system interacts with the dynamics of fragility within a complex network of interlinking factors that play out within a subtle, complicated framework of state and community capacity and wilt relationships which range along a continuum from weak to strong[3]. Their potential or real contribution to either exacerbating or mitigating risk of conflict is rarely immediately clear but demands attention.

Recommendations

The expanding evidence base delineated above allows for a number of conclusions from which recommendations can be made about how education policy, planning and programming should consider the subtle, detailed interfaces of education's role in conflict and fragility as service delivery and beyond. At the core of these conclusions is the understanding that the nuances of education must be interrogated in order to ensure that education at a minimum does no harm and at its best, serves to mitigate conflict and fragility. The INEE Working Group on Education and Fragility would thereby

---

[3] For example, see footnote number 1 for the categories on the OECD-DAC continuum of fragility.

propose a number of recommendations for education policy, planning and programming based on this emerging evidence and understanding.

Both the World Bank 2011 World Development Report and the 2011 EFA Global Monitoring Report will put forth recommendations for policymakers and practitioners to undertake in order to enhance broad development and education goals while mitigating fragility and building peace. The Working Group proposes that both reports include the following recommendations:

Education is more than service delivery
Education must be recognized for the diversity of roles it plays in conflict-affected and fragile contexts, namely,
- as a stabilizing factor, and therefore as a service that should be delivered;
- as a potential source for contributing to the likelihood of conflict and perpetuation of fragility; and
- as a potential means to mitigate conflict, contribute to state-building and build more resilient societies.

Education must be considered from a quality as well as access framework
Education's capacity to mitigate conflict and fragility requires a focus beyond access to a range of other educational dimensions. A focus on quality is critical. Curriculum must be relevant to the social, political and economic contexts to enable learners to take advantage of or contribute to the creation of sustainable livelihood opportunities, and both curriculum and teaching methods must be inclusive and free of bias in order for education to contribute to mitigating conflict and fragility, particularly in the longer term.

Analysis of education's role(s) in conflict and fragility is indispensable as the basis for education policy, planning and programming to ensure that education does not exacerbate conflict and fragility
The nuances of education's many interfaces with conflict and fragility are context-specific and seldom straightforward. In-depth knowledge of these interfaces is fundamental to developing policy, planning and programming for education in situations of conflict and fragility that ensures the principle of "do no harm" and may also contribute to long-term peacebuilding. Understanding the multiple, nuanced influences of education on conflict and fragility requires comprehensive qualitative analysis including a) through examination of the drivers and dynamics of conflict and fragility and b) analysis of education's interactions with those drivers and dynamics. Conflict analysis or assessments should include a full education sector diagnosis using fragility indicators as one of the core components of the assessment. Likewise conflict/fragility analysis should be included in the educational planning and sector review processes.

Analysis should also draw on extant quantitative data. Education data exist, are available and should be used increasingly in careful analyses related to conflict, and its prevention and mitigation. See Annex A for further information on existing education data.

Taking a holistic perspective of the education system is essential in conflict-affected and fragile contexts
A focus on primary/basic education is not sufficient in order to ensure that education mitigates conflict and fragility. Evidence suggests that secondary education, for example, has a critical role to play in mitigating conflict and fragility. Additionally, education's capacity to build social capital and contribute to sustainable livelihoods and economic and other forms of development requires attention to a range of educational opportunities. A holistic perspective on the education system must be ensured, including consideration given to secondary and higher education, as well as to alternative modes of delivery for children and youth who have missed educational opportunities.

ANNEX A. Data on education in conflict-affected and fragile contexts

In a development and humanitarian aid context that is increasingly looking to evidence to guide actions and investments, reliable data on education systems and their performance is extremely important. In arguing that education has a much larger role than mere service delivery in relation to conflict it is incumbent that there be a commitment to improve the amount and use of available data on education to address service delivery during and after conflict as well as to better understand the role of education in both mitigating and promoting conflict.

Fortunately, at the global level, data on education has improved significantly over the last decade. It is available for more countries, for an increasing number of indicators, and, increasingly, at the sub-national as well as national level. The emergence of the Education for All (EFA) Global Monitoring Report (GMR) as a key source on progress and issues in education provides a "consensus" point on both definitions and data. Regarding definitions, its development uses a consultative and research-based approach for identifying and describing issues. With regard to data it uses the key data sources that are internationally recognized[4]. That is, they are reliable and have been "cleaned". Thus, INEE proposes that data from these sources, including the compilation and analysis that is provided in the EFA GMR, be used in other global analyses.

There are at least two key data challenges that immediately come to play—how to define a state or region that is in conflict and how to get data on education in a situation that is extremely fluid at best, and may have broken down altogether at worst. From an education perspective there have been several attempts to define conflict and/or fragility resulting in "country lists"[5]. Different definitions of conflict and fragility using different metrics lead to different lists of countries—the content of these lists varies somewhat, but not greatly. The time is right to begin to amalgamate these approaches as has been done in the 2010 EFA GMR.

With regard to education data in an ongoing conflict situation there are two key data trajectories. In terms of looking at education's relationship with conflict (mitigating or encouraging), it is becoming much easier to do trend analysis with education data due to the improvements in the data sets. One source for this is the Education Policy and Data Center (EPDC). The EPDC (www.epdc.org) houses data from the data bases mentioned in footnote 4 in a single searchable data base and provides tools for presenting data, relating different indicators, identifying trends, and producing projections with different assumptions.

These data also provide a useful backdrop for concerns about the second trajectory, service provision. They give information on such things as how many schools were operating, enrolment and transition rates over time, teacher allocations, and financial investments. If governance has broken down and there is a need to respond to the need to reallocate spaces due to internal migration or to change curriculum, for example, it is likely that the best source for current data is through the IASC cluster process, which provides for rapid data collection on the ground as early as during the conflict. Minimum standards for education in emergencies have been agreed to through the Inter-Agency Network on Education in Emergencies (INEE) and tools exist for data collection.[6] Module 1 of the referenced Joint Needs Assessment Toolkit lists core education domains on which education data are

---

[4] Sources include the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) data base (primarily administrative data), the EdStats data base housed at the World Bank, household surveys such as the US Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS), and UNICEF-supported Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS), as well as additional data provided by countries.
[5] See, for example, *Last in Line Last in School* published by Save the Children, the joint publications on education in emergencies by CfBT and the IIEP, and the GMR 2010, published by UNESCO, *Reaching the Marginalized*.
[6] *Education Cluster Joint Needs Assessment Toolkit for Education in Emergencies*, IASC, 2009. Available on the INEE website www.ineesite.org

collected and the IASC Education Cluster is engaged in a purposeful activity related to knowledge management for education in these situations. While this data may not be as "clean" as data from the cited databases, it usually reflects reality at a particular point in time.

A third data challenge, which deserves research, is the amount of data, and on which indicators, that is useful for either immediate service delivery in an area affected by conflict or that can address issues around the predictability of conflict and the role of education in either mitigating or encouraging conflict. Data in and of itself is somewhat limited. But, through careful analysis, data can and does provide important insights. In particular, analysis that takes into account the unique context, including the political "landscape", helps make data much more meaningful and useful. (This is discussed in more detail in the body of this paper.) Thus, data can provide information on needs for service delivery, but can also be considered as possible indicators of impending state fragility.

References

Barakat, Bilal and Henrik Urdal (2009). "Breaking the Waves: Does Education Mediate the Relationship between Youth Bulges and Political Violence?" World Bank Policy Research Working Paper, No. 5114.

Barakat, Bilal, Zuki Karpinska and Julia Paulson (2008) "Desk Study: Education and Fragility," Conflict and Education Research Group (CERG), Oxford University, for the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE).

Collier, Paul and Anke Hoeffler (2004). "Greed and Grievance in Civil War," Oxford Economic Papers Vol. 56, No. 4.

Collier, Paul, Lani Elliott, Håvard Hegre, Anke Hoeffler, Marta Reynal-Querol and Nicholas Sambanis (2003). *Breaking the Conflict Trap: Civil War and Development Policy.* Washington, World Bank.

Collier, Paul (2007). *The Bottom Billion: Why the Poorest Countries Are Failing and What Can Be Done about It.* Oxford, UK, Oxford University Press.

Collier, Paul, Anke Hoeffler, and Dominic Rohner (2009). "Beyond Greed and Grievance: Feasibility and Civil War," Oxford Economic Papers 61, No. 1, pp. 1–27.

Dixon, Jeffrey (2009). "What Causes Civil Wars? Integrating Quantitative Research Findings." *International Studies Quarterly.* Vol. 11, No. 4, pp. 707-735.

Dupuy, Kendra (2008). "Education for Peace: Building Peace and Transforming Armed Conflict Through Education Systems." Save the Children Norway.

Fearon and Laitin (2003). "Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War." *American Political Science Review.* Vol. 97, No. 1, pp. 75-90.

Goldstone, Jack A., Ted Robert Gurr, Barbara Harff, Marc A. Levy, Monty G. Marshall, Robert H. Bates, David L. Epstein, Colin H. Kahl, Pamela T. Surko, John C. Ulfelder and Alan N. Ulger (2000). *State Failure Task Force: Phase III Findings.* Political Instability Task Force.

Magill,Clare (Forthcoming) "Education and Fragility in Bosnia and Herzegovina." INEE and IIEP/UNESCO.

Miller-Grandvaux, Yolande (2009). "Education and Fragility: A New Framework," *Journal of Education for International Development.* Vol. 4, No. 1.

O'Malley, Brendan (2010). *Education Under Attack 2010.* Paris, UNESCO.

Rice, Susan E., Corinne Graff, and Janet Lewis (2006). "Poverty and Civil War: What Policymakers Need to Know," Global Economy and Development Working Paper. Washington, Brookings Institute.

Sambanis, Nicholas (2002). "A Review of Recent Advances and Future Directions in the Literature on Civil War," *Defense and Peace Economics.* Vol. 13, No. 6, pp. 215–43

Sambanis, Nicholas (2004). "Poverty and the Organization of Political Violence: A Review and Some Conjectures," unpublished paper. Yale University.

Sambanis, Nicholas (2004). "Using Case Studies to Expand Economic Models of Civil War," *Perspectives on Politics.* Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 259–79.

Sigsgaard, Morten (2009). "Education and Fragility in Afghanistan," INEE and IIEP/UNESCO.

Tebbe, Kerstin (2009). "Global Trends for Education to Support Stability and Resilience: Research, Programming and Finance," *Journal of Education for International Development.* Vol. 4, No. 1.

Thyne, Clayton (2006). "ABC's, 123's, and the Golden Rule: The Pacifying Effect of Education on Civil War, 1980-1999." *International Studies Quarterly.* Vol. 50, pp. 733-754.

United Nations (2005). "The inequality predicament: report on the World Social Situation". UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

UNESCO (2010). "Education for All (EFA) Global Monitoring Report 2010: Reaching the Marginalized", Paris, UNESCO.

Wedge, Joanna (2008) "Where Peace Begins: Education's Role in Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding." International Save the Children Alliance.

Williams, James (Forthcoming) "Education and Fragility in Liberia," INEE and IIEP/UNESCO.

(Forthcoming) "Education and Fragility in Cambodia." INEE and IIEP/UNESCO.