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Today

- Introduce education-conflict-fragility project + key findings
  - Dutch partner countries

- Present conceptual space of fragility definitions
  - Consider implications for education
  - Using select Dutch partner countries

- Discuss fragility indices and their implications

- Conclusions and Questions
The effect of conflict on education

- “Conflict is destroying opportunities for education on a global scale”
- “Conflict can reverse achievements in education”
- Conflict affected countries among the furthest from achieving EFA goals
Questioning the mainstream narrative

- The ‘mainstream narrative’ relies on ‘worst-case bias’

- Education is “a development indicator that again appears to improve during many periods of warfare”

- “If policy-makers are concerned with low educational outcomes in wartime, then policy needs to address their root causes – i.e. those that predate the fighting. Here an obvious candidate is state fragility.”
Data Sources

- Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP)
  - Criteria used in EFA GMR for 1999-2008 (UNESCO, 2011; 138)
  - Conflicts with total of 1,000 “Battle Deaths” (or 200 in past 4 years)
  - Yields 39 countries between 2000-2012 (same as GMR for 1999-2008)

- Educational Outcomes
  - Primary and Secondary Net Enrolment Rates (NER) from UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2000 – 2012)
  - At least 4 instances over the period

- State Fragility Index: (Centre for Systemic Peace)
  - Composite indicator, measuring Fragility on a scale of 1 – 25.
  - Includes indicators on governance, economics, social development and security
Multilevel regression shows that conflict-affected countries have lower 2000 baselines and higher levels of growth.

But, controlling for the baseline, conflict-affected countries have lower rates growth.

So, conflict does have a negative effect on educational enrolment.
When we add a fragility variable (SFI), the effect is much larger than conflict.

Conflict is no longer significant.

This is consistent with the HSR's argument that fragility is an underlying cause of conflict and low growth in enrolment.
Fragility versus Conflict
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO DATA</td>
<td>Afghanistan, Palestinian Territories, Sudan, Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFLICT, FRAGILITY, LOW ENROLMENT</td>
<td>Burundi, Ethiopia, Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFLICT, FRAGILITY, HIGH ENROLMENT</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO CONFLICT, FRAGILITY, LOW ENROLMENT</td>
<td>Benin, Ghana, Kenya, Mali, Mozambique, Yemen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO CONFLICT, FRAGILITY, HIGH ENROLMENT</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTLIER</td>
<td>Indonesia (conflict, fragility, high enrolment: contrary to expectation, enrolment increases)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“No consensus on what that problem is or on what the terms ‘fragility’ and ‘fragile states’ encompass and exclude” (Bengtsson 2011, 34)

- Governance
- Conflict / security
- Development outcomes
- Donor relationship

‘States are fragile when state structures lack political will and/or capacity to provide the basic functions needed for poverty reduction, development and to safeguard the security and human rights of their population.’ (OECD/DAC 2007, p. 2).
**Coding of Donor Definitions**

- 17 definitions from donor document. Coded based on keywords
- Analysed using multidimensional scaling (MDS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aid Resources</th>
<th>Expectations</th>
<th>Poverty Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>Functions</td>
<td>Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConflictPeace</td>
<td>Instability</td>
<td>Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis</td>
<td>Institutions</td>
<td>Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>Willing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Political Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview
Coded “Peace and Conflict”
Coded: Legitimacy
Coded: Poverty Reduction
Coded: Resilience
Capacity & Services vs. Peace & Conflict
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A Conceptual Space of Fragility
Definitions

- Development/Poverty Reduction
- Conflict
- Legitimacy/State-Society
- Capacity and Governance

References:
- OECD.2013
- OECD.2010
- OECD.2008
- OECD.2007
- OECD.2007
- EU.2007
- WB.2005
- USAID.2014
- USAID.2005
- OECD.2006
- USDos.2008
- AusAid.2011
- GlZ.2012
- WB.2002
- DFID.2005
- DFID.2004
+ implications for education

Education: social cohesion, inequality and employment challenges

Education: fragmentation, corruption and inefficiency challenges

Education: access, equity, infrastructure and quality challenges

Education: human capital, service delivery and reconciliation challenges

Legitimacy - state - society

Development / Poverty reduction

Capacity / governance

Conflict
Education: Human capital, service delivery and reconciliation challenges
“USAID/Colombia’s support for transition out of internal armed conflict is based on the hypothesis that strengthening state presence and legitimacy through improved democratic governance and addressing conflict victims’ needs will create the conditions in the short term that are necessary to establish sustainable peace over the long term... Colombia must promote reconciliation among all citizens, protect human rights and provide access to justice and basic services to improve people’s lives.” (USAID Development Strategy 2013/17)
Ethiopia

- Enrolment growth limited by fragility and conflict
- High ODA environment – multiple understandings of fragility
- “The Ethiopia General Education Quality Improvement Project [USD 550 million – WB + DFID main contributors] will help students gain proficiency in mathematics, the sciences and languages and aims to improve learning conditions. It will work towards these goals by improving the curriculum, making more textbooks available, and strengthening the National Learning Assessment and school inspection systems.” (World Bank 2013).
Education: social cohesion, inequality and employment challenges
Ghana

- Enrolment growth limited by fragility
- Legitimacy and poverty reduction / development challenges
- Education: social cohesion, inequality and quality challenges

“The objective of the Ghana Country Partnership Strategy 2013-2016 is to assist government to sustain economic growth, accelerate poverty reduction and enhance the shared prosperity in a sustainable manner.” (World Bank Strategy Overview 2013)

- Vocational training mentioned, along with jobs and inequality in access to social services
Education: Access, equity, infrastructure and quality challenges
Bangladesh

- High enrolment declining marginally
- Conflict + poverty reduction / development challenges
- Education: access, equity, infrastructure and employment challenges

“Becoming a middle-income country will require substantial efforts on many fronts. These include maintaining macroeconomic stability; strengthening revenue mobilization; tackling energy and infrastructure deficits; deepening financial-sector and external trade reforms; improving labor skills, economic governance and urban management; and adapting to climate change.” (World Bank country overview 2014)

- Education not mentioned in overview (though jobs, youth and skills are)
Utility of the conceptual space?

- Interpretive framework shows ideological **differences between donors** and potential difficulties in arriving at a shared understanding.

- Highlights potential implications of **different views of fragility** for **different education priorities**.

- Some tentative alignment with high level in country priorities.

- Further definitional problems:
  - WB’s 2014 harmonised list of fragile states
  - Conflict + fragility data
  - Assumes policy logic and coherence that is likely not the case in practice
  - Opposite of fragility towards which actors are working
    - Security?
    - Development?
    - Liberal democracy?
    - Resilience?
Fragility Indices

- Analysis of 11 indices of fragility
- Combine measures of governance, violence, conflict, and policies
- In most cases, combined and weighted by the authors of the index

AfDB CPIA - African Development Bank CPIA,
BTI - Bertelsmann Stiftung’s Transformation Index
CIFP - Country Indicators for Foreign Policy
EIU - Economist Intelligence Unit Political Instability
FSI - Failed State Index
GPI - Global Peace Index
IIAG - Ibrahim Index of African Governance
ISW - Index of State Weakness
SFI-State Fragility Index
WB CPIA - World Bank CPIA
WGI-World Governance Indicators
Fragility Indices

AfDB.CPIA - African Development Bank CPIA
BTI - Bertelsmann Stiftung's Transformation Index
CIFP - Country Indicators for Foreign Policy
EIU - Economist Intelligence Unit Political Instability
FSI - Failed State Index
GPI - Global Peace Index
IIAG - Ibrahim index of African Governance
ISW - Index of State Weakness
SFI-State Fragility Index
WB.CPIA - World Bank CPIA
WSI-World Governance Indicators
### Partner Countries – Fragility Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>WB.CPIA</th>
<th>WGI</th>
<th>AfDB.CPIA</th>
<th>ISW</th>
<th>IIAG</th>
<th>BTI</th>
<th>EIU</th>
<th>CIFP</th>
<th>FSI</th>
<th>GPI</th>
<th>SFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>95.90</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>89.70</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>44.69</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>95.30</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>64.14</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Percentage Rankings (low = good)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>WB.CPIA</th>
<th>WGI</th>
<th>AfDB.CPIA</th>
<th>ISW</th>
<th>IIAG</th>
<th>BTI</th>
<th>EIU</th>
<th>CIFP</th>
<th>FSI</th>
<th>GPI</th>
<th>SFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Findings

- Key parameters for modelling conflict and enrolment:
  - Baseline (overall enrolment level)
  - Conflict
  - Fragility

- For two countries with an equal starting point, conflict-affected countries have lower growth.

- Fragility is not a "unique and solvable problem" (Bengtsson 2011):
  - Measurements of fragility are actually theories about how a state should operate.
  - Definitions vary by donor and time, emphasising poverty reduction and aid, legitimacy and state-society relations, conflict/peace and state capacity.
  - Fragility is state-centric and endogenous rather than systemic.
Future Research

- Relating the “dimensions of fragility” to educational outcomes
  - Modelling institutions, conflict, legitimacy as separate variables

- Looking at outcomes more broadly
  - Gender parity
  - Human capital development (total attainment)
  - Longer term trends (1960s/70s – present)
  - Spatial data within nation-states
## Appendix: Conflict Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1 Primary</th>
<th>Model 1 Secondary</th>
<th>Model 2 Primary</th>
<th>Model 2 Secondary</th>
<th>Model 3+ Primary</th>
<th>Model 3+ Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>87.13**</td>
<td>66.64**</td>
<td>87.16**</td>
<td>66.70**</td>
<td>85.68**</td>
<td>64.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>-12.95**</td>
<td>-25.61**</td>
<td>-13.09**</td>
<td>-25.61**</td>
<td>-1.88**</td>
<td>-4.11**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.70**</td>
<td>0.61**</td>
<td>1.02**</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.83**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>0.70*</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
<td>-1.08**</td>
<td>-1.88**</td>
<td>-0.15**</td>
<td>-0.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-0.14**</td>
<td>-0.10**</td>
<td>-0.14**</td>
<td>-0.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Std. Dev.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>17.03</td>
<td>25.88</td>
<td>16.99</td>
<td>25.93</td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>25.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residuals</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>8797</td>
<td>6849</td>
<td>8806</td>
<td>6856</td>
<td>8815</td>
<td>6865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIC</td>
<td>8840</td>
<td>6890</td>
<td>8863</td>
<td>6911</td>
<td>8863</td>
<td>6911</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05      ** p < 0.01

* Continuous conflict variable
## Appendix: Fragility Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 5*</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>93.61**</td>
<td>78.93**</td>
<td>103.45**</td>
<td>93.95**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>-4.50</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragility</td>
<td>-20.43**</td>
<td>-40.91**</td>
<td>-2.29**</td>
<td>-4.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.52**</td>
<td>-0.42*</td>
<td>2.62**</td>
<td>-2.65**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>-0.17**</td>
<td>0.06**</td>
<td>-0.17**</td>
<td>0.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragility</td>
<td>-2.56**</td>
<td>2.99**</td>
<td>-0.27**</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Deviation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>15.59</td>
<td>19.96</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td>16.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residuals</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>7470</td>
<td>5379</td>
<td>7452</td>
<td>5351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIC</td>
<td>7527</td>
<td>5433</td>
<td>7510</td>
<td>5405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05  ** p < 0.01  * Continuous conflict and fragility variables