

Educational Administration Challenges in the Destabilised and Disintegrating States of Syria and Yemen: The Intersectionality of Violence, Culture, Ideology, Class/Status Group and Postcoloniality in the Middle East

Eugenie Samier
University of Strathclyde

Abstract:

This chapter examines internationalising the educational administration field to include countries classified as conflict zones by international agencies, and the conditions under which school communities operate. To achieve this, a new type of intersectionality theory is proposed that includes the conditions and factors of ‘collapsed’ or ‘disintegrating’ states like Syria and Yemen experiencing high levels of conflict and humanitarian crises. The purpose of this chapter is three-fold in covering populations rarely represented in the literature: 1) conditions in Syria and Yemen and the region that are extreme and life-threatening where trauma is systemic and access to resources and infrastructure is limited or no longer exists; 2) identity-based, Western-based intersectionality theory modified to include educational experience in high conflict zones characterised by extreme violence and human rights violations; 3) recommendations and guidelines developed for education by the UN and NGOs during crisis and wartime, and the difficult circumstances of reconstruction after sufficient peace is established.

There are approximately 350 million children living in areas affected by conflict today, ... Many of these children have been subjected to unimaginable suffering. They are not just caught in the crossfire or treated by combatants as expendable collateral damage, but often deliberately and

systematically targeted. They are killed, maimed, and raped. They are bombed in their schools and in their homes. They are abducted, tortured, and recruited by armed groups to fight and to work as porters, cooks and sex slaves. ... Children living in conflict-affected settings are less likely to be in school or have access to basic sanitation and clean water, and more likely to die in childhood due to under-nutrition and a lack of medical care, including vaccinations. Recent studies have shown high levels of toxic stress in children who have lived in or fled from war zones, which can have a lifelong impact on their mental health and development. (Kirolos et al., *The War on Children*, 2018, p. 8)

Introduction

This chapter explores a set of conditions that need to be addressed if the field of educational administration is to truly be internationalised, that is, educational administrators ‘in extremis’ in countries and communities coping with conditions of continual violence – whether physical, emotional, psychological or social – where massive human rights violations are taking place (Paulson, 2009). Destruction can be physical through war, an oppressive regime, and famine, but also of identity, community, culture and other individual, social and cultural constructions that sustain humanity, all of which affect education and which educational professionals can help mitigate. Smith (2005) suggests four socio-political categories that need to be used to adequately examine education in conflict conditions, for each of which different priorities and concerns exist within differing policy, security, administrative and practice contexts: relatively stable and peaceful conditions; violent conflict; an early transition period of reconstruction; and longer term peace and reconciliation. It is also important, he argues, to recognise the many roles education can play – as a tool of conflict, repression and violence, a means to carry out nation-building and reconstruction, and as a means of preventing the rise of extremist groups, although the efficacy of

education in all of these varies considerably if other socio-political forces are strong (see also Bush & Salterelli, 2000).

The challenges for school teachers and heads in ‘failed’ or ‘collapsed’ states like Syria and Yemen include a complex set of factors that produce an extremely violent and insecure environment of war, terrorism, mortality, epidemics (Chatty, 2017) as well as high levels of trauma and severe deprivations creating humanitarian crises. The focus here - Syria and Yemen - are two of ten of the most dangerous countries for children (Kirolos et al., 2018). They are undergoing catastrophic disruption and fragmentation of social institutions that challenge most of the theories and models in the field of educational administration predicated primarily upon stable Western English-speaking countries. New approaches in the field need to be developed to address problems educational administrators face in many countries, along with teachers, students and families, that could provide guidance and support under these conditions. A number of initiatives have been developed by scholars like Bush and Saltarelli (2000) who define the dual manner in which education is involved in such conflicts – the weaponisation of education in repressing selected populations, and the use of education to mitigate conflict. NGOs characterising and classifying education in these contexts including the World Bank, the OECD’s Fragile States Group, and the UN Peacebuilding Commission (Ellison, 2012).

Internationalisation of the field has begun with important studies like Dimmock and Walker (2005), contributions from scholars from non-Western contexts (Samier & ElKaleh, 2019; Wan, Lee & Loke, 2019) who have also contributed to expanding the field to more comprehensively reflect global conditions and developments, some of which are postcolonial (Lo & Haron, 2016), and others indigenously derived (Zane, 2015). However, there are few sources about countries with significant levels of conflict such as war, invasion, and political collapse, or where drought and other natural forces as well as large numbers of refugees have created humanitarian crises, or

have focussed on post-conflict reconstruction (Cerna, 2019). Some of the notable sources of educational post-conflict reconstruction are Goddard's (2004) study in Kosovo, Ellison's (2012) in Sierra Leone, and Barakat et al.'s (2013) examination of post-conflict recovery where the critical role of educational administration can help create peace and rebuild. Wanjiru's (2019) study in Kenya produced a conceptual framework for how school leadership can achieve inclusive cultures in a post-conflict school consisting of a multi-dimensional diagnosis of context (resources, socio-emotional concerns, leadership possibilities and teacher participation) and authentic local structures of educational capacity (proactive engagement, consensus-building, and recognition and investment in teacher capacities).

Given the extreme conditions of Syria and Yemen, there is little recent data available from academic sources resulting in a heavy reliance on journalistic sources, UN and NGO reports, media accounts and various local groups able to collect and distribute information. Other important sources are documentary films risking the lives of filmmakers and often needing to be covertly made and smuggled out, such as Feras Fayyad's (2017) *Last Men in Aleppo*, about the White Helmut volunteers who rescued victims and recovered bodies after military strikes, Matthew Heineman's (2017) *City of Ghosts* that follows a group of citizen journalists in Raqqa, Syria, and Van Leeuw's (2017) *In Syria*, a dramatic film chronicling the events of a woman's struggle to keep her family safe in a barricaded Damascus flat. Film is an important source where conducting academic research is impossible - it is one of the few ways to record in a meaningful and direct manner the pain, loss, trauma, devastation and fear experienced by teachers, school heads, students and families. All too often their shattered bodies are witness to gross atrocities within which 'education' is located, with often the only option is escape as a refugee where conditions there may also be dire. It is only in entering this world that anything authentic, moral and constructive can possibly be said about education and schools if understanding is achieved.

The purpose of this chapter is three-fold in providing more voice for educators in extreme conditions who are rarely represented in the literature. The first section describes conditions in Syria and Yemen and the region that create a context within which schools and their staff try to function, characterised by extreme and life-threatening circumstances (Pradhan, 2017), where trauma is systemic (Kira et al., 2014), and where access to resources and infrastructure is extremely limited, if available at all. The second is to extend identity-based, largely Western-based intersectionality theory to include educational experience in high conflict conditions that allows for a consideration of historical and contextual factors (including third party governmental and non-governmental actors), educational conditions, and the experiential dimensions of those affected, such as ‘toxic stress’ (Kirollos et al., 2018). Many of these factors are not currently used in building an intersectionality model that includes power hierarchies (Smooth, 2013), inequities, and human rights problems (Hill Collins and Bilge, 2016) found in high conflict zones. And the third aim is identifying recommendations and guidelines that have been developed in NGOs and some academic literature for school heads and teachers during crisis and wartime (Pepper et al., 2010), and the very difficult circumstances of reconstruction after sufficient peace is established (Arnhold et al., 1998).

The argument here is that the field of educational administration has a much larger role to fulfil in research and teaching that can better equip educational staff in zones where reconstruction can take place involving the community and youth themselves and in refugee havens. This requires introducing conceptions and vocabulary that can authentically represent the nature of these experiences, although significant steps have been taken by some in exploring the educational experience of refugees from violent conflict, for example, studies of Syrian refugee children in Turkey (Arar, Örucü and Küçükçayır, 2018, 2019a 2019b; McCarthy, 2018) requiring a rethinking of educational administration to include the roles of politics, policy and educational administrators’ practices.

The main influence of neoliberalism in this context is the fundamental failure of its ideology to incorporate or address any values other than the economic ones that define its character. From an economic and market perspective, education becomes objectification and commodified, thereby becoming detached from other systems of meaning, values and purposes. In its exported form it becomes globalization, which for education includes curriculum and pedagogy that effectively colonizes the mind, values, conceptions of authority, organizational culture and aims or ends that are defined economically. This 'poverty' of neoliberalism means that it does not have the conceptions and capacity to respond to human crises where other values are at stake, like human rights and the preservation or rebuilding of societies (Di Leo, 2017; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2009; Smyth, 2017; Spring, 2015).

Historical Background and Contemporary Conditions

The current conditions characterising much of the MENA region in the popular and educated mind are oppression, violence, war, invasion and severe deprivation, however, this region also has other sides. Historically it is the site of the rise of civilisations, early periods of globalisation when trade routes developed about 4,000 years ago (Murphy, 2014), the development of technology and industry, administrative systems, and research and scholarship in many fields (Crawford, 2013). While politics separates people in the region, there are also commonalities of culture and religion that work as unifiers (Kamrava, 2005). It is also in this region that schools and higher education first developed in the city states of Mesopotamia, and where a highly organised public bureaucracy formed (Oates et al., 2007) that served as a foundation for subsequent empires and countries, including influencing European developments.

The context of the two countries selected here is the geopolitics of the Middle East, a region that has for many years experienced colonisation, invasion, wars, and ongoing security issues. Miller

(2006) characterises its socio-political conditions as very high in incidences and severity of conflict due to poor institutionalisation in society, the incapacity to manage resources, state boundaries that do not coincide with identities, a strong desire among ethno-sectarian minorities to secede, and revisionist political forces that use violence to change the territorial status-quo, many of which arose or intensified during Western colonisation and ill-thought out decolonisation decisions. The consequence is the highest militarised region of the world, with competitive alliances within the region and between major external powers, producing the highest war-proneness. The Middle East and North Africa (MENA) have been in frequent turmoil, political instability, oppressive regimes, sectarian violence, extremism, revolution, inhumane conditions of hardship, economic crises, and everyday life that is highly politicised (Potter, 2013), all of which have varying consequences for education, including security, access and resources (Hashemi & Postel, 2017).

It is important to note that countries and peoples in this region are experiencing many forms of change, and in many violence – nation-building, postcolonial reconstruction, destabilization, societal disintegration and dispossession (Samier, 2018). It has been used as a site by ‘great powers’ for European conflicts, Cold War politics, sources of resources that have been used to justify invasion, involvement in civil war, and power politics by external states in their competition for influence and establishing trade (Krieg, 2017). This pattern of European colonisation and economic competition became well established in the 18th century and continued into the 20th century during a period in which a pact to divide up the Middle East between them took place (Barr, 2012), followed by the contemporary historical period in which the UK and US have competed for power and influence (Barr, 2018). Currently, similar influences on nation-building and its social institutions is accompanied by cultural influence and shaping of educational systems like that of France in Syria and much of North Africa (Williams, 1968) and by the US and UK in the Arabian Gulf (Kamrava, 2005) disrupting cultural continuity. An

additional complexity is informal politics in society that exercise power, exert pressure and at times use violence against formal political actors (Anceschi, Gervasio & Teti, 2014), and a site used by intelligence agencies from foreign countries competing for influence and access to resources (Gerolymatos, 2010; Zamir, 2015). In addition, study of the region is too often simplistic or inaccurate, or advance others' interests (Halliday, 2005). As Krieg (2017) argues, the prisms used to study MENA are Western using the language and conceptions of Western socio-political organisation resulting in a Western-style state-centric perspective that assumes Western values and styles of social institutions, heavily neoliberal in character. As Krieg also notes, education is a site of intra- and inter-state conflict, and a strategy used by some Western powers in influencing policy.

One factor that has to be included in intersectionality theory is the role of external state and non-state actors engaging in rivalry for influence, often involved in or triggering violent episodes. For example, in Syria, a number of states like Russia and the US are involved, as well as those surrounding and directly affected by and involved in military and political activities, non-state actors like ISIS and Hezbollah and the internal politics of other states like Saudi Arabia (Phillips, 2016). Syria has primarily a strategic value in competition and struggle with other states, rendering it is expendable and subject to external self-interests and where aid for educational development reflects foreign preferences (Hetou, 2019). These dynamics have a destabilising if not collapsing effect on all social institutions, creating an environment in which schools and universities simply cannot function or even continue to exist, straining the resources and politics of neighbouring countries receiving refugees (Fiddian-Qasmiyeh et al., 2014).

These conditions make all sectors of society a security risk – social institutions, human beings, and external relations; nothing is untouched from a security perspective, at a much higher level of securitisation of educational organisations than in the West (Awan, Spiller & Whiting, 2019;

Deakin, Taylor & Kupchik, 2018). In Syria, the neoliberal path followed prior to civil war contributed to its desecuritisation due to private concerns substituting for public concerns and its commercialisation leaving it vulnerable to non-educational interests resulting in the loss of many services (Hinnebusch, 2018; Matar and Kadri, 2018). In this context all educational activities and their administrative, leadership and governance are securitised. Education now is in crisis with countless students displaced or dead, thousands of schools destroyed or damaged, with almost half of students out of school from 2014, and many school staff dead, injured or displaced (Marzouk, 2018). Yemen has become the largest humanitarian crisis in recent years where approximately 250 thousand people have died through direct military action and a lack of access to food, health services and infrastructure creating famine and disease with 60 per cent of victims being children under five (Moyer et al., 2019). This follows a long history of internal political struggles and tensions that have destroyed many social institutions, including the use of education as a site of political struggle (Blumi, 2018). Also disturbing is that large portions of Western populations seem to be unaware of the warfare being waged and consequent suffering (Lackner, 2017). As Lackner (2017) explains, Yemen is a strategic location on an international trade route, also used by maritime forces of countries involved in the geopolitics, as well as a site for counter-terrorism interest from those states battling Al-Qa'ida.

Intersectionality Factors in an 'in extremis' model

In order to construct a form of intersectionality that applies, it is necessary to identify on several levels the factors and experiences that pertain, on an individual experiential level, on a group and organisational level, and nationally and inter-nationally. The first should begin with the voices of children:

Reem's (13 years old) story, Yemen

“An airstrike hit my village when I was at home doing my homework. Suddenly part of the ceiling fell, and the bomb came through a hole in the ceiling and exploded in the room. I could not breathe because of gas and smoke. I was injured in my thigh, head and back, and most of my family members were injured too. I walked to the hospital while I was bleeding. The doctor gave me medicine for one month only, and asked us to go back home because there was no space. ... Since that airstrike, I don’t go to school and I feel worried about missing a year of education. Our life before was wonderful – but the war and airstrikes make me feel sad and scared. I still feel the pain in my thigh and back and I wish the war would stop.” (Kirolos et al., 2018, p. 21)

Basma’s (8 years old) story, Syria

“I am from a town near Damascus city; my home was there and my school too. I really loved my school back home, it was pretty, my teacher loved me and I had a lot of friends. I was in class when my school was hit. We ran out of the school right away and I went back home, but I later found out that many children had been injured. I have never seen my school or my friends again; I miss them a lot. ... [We moved to a new town.] I never once stopped going to school but in this new town my school was hit, and this time 20 children died.” (Kirolos et al., 2018, p. 29)

There have been attacks on education in 74 countries between 2013 and 2017, of which a high number include deaths of students and staff, maiming and trauma as well as destruction of educational facilities. These were carried out for many reasons including political, military, ideological, sectarian or ethnic because education is a symbol of state authority, or because the sites are strategically useful for military purpose and are convenient as sites to recruit children

and young people into the ranks and perpetrate sexual violence as part of the overall conflict-based action (GCPEA, 2018). They have been subjected to the six 'grave violations' that the UN Secretary General on Children and Armed Conflict has defined: 'killing and maiming; recruitment and use of children; abduction; sexual violence; attacks on schools and hospitals; and denial of humanitarian access' (Kirolos et al., 2018, p. 8). Battlefields now include homes, schools and playgrounds; children die from airstrikes that hit their schools, they are shot by a sniper when walking outside or by explosive devices, and suffer secondary effects of conflict zones: disease, acute malnutrition, and psychological toxic stress and trauma.

The main forms of attack are the following: 1) physical attacks or threats of attacks on schools (including bombing); 2) physical attacks or threats against students, teachers and other staff (killing, maiming); 3) the military use of school and university facilities (such as detention and interrogation/torture centres, depots, or as missile launch sites); 4) the recruitment of children *en route* to or from schools and universities; 5) sexual attacks on members of school and university communities who are *en route*; and 6) attacks on higher education which includes storming and taking over facilities and killing students. Disrupting or denying access to humanitarian aid is also a form of violence (Save the Children, 2018). The scope of attacks can be, for those in relatively peaceful and stable societies, unimaginable – by late 2017, 256 schools in Yemen were destroyed and another 1,413 partially destroyed and in Syria by the same date more than 650 educational sites were similarly affected (GCPEA, 2018, pp. 8-9, 34).

The numbers, levels and types of violence involved are staggering, reported by Kirolos et al. (2018) for Save the Children International to include the following:

1. By 2016, 357 million children live in a conflict zone, with 165 million in high intensity conflicts – 1 of 6 children in the world. In 2016 10,068 children were killed or maimed. 27 million children are out of school.

2. In the Middle East 2 children in 5 live within 50 km of a conflict event, with those in Syria and Yemen being at risk of all grave violations, where increasingly explosive weapons are used in urban centres.
3. Since 2010, the numbers of children killed and maimed has risen by 300%, with denial of humanitarian access rising 15-fold. In 2017, more than 250,000 children in Syria were denied humanitarian access.
4. The violence children are experiencing has become increasingly brutal by intentionally targeting schools and hospitals (1004 attacks on hospitals in Syria from 2011 to 2018), using children as suicide bombers, and the more frequent use of indiscriminate weapons like cluster munitions, barrel bombs, and improvised explosive devices. Increasingly siege and starvation tactics are being used as a war weapon.
5. Children as young as 8 years old are recruited forcibly to engage in fighting, carrying supplies, and in other frontline roles. They can also be forced to kill and maim, become wives or girlfriends of fighters, carry out spying operations, abducted for ransom, revenge, or to carry out forced labour.
6. The emergence of widespread 'toxic stress'.

By 2019, 420 million children live in a conflict zone, a number doubling over the last 30 years. Of these, 142 million are in high-intensity conflict zones, with a tripling of 'grave violations' since 2010 as children are targeted for abduction, enslavement and starvation (Save the Children, 2019). For those who survive, the damage they bear is physical, mental and psychosocial. Syria and Yemen are in the top ten worst conflict zones for children. In Yemen, the site of the largest humanitarian crisis where school buildings have been targeted for bombing, 11.3 million children are in need of humanitarian aid at the most basic level of food and medical treatment in 2019.

And, as Save the Children (2010) reports, it is not only the aggressors who are causes of suffering, but also international indifference and, in some cases, complicity. Given the vast scale of this humanitarian crisis, the response in some academic fields is negligible.

Of global significance also are displaced populations seeking refuge in other countries, which themselves can be overwhelmed in accepting very large numbers without the resources to adequately take care of them. The numbers are large – of the 2.7 million refugees from Syria taken in by Turkey by 2016, over 50% were school-aged children, with the total number rising to 3.5 million in 2018. Based on two school case studies in Ankara, Arar, Özücü and Küçükçayır (2019a) found the challenges to be children who do not speak Turkish, have been out of school for considerable periods of time, are deeply traumatised, unfamiliarity with the local culture, and have health problems.

Smith (2005) cautions against simplistic approaches to examining how education is affected in violent conflict including: authoritarian political systems, the disintegration of states and economic development, corruption, invasion, and socio-cultural conflict between ethnic groups, sects, and other identity-based groups. The role of education in these conditions varies, sometimes used as a tool of ideology, indoctrination, and repression, and a source of recruitment in conflict as well as the construction and perpetuation of negative stereotypes, and its weaponisation through differential access. Education can also be an area of societal neglect if other political and economic goals take prominence. Of course, education can also be seen as a solution in reconstruction by helping stabilise populations, assist in nation-rebuilding, as a means of reconciliation and peace-building, and re-educating. Political agendas affect all aspects and levels of education, from legislation and policy to levels of resources, appointments and regulation, curricular design and pedagogical practices, all necessary in capacity building.

However, international standards like those of the Geneva Convention and later UN declarations and resolutions have little currency in the more extreme forms of conflict (Tawil, 2000).

In such conditions, initiatives and activities of educational administration take forms that are generally not included in responsibilities addressed in the literature: responding to refugees and displaced people, preventing children from being recruited into military action, protecting female children from violations, providing landmine education, providing trauma counselling (Smith, 2005), and in many cases providing shelter, food, medicine, and refuge from those trying to kill them. In other words, a suitable theory and model in these contexts has to be interdisciplinary and multi-dimensional. Jabar's (2004) identifies a number of factors that are important to include in an analysis: class, ethnicity, culture, gender, education, family, sect, age, urban versus rural (e.g., Bedouin), profession, the role of bureaucracies and the armed forces, surveillance and the use of electronic media like social media. Al-Saif and Ghabra (2016) include "Whiteness" as a central element of intersectionality in examining forms of power and influence in Western style universities in the Middle East, whose hegemonic composition and activities came into stark relief during the Arab Spring, causing them to classify 'Whiteness' as an ideological system aimed at global white dominance through curriculum, pedagogy and the discursive practices that are internalised as assimilation or resistance of Orientalist otherness (Said, 1978). Goddard (2004) also includes factors that require a broadening of intersectionality to include religion, a deteriorating economic system, and a high violent conflict context. Additional factors that are important in many contexts are the intersection of citizens versus elites and level and type of trauma (McGraw, 2006) and the intersections of biography and history (Franzosi, 2006).

Intersectionality theory was proposed initially by Crenshaw (1991) to identify and examine the interactions and impact of more than one subordination structure, such as gender, race, and class. It is intended to examine overlapping structures of marginalisation and oppression that take

structural, political or representational forms, and effectively negates the knowledge and experiences of those subordinated. In contrast with unitary approaches focussed on one factor and multiple approaches that are relatively static, and separating individual and institutional factors, intersectionality regards the categories used in dynamic interaction and across individual and social institutional levels (Hancock, 2007).

Modifications in intersectionality theory began shortly after its introduction, adding factors like crime control (Hannah-Moffat, 2005), risks related to welfare policy (Olofsson, et al., 2014), international human rights (Hancock, 2016), and a multiple intersection of race, class, gender, ethnicity, sexuality, age, ability and nation (Collins, 2010). Berard (2014) proposes a broad range, drawing on Weber, like subculture and cultural background, social class, social status group, and religion, although in only an American context. Choo and Ferree (2010) describe different styles of intersectionality: the group-centred that places multiply-marginalised groups at the centre of analysis; the process-centred that examines power relationally through the interactions among factors; and the system-centred that takes an interactional approach including historical factors and a higher degree of complexity.

One additional feature in the development of intersectionality theory is what Bilge (2013) and Alexander-Floyd (2012) call the ‘whitening’ of the field, itself a hegemonic practice. Given where the main focus has been, one could argue that it has become ‘orientalist’ (Said, 1978), where many assumptions about national conditions and the nature of social institutions demonstrate a Western bias (mostly US, UK, Canadian or Australian) and exclusion of conditions relevant to other countries that assume leadership to be white and male, with little representation of minority educational administrators resulting in an ‘institutional silencing’ (Fuller, 2018, p. 2), caused by what Lumby and Heystek (2012) describe as a multilevel and dimensional exclusion of minorities. The factors that are considered in Fuller (2018), drawing

also on Holvino (2005), include a broadened set: nationality, sexuality, class, gender/sex, ethnicity, race, age, location, professional role, and religion.

Some writings only discuss education authors' applied theoretical foundations rather than sourcing the original theory in primary disciplines, resulting in simplistic or superficial conceptions of ideas and models. Agosto and Roland (2018) found in a survey of American articles three main limitations: focus on a micro level analysis that does not take into account larger group and institutional structures and processes of society; a focus on individuals and their capacity rather than their actual practices; and using intersectionality to promote transformational leadership models, rather than many other viable and legitimate forms. A Western-centric conception of educational administration intersectionality excludes other experiences such as those in highly violent contexts.

On a macro level there are contextual factors that also play a role internationally. Purkayastha (2012) has proposed including religion or sect as a factor as well as different constructions of 'race' evident through transnational spaces that better reflect relationships among and across nations and the effects of migration where minority groups continue connections and activities in multiple countries where families are situated, including web-based geographically dispersed communities. Smooth (2013) explains how intersectionality categories and their interactions are dependent upon varying political regimes, power hierarchies and historical understanding as well as changes over time, and may involve categories that may not be typified in many Western contexts but are necessary to analysis such as religion, political and legal systems, and family structure. What becomes increasingly important in the evolution of intersectionality theory is that different contextual factors are at play internationally, and that the categories themselves change in meaning as social constructions from culture to culture, involving different types of social institution, differing cultures (where power may be located), judicial systems, role of the military,

and many others that have emerged in cross-cultural management studies. While Smooth (2013) extends the principles of intersectionality from an essentialist Anglo-American model into a broader inclusion and characterisation of categories and factors, the conditions that some countries experience, like Syria and Yemen are qualitatively different, requiring further modification.

Proposed here is an 'in extremis' intersectionality theory for educational administration extended from its original formulation into one that is able to capture through a systematic and anticategorical structural process-centred analysis the conditions in which schools in extreme conditions operate or are destroyed, where all factors are unfixed and equally important in their interrelationships, and which vary in effect by context (Choo and Ferree, 2010; Wilson, 2013). It involves several dimensions of social reality shaping people's social experience and participation in social institutions including those of war. Such a theory includes as factors, violence, insecurity, political ideologies, cultural antagonism, religious sectarianism (Hashemi and Postel, 2017), and prior and current involvement by major global powers contributing to political collapse, economic disruption, a tearing apart of the socio-cultural fabric, dispossession through refugee status, and humanitarian crises. Also included are fracturing and fluid identities, destroyed social institutions, foreign powers bringing substitute structures, norms and practices, terrorist groups, traumatic levels of violence which themselves have replaced social and cultural norms, and a shift from goals of achieving equity towards those of basic survival. In this way, intersectionality theory can overcome the essentialised Western categories that do not apply well to other countries (Fajardo-Fernández, Soriano-Miras and Requena, 2019; Lugones, 2007).

Conclusion: Prospects for Educational Administration

The value of an intersectionality theory or model lies in its correspondence with research results from studies of education in conflict zones and what kind of reconstruction is possible. The internationalisation of educational administration cannot be undertaken successfully unless the differences experienced in countries are accommodated, in particular those facing dire conditions. UNESCO has identified a number of components that require effective planning for reconstruction: environmental, organisational, infrastructural, material and financial, human, institutional, pedagogical and curricular (Arnhold et al., 1998). These require considerable educational administrative and leadership capacity working in collaboratively with teachers and school heads, families and communities, the private sector and religious organisations, and governance and regulatory activity on national and international levels. An effective internationalisation needs to build into curriculum and pedagogy the knowledge and skills necessary for relief and reconstruction work. It also requires study of international agencies involved in high conflict zones, such as the European Court of Human Rights, the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, a number of treaties and regional bodies that oversee the rights of children, and independent investigative bodies like the UN Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism on Grave Violations against Children in Situations of Armed Conflict (GCPEA, 2018).

Recommendations from Save the Children International (Kirolos et al., 2018, pp. 38, 40-41) suggest areas that require research and training in educational administration, through governance, policy and educational law, as well as helping build educational capacity for implementation:

1. All countries need to strengthen the link between UN monitoring activities and operational assessments and programmes
2. All countries need to deploy child protection experts

3. Donors should increase investment that includes youth-focussed initiatives in conflict prevention and knowledge and skills involved in peace-building
4. Invest greater resources in addressing violations of children's rights through various judicial bodies
5. Contribute to support programmes for victims with psycho-social support, child protection and reintegration
6. Greater investment and training in support personnel like social workers and mental health care, as well as education in emergency situations

A more active role for educational administration includes conducting more research relevant to conflict zones and developing more suitable research methodologies, increasing participation in various NGOs and UN agencies, including supporting refugee relocation and provision of not only educational services but also trauma counselling and teacher training as well as administrative education in better understanding these populations and ensuring that appropriate provisions are made. Internationalising curriculum can include integrating co-op appointments, residencies or practica with international aid agencies. This does mean understanding other cultures, jurisdictional characteristics like constitutions and legal systems as well as policy regimes without condescension. It also requires the coverage from primary disciplines of more international relations, psycho-social analyses of deprivation and trauma, international relations and diplomacy studies, historical background, and cross-cultural relations.

Among the considerations of maintaining education in conflict from Smith (2000) are the following:

1. Trying to insulate education from political bias and misuse.
2. Seeking to maintain equality of educational access where possible.

3. Trying to maintain relationships of trust that are often eroded in conflict zones.
4. Reduce or prevent ideological content from entering the curriculum.
5. Minimising the use of curricular materials that promote political agendas in conflict zones and the use of teachers working as political agents.

The Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) (2007), composed of UN and non-UN humanitarian partners, has developed guidelines on mental health and psycho-social support that include more responses to children in conflict zones such as multi-sectoral programmes and coordination, involving victims as participants in initiatives, and strengthening capacity (Save the Children, 2018). Save the Children (2019) has also promoted a Healing and Education through the Arts programme (HEART) that promotes the use of arts to provide support for children in communication, relaxation, stress processing, emotional regulation and confidence building, and reducing their feelings of isolation and safety.

A few authors in educational administration have examined the potential roles of school leadership in post-conflict contexts, in this case referring to substantial societal disruption, destruction of infrastructure, high mortality rates due to military and para-military action, disrupted food and water supplies, inability of the healthcare system to function, displaced communities, family destruction, and problems of consequent deaths through disease all of which leave a traumatised population as well as rebuilding socio-cultural factors like social justice, recompensing the victims, and recognising the role of symbolic events (Smith, 2000). As Smith (2000) argues, this requires work on several levels, not just the physical reconstruction of buildings, but also on ideological levels democratising the system and retraining teachers, and addressing psychological reconstruction of staff and students suffering demoralisation, loss of confidence and trauma.

Additionally, there are research implications for conflict zones where collecting data may not be safe, where more reliance on refugees, journalism and NGOs is necessary as well as meta-analysis and more effective methodologies. Smith (2000) has critiqued an overuse of quantitative methods, where qualitative is required to study many of the dimensions of education in a conflict zone and in determining what quality of education exists and needs to be rebuilt, and Guerin and Guerin (2007) have recommended participatory methodologies when working with refugee communities. Recommended in Arar, Örucü and Küçükçayır (2019a) is school administration grounded in an ethic of care and cultivating in teachers and students a culturally relevant critical consciousness that can frame the inequalities refugees face through deprivation, implying for research approaches derived from these theories. They use the Culturally Relevant Leadership model of Horsford, Grosland and Gunn (2011) that examines the four dimensions of political context, pedagogical approaches, personal journeys of participants, and the professional duties of staff. Approaches that are most appropriate for conflict zone survivors include phenomenological and hermeneutic methods that can affirm the research subject, and psychoanalytic methods used in organisation and management studies for researching toxic conditions and potential recovery (Kets de Vries, 1993).

References

- Agosto, V., & Roland, E. (2018). Intersectionality and educational leadership. *Review of Research in Education*, 42, 255-285.
- Alexander-Floyd, N. (2012). Disappearing acts: Reclaiming intersectionality in the social sciences in a post-Black feminist era. *Feminist Formations*, 24(1), 1-25.
- Al-Saif, B. and Ghabra, H. (2016). Higher education and contestation in the state of Kuwait after the Arab Spring. In E. Mohamed, H. Gerber, & S. Aboukacem (Eds.), *Education and the Arab Spring* (pp. 97-113). Rotterdam: Sense.

Anceschi, L., Gervasio, G. & Teti, A. (Eds.) (2014). *Informal power in the greater Middle East*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Arar, K., Örucü, D., & Küçükçayır, G. (2018). These students need love and affection: Experience of a female school leader with the challenges of Syrian refugee education. *Leading & Managing*, 24(2), 28-43.

Arar, K., Örucü, D., & Küçükçayır, G. (2019a). Culturally relevant school leadership for Syrian refugee students in challenging circumstances. *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership*, 47(6), 960-979.

Arar, K., Örucü, D., & Küçükçayır, G. (2019b). A holistic look at education of the Syrians under temporary protection in Turkey. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, DOI: 10.1080/13603124.22019.1603401.

Arnhold, N. et al. (1998). *Education for reconstruction*. Oxford: Symposium.

Awan, I., Spiller, K., & Whiting, A. (2019). *Terror in the classroom: Security, surveillance and a public duty to act*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Barakat, S., Connolly, D., Hardman, F., & Sundaram, V. (2013). The role of basic education in post-conflict recovery. *Comparative Education*, 49(2), 124-142.

Barr, J. (2012). *A line in the sand: Britain, France and the struggle that shaped the Middle East*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Barr, J. (2018). *Lords of the desert: Britain's struggle with America to dominate the Middle East*. London: Simon & Schuster.

Bilge, S. (2013). Intersectionality undone: saving intersectionality from feminist intersectionality studies. *Du Bois Review*, 10(2), 405-424.

Berard, T. (2014). The study of deviant subcultures as a longstanding and evolving site of intersecting membership categorizations. *Human Studies*, 37, 317-334.

Blumi, I. (2018). *Destroying Yemen*, Oakland, CA: University of California Press.

- Bush, K., & Salterelli, D. (2000). *The two faces of education in ethnic conflict*. Florence: United Nations Children's Fund.
- Cerna, L. (2019) Refugee Education: Integration Models and practices in OECD countries. Paris: OECD.
- Chatty, D. (2017). *Syria: The making and unmaking of a refuge state*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Choo, H., & Ferree, M. (2010). Practicing intersectionality in sociological research. *Theory and Society*, 28(2), 129-149.
- Collins, P. (2010). The new politics of community. *American Sociological Review*, 75, 7-30.
- Crawford, H. (Ed.) (2013). *The Sumerian world*. London: Routledge.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43, 1241-1299.
- Deakin, J., Taylor, E., & Kupchik, A. (Eds.) (2018). *The Palgrave international handbook of school discipline, surveillance, and social control*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Di Leo, J. (2017). *Higher education under late capitalism*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dimmock, C., & Walker, A. (2005). *Educational leadership: Culture and diversity*. London: Sage.
- Ellison, C. S. (2012). The role of education in peacebuilding. *Compare*, 44(2), 186-207.
- Fajardo-Fernández, R., Soriano-Miras, R., & Requena, A. (2019). Intersectionality applied to the study of global economy. *Third World Thematics*, DOI: 10.1080/23802014.2019.1622441.
- Fayyad, F., & Johannessen, S. (2017). *Last men in Aleppo*. K. Abeed and S. Jespersen, Producers. New York: Grasshopper Films.
- Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, E., Loescher, G., Long, K., & Sigona, N. (Eds.) (2014). *The Oxford handbook of refugee and forced migration studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Franzosi, R. (2006). Historical knowledge and evidence. In R. Goodin, & C Tilly (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of contextual political analysis* (pp. 438-452). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fuller, K. (2018). New lands, new languages: Navigating intersectionality in school leadership. *Frontiers in Education*, 3. Available online (accessed 12 June 2019), DOI: 10.3389/educ.2018.00025.
- Gerolymatos, A. (2010). *Castles made of sand: A century of Anglo-American espionage and intervention in the Middle East*. New York: Thomas Dunne.
- Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA). (2018). *Education under Attack 2018*. New York: Columbia University.
- Goddard, T. (2004). The role of school leaders in establishing democratic principles in a post-conflict society. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42, 685-696.
- Guerin, P., & Guerin, B. (2007). Research with refugee communities. *Australian Community Psychologist*, 19(1), 150-162.
- Hancock, A.-M. (2007). When multiplication doesn't equal quick addition: Examining intersectionality as a research paradigm. *Perspectives on Politics*, 5(1), 63-79.
- Hancock, A.-M. (2016). *Intersectionality: An intellectual history*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hannah-Moffat, K. (2005). Criminogenic needs and the transformative risk subject. *Punishment and Society*, 7(1), 29-51.
- Hashemi, N., & Postel, D. (Eds.) (2017). *Sectarianization: Mapping the new politics of the Middle East*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heineman, M. (2017). *City of ghosts*, M. Heineman Producer. New York: Our Time Projects.
- Hetou, G. (2019). *The Syrian conflict: The role of Russia, Iran and the US in a global crisis*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Hill Collins, P., & Bilge, S. (2016). *Intersectionality*. Malden: Polity Press.

- Hinnebusch, R. (2018). What went wrong: Understanding the trajectory of Syria's conflict. In L. Matar, & A. Kadri (Eds.), *Syria: From national independence to proxy war* (pp. 29-51). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) (2007) IASC Guidelines on Mental Health and Psychosocial Support in Emergency Settings. Available online: https://www.who.int/mental_health/emergencies/guidelines_iasc_mental_health_psychosocial_june_2007.pdf (accessed 2 October 2019).
- Jabar, F. (2004). The war generation in Iraq. In G. Potter, & G. Sick (Eds.), *Iran, Iraq, and the legacies of war* (pp. 121-140). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kadri, A., & Matar, L. (2018). Introduction: Syria in the imperialist cyclone. In L. Matar, & A. Kadri (Eds.), *Syria: From national independence to proxy war* (pp. 1-25). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kamrava, M. (2005). *The modern Middle East*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kets de Vries, M. (1993). *Leaders, fools and imposters*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kira, I., Lewandowski, L., Chiodo, L., & Ibrahim, A. (2014). Advances in systemic trauma theory. *Psychology*, 5, 389-412.
- Kirollos, M., Anning, C., Fylkesnes, G., & Denselow, J. (2018). *The War on Children*. London: Save the Children International.
- Krieg, A. (2017). *Socio-political order and security in the Arab world*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lackner, H. (2017). *Yemen in crisis*. London: Saqi Books.
- Lo, M., & Haron, M. (Eds.) (2016) *Muslim institutions of higher education in postcolonial Africa*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lugones, M. (2007). Heterosexualism and the colonial/modern gender system. *Hypatia*, 22(1), 186-219.

- Lumby, J., & Heystek, J. (2012). Leadership identity in ethnically diverse schools in South Africa and England. *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership*, 40, 4-20.
- Marzouk, N. (2018). The Syrian conflict. In L. Matar, & A. Kadri (Eds.), *Syria: From national independence to proxy war* (pp. 115-131). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- McCarthy, A. (2018). Politics of refugee education: Educational administration of the Syrian refugee crisis in Turkey. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 50(3), 223-238.
- McGraw, K. (2006). Why and how psychology matters. In R. Goodin, & C Tilly (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of contextual political analysis* (pp. 131-155). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Miller, B. (2006). Balance of power or the state-to-nation balance: Explaining Middle East war-propensity. *Security Studies*, 15(4), 658-705.
- Moyer, J., Bohl, D., Hanna, T., Mapes, B., & Rafa, M. (2019). *Assessing the impact of war on development in Yemen*. Sana'a: United Nations Development Programme. Available online: <http://ye.undp.org> (accessed 14 October 2019).
- Murphy, C. (2014). Global governance over the long haul. *International Studies Quarterly*, 58, 216-218.
- Oates, J., McMahon, A., Karsgaard, P., Al Quntar, S., & Ur, J. (2007). Early Mesopotamian urbanism. *Antiquity*, 81, 585-600.
- Olofsson, A., Zinn, J., Griffin, G., Nygren, K., Cebulla, A., & Hannah-Moffat, K. (2014). The mutual constitution of risk and inequalities: Intersectional risk theory. *Health, Risk & Society*, 16(5), 417-430.
- Paulson, J. (2009). (Re)creating education in postconflict contexts. New York: International Center for Transitional Justice.
- Pepper, M. et al. (2010). *Leading schools during crisis*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Phillips, C. (2016). *The battle for Syria*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Potter, L. (2013). *Sectarian politics in the Persian Gulf*. London: C. Hurst & Co.
- Pradhan, P. (2017). *Arab Spring and sectarian faultlines in West Asia*. New Delhi: Pentagon Press.
- Purkayastha, B. (2012). Intersectionality in a transnational world. *Gender & Society*, 26(1), 55-66.
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage.
- Samier E.A. (2018). The politics of educational change in the Middle East: Nation-building, postcolonial reconstruction, destabilized states, societal disintegration, and the dispossessed. In K. Saltman, & A. Means (Eds.), *The Wiley handbook of global education reform* (pp. 173-198). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Samier, E.A. & ElKaleh, E. (Eds.) (2019). *Teaching educational leadership in Muslim countries*. Singapore: Springer.
- Save the Children. (2018), Healing the invisible wounds of war. Report on the Wilton Park Dialogue 2018. Wilton Park, DFID, Save the Children.
- Save the Children (2019). Stop the war on children. Berlin: Save the Children.
- Scanlan, M., & Theoharis, G. (2015). Introduction: Intersectionality in educational leadership. In G. Theoharis, & M. Scanlan (Eds.), *Leadership for increasingly diverse schools* (pp. 1-13). New York: Routledge.
- Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2009). *Academic capitalism and the new economy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Smith, A. (2005). Education in the twenty-first century: Conflict, reconstruction and reconciliation. *Compare*, 35(4), 373-391.
- Smooth, W. (2013). Intersectionality from theoretical framework to policy intervention. In A. Wilson (ed.), *Situating intersectionality* (pp. 11-41). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Smyth, J. (2017). *The toxic university*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Spring, J. (2015). *Globalization of education*. New York: Routledge.

- Tawil, S. (2000). International humanitarian law and basic education. *International Review of the Red Cross*, 82, 581-600.
- United Nations. (2018). Annual Report of the Secretary General on Children and Armed Conflict. Available online: <http://undocs.org/s/2018/465> (accessed 18 June 2019).
- Van Leeuw, P. (2017). *In Syria*, G. Maladrin, Producer, Brussels: Centre du Cinéma et de l'Audiovisuel de la Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles.
- Wan, C., Lee, M., & Loke, H. (Eds.) (2019). *The governance and management of universities in Asia*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Wanjiru, J. (2019). Post-conflict reconstruction. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 1-18. DOI: 10.1177/1741143218817554
- Williams, A. (1968). *Britain and France in the Middle East and North Africa, 1914-1967*. London: Macmillan.
- Wilson, A. (2013). Introduction. In A. Wilson (Ed.), *Situating intersectionality: Politics, policy, and power* (pp. 1-10). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Zamir, M. (2015). *The secret Anglo-French war in the Middle East*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Zane, M. (2015). *Leading and managing indigenous education in the postcolonial world*. Abingdon: Routledge.