Research Article

Creating Pathways to Opportunity: Non-formal Educational 'Inclusion' for Rohingya Refugee Children in Bangladesh

Journal of South Asian Development
1–22
© The Author(s) 2023
Sage Publications India Private Limited
Article reuse guidelines:
in.sagepub.com/journals-permissions-india
DOI: 10.1177/09731741231202872
journals.sagepub.com/home/sad

Md. Reza Habib[1], Arnab Roy Chowdhury[1] and Artem Uldanov[2]

Abstract

In coordination with the Government of Bangladesh, the United Nations Children's Fund and Save the Children International have been conducting a non-formal educational programme for the children of Rohingya refugees since 2017. Domestic partner non-governmental organizations are implementing the initiative. The purpose of this study was to examine the policy and the institutional arrangements and determine how they may influence the inclusion of Rohingya children in the education system. We found that the programme has set up infrastructure, but the location of refugee education that the government created is distinctly short-term, top-down, emergency-oriented and restrictive in many ways. Evidently, in order to avoid geopolitical and local sociocultural tensions, the host government did not really want to integrate refugees into local services and facilities, particularly access to education in public institutions. Nevertheless, civil society organizations and the Rohingya negotiated with the government, to a certain extent, an 'inclusive' space through discussion, dialogue and resilience for an expansion of this educational sphere. This space has created a limited sense of empowerment among the Rohingya.

Keywords

Rohingya, Bangladesh, inclusive education, refugee, children

[1]School of Sociology, HSE University, Moscow, Russian Federation
[2]School of Politics and Governance, HSE University, Moscow, Russian Federation

Corresponding author:
Arnab Roy Chowdhury, School of Sociology, HSE University, Moscow 101000, Russian Federation.
E-mail: achowdhury@hse.ru

Introduction

Worldwide, violence, conflicts and natural disasters have displaced nearly 31 million children (1–18 years) (UNICEF, 2020a). They make up more than half of all refugees (UNHCR, 2020) and include 7.4 million children of school-going age (4–14 years) (UNHCR, 2018). Refugee children are at risk of abuse, trafficking, early marriage, exploitation and terrorism, more so in countries that restrict their fundamental rights to education and health (Habib & Roy Chowdhury, 2023; Tuangratananon et al., 2019). Around 4 million refugee children are out of school now (UNHCR, 2018); over half are in Ethiopia, Kenya, Lebanon, Turkey, Chad, Congo and Pakistan (UNHCR, 2016). Some host countries allow refugee children to receive education only in camp-based schools, not in the formal education system, which is mostly temporary, resource-constrained and overcrowded (Save the Children, 2018a).

The Rohingya, who live in the Northern Rakhine state of Myanmar, are among the most persecuted communities in the world (Roy Chowdhury, 2020; Ullah & Chattoraj, 2018). The Myanmar government has discriminated against the Rohingya, executed oppressive actions and excluded them from citizenship rights for decades (Ullah, 2011). Unlawful military operations and communal violence in Myanmar drove the Rohingya into Bangladesh in 1978, 1992–1993, 2012, 2016 and 2017; they number a million now (Alam, 2018; Roy Chowdhury, 2021; Ullah, 2016). More than 700,000 Rohingya—over 60% of them children (over 400,000 are children) and women—fled to Bangladesh late in August 2017 (Roy Chowdhury, 2019; UNICEF, 2017). Nearly 50% of eight-year-old children had completed grade 1 schooling in Myanmar before being displaced (Education Cluster et al., 2018). The refugees, particularly the children, have experienced the trauma of dislocation from their home country—deaths, separation, damage, injuries—which made the process of emotional, psychological and societal relocation an intricate one (Roy Chowdhury, 2022; Thomas, 2016; Ullah & Chattoraj, 2022).

The trauma can impair the possible inclusion and integration of refugees into receiving societies. Displaced children experienced violence, and they are therefore at risk of developing learning, behavioural and psychological problems (Hamilton & Moore, 2004). Giving refugee children access to quality education and supplementary support reduces the likelihood of their replicating such violence (Lerch & Buckner, 2018). Education and support can help them to integrate into the host country's education system and maintain their social and emotional well-being (Cerna, 2019; Guo et al., 2019). Also, education and legal protection (Alam, 2020) can minimize the impending radicalization of the Rohingya (Rahman, 2010).

In coordination with the Government of Bangladesh, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and Save the Children International (SCI) have been conducting an inclusive educational programme for the children of Rohingya refugees since 2017. The programme is being implemented by 24 domestic partner non-governmental organizations (NGOs). The purpose of our research was to examine the policy and the institutional arrangements and determine how they may influence the inclusion of Rohingya children in Bangladesh's education system.

This initiative is an important one, but the Bangladesh government does not aim for real 'integration' of the Rohingya to avoid geopolitical and sociocultural stress in this crisis and due to a lack of resources. Yet, through discussion, dialogue and resilience, civil society actors and the refugees have negotiated a veritable space for non-formal and inclusive education. The space is top-down, lacks a coherent vision and is literacy focused; the Rohingya feel that it will be short-lived; yet it has somewhat empowered them, albeit in a limited and restricted sense.

Educational Inclusion and/or 'Integration' in an Emergency Situation

In the conceptual model of integration (Ager & Strang, 2008), education is considered to equip refugee children with skills and competencies for work and to support them in establishing relationships with members of the host community. A holistic model for facilitating the educational integration of refugee children establishes relationships between needs, factors, policies and education integration developed by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (Cerna, 2019). The model emphasizes the learning needs of refugee children—the host language and the mother tongue, schooling and adjustment to a new education system—along with their social and emotional needs. Apart from individual and interpersonal factors, the needs of refugee children can be properly shaped by institutional factors, such as the learning environment, school engagement, student–teacher interaction, school assessment, extracurricular activities and family involvement with schooling, which we partially discuss in this article.

The interest in a policy for educating refugee children and the demand for it—particularly from humanitarian agencies—have been growing in the past few years, and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) was the first to take an active role. The UNHCR defines integration as a long-term 'two-way process, and this is premised on "adaptation" by one party and "welcome" by the other' (UNHCR 2013, p. 14). Article 34 of the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refuge declares that states shall, as far as possible, facilitate the integration and naturalization of refugees. Civil society efforts led to the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) in 2000. The INEE published the Minimum Standard for Education: Preparedness, Response, and Recovery in 2004 and updated it in 2010. The concept of Education in Emergencies is based on 'Education as Humanitarian Response', and it ensures the education of minimum quality and access through emergencies to recovery. The networks have grown since then, and their standards have been translated and adapted in around 20 countries (Brun & Shuayb, 2020).

However, as Shuayb and Crul (2020) argue, shorn of the context in which education functions, 'refugee education' becomes a distinct, artificial category because the refugees are increasingly 'reified'. Shuayb and Crul (2020) draw on Malkki (1996) to posit that the United Nations (UN) agencies and academia have created the image that refugees are isolated and disempowered and that their

unique experiences make them distinct in nature and behaviour. But that reifies and 'others' them further, and they are then seen as a homogenous entity and a problem to solve. The nature and the vision of education are of the long term, but emergency education focuses on the short term, technicalities and literacy, and that is why some have argued that a framework for 'emergency education' is an oxymoron (Dryden-Peterson et al., 2019).

However, the context of Bangladesh is different as the 'integration' of the Rohingya is not the aim of the government, so an 'inclusive' and 'emergency' dimension of education can only be possibly talked about without laying much emphasis on the 'integration dimension.' Inclusive education, in general, refers to the fundamental right to access education for everyone and from which nobody can be excluded (Stubbs, 2008). Inclusive education empowers every child regardless of their abilities and backgrounds, such as children with disabilities, refugees and migrant children; children of minorities and children who are victims of violence and abuse; it also creates real learning opportunities in the same classrooms and in the same schools (UNICEF, 2018). The institution of inclusive schools allows students of all backgrounds to learn and grow side by side, without exclusions, for the benefit of all (UNICEF, 2018). In 2015, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG, 2015–2030) were adopted by the UN, and they urged all governments and civil societies to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all (UNDP, 2015). For inclusive education, all the challenges of attending school need to be identified and addressed. Successful inclusive education practice depends on the participation of children, the school environment, the curriculum, leadership, collaboration, assessment and funding (Muhaidat et al., 2020).

In the case of the educational 'inclusion' of the Rohingya refugee children, we argue that an excessive ascription of victimhood and othering to refugees—as in the academic and policy literature—takes away the agentic capability of the Rohingya partly because it focuses on the initial phase of trauma and forced migration (albeit important) and not on the afterlife of displacement, where negotiation, resilience and agency emerge. These afterlives have recently been recognized in scholarship. The ecological theory of Bronfenbrenner and Morris (1998), for example, described human development by considering its environment or context; the authors categorized the environmental aspects by the immediacy of their impact on developing children. Anderson et al. (2004) integrated this approach into a model that provides refugee children with inclusive education, conceptualized the refugee children's adaptation process over time and distinguished between pre-migration, trans-migration and post-migration ecological factors.

In the case of the Rohingya, the pre-migration ecology in Myanmar is mired in conflict and the absence of proper education. The trans-migration phase of hiding and fleeing has no formal or non-formal educational dimension, except for traumatic 'experiential learning'. However, the limited non-formal education that Rohingya refugee children receive in Bangladesh takes place in a relatively conflict-free environment. The contribution of the Bangladesh government and national and international civil society organizations (CSOs) is considerable, and it has helped the Rohingya develop a sense of empowerment.

Few have studied the educational integration of the Rohingya in Bangladesh. Shohel (2020), who is among the first to study this field, conducted a path-breaking study from the perspectives of 'education in emergencies', human rights and the Sustainable Development Goals. Our study touches upon all these themes and additionally tries to provide an 'emic' perspective of those implementing the non-formal and inclusive education programme and of the beneficiaries to discuss the problems and prospects of this policy and analyse the current situation.

Methodology and Fieldwork

This is an independent scholarly study that was not commissioned or funded by any government, UNICEF or any other agency or NGOs. We conducted this study in the Ukhiya and Teknaf sub-districts of Cox's Bazar, which is one of the poorest and most vulnerable districts in Bangladesh and where the presence of refugees has strained regional and local resources (Shohel, 2020). The Kutupalong-Balukhali Expansion Camp in Ukhiya, known as the 'Mega Camp', is the world's largest refugee camp (Human Rights Watch, 2018). We selected four schools, one each from Balukhali—Kutupalong (Mega Camp; camp 19 and camp 4) from Ukhiya, and Unchiprang (camp 22) and Leda (camp 24) from Teknaf. We adopted a qualitative methodology and used purposive sampling to select respondents. To collect the primary data for this analysis, we conducted 30 in-depth interviews—20 with men and 10 with women: 16 with refugees (school-going children, parents, teachers, Majhi [religious leaders of the Rohingya]) and 14 with government officials, NGO officials and UNICEF representatives between August 2020 and January 2021.

In terms of ethics, obtaining informed, voluntary consent can be challenging with vulnerable populations, and we struggled with that. The most important challenge was to make them understand the theme of our research. Initially, many thought that we were government people and that we wanted to elicit private information from them, and they were afraid. We solved this problem with the help of our Rohingya 'friends', who helped the respondents understand our motif by explaining it to them correctly. After that, we were able to take in-depth interviews that were audio-recorded using digital media. These files were then transcribed to aid the analytical process. Both the digital audio files and the text transcripts containing any identifying information will be destroyed after the publication of this article. Around four school-going Rohingya children were interviewed in the presence of their parents, with their oral consent. In this article, all respondents' names have been anonymized. However, demographic information and organizational affiliation have been provided where available.

Of the 24 partner NGOs, we selected 4 NGOs actively implementing UNICEF's education policy—Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC), the Community Development Centre (CODEC), Mukti and Young Power in Social Action (YPSA)—and interviewed their representatives. We selected these four implementing NGOs considering organizational strength, number of schools covered and experience of long-term implementation of non-formal education projects.

We analysed the in-depth interviews inductively, which involves reviewing records and taking notes in appropriate places to keep track of the emerging findings. For analysing these data, we familiarized ourselves with the materials and read through transcribed recordings and expanded notes. As we read through the data, certain 'themes' started emerging.

We also captured some of this thematic and narrative data through 'topical stories' and 'personal stories' related to educational attainment, analysed it by applying the method of narrative analysis and provided quotations from that. We framed case studies of the four NGOs implementing the UNICEF programme as we wanted to get concrete, contextual and in-depth knowledge about their specific objectives. We present the case studies in this article in a narrative style, along with thematically relevant excerpts from the interviews.

Educational Inclusion of Rohingya Children in a Regionally Comparative Perspective

After the conflict in Rakhine State in June 2012, nearly 6,000 Rohingya moved to Thailand by boat (Letchamanan, 2013). According to the Thai Immigration Act 1979, the Rohingya are illegal migrants (Equal Rights Trust, 2014), but the Thai Cabinet Resolution 2005 on education allowed all migrant children without legal status to join public schools. The Resolution aimed to promote and protect the social rights of non-Thai children, but the migrants prefer to send their children to migrant learning centres, which operate independently and are most often located near their communities, rather than Thai public schools.

The migrant learning centres follow the Myanmar curricula, and native Myanmar instructors teach the students. By Thai policy, migrant students at Thai public schools are identified as 'G-series' students, and they receive a unique identification code; the code starts with the letter 'G' (Tuangratananon et al., 2019). Some refugee families send their children to public schools so that they have a chance to live in Thailand permanently.

Malaysia hosts the second largest number of Rohingya refugees. After the 1980s, more than 100,000 Rohingya migrated to Malaysia (Farzana et al., 2020); over 60,000 are younger than 18 years (Letchamanan, 2013; PRIO, 2020). Rohingya children born in Malaysia are not *jus soli* citizens (citizens by birthright) because Malaysia is not a signatory to the 1951 Geneva Convention (Letchamanan, 2013; PRIO, 2020). Refugee children may not study at public educational institutions (Farzana et al., 2020; UNHCR, 2017), but only at UNHCR-funded learning centres, community-based organizations (CBOs) or madrasas. The UNHCR set up around 148 learning centres all over Malaysia, but only 33% of the students studied there; most received their education at CBOs in line with the Malaysian curriculum (Letchamanan, 2013). Many refugee girls marry early, as is the practice, and drop out of non-formal secondary-level education (PRIO, 2020).

The conflict in Myanmar forced the Rohingya to flee in phases, and about 1,800 reached Indonesia illegally in 2015 (Missbach, 2017). Local NGOs, funded by

humanitarian aid from the European Union (EU), worked to integrate the Rohingya culturally by teaching them the Indonesian language and engaging them in cultural activities. Along with the local government of Aceh, UNHCR and the International Organization for Migration (IOM) manage the Rohingya refugee camps. Refugee children learn to read and write in the Indonesian and English languages, and they are taught the Quran and given life-skills education (Silvya Sari, 2018). They may not study at local public schools, but it is claimed that six Rohingya students were admitted to the local primary school at Langsa in 2016 (Missbach, 2017).

Even in the pre-migration phase, a large proportion of Rohingya children were not schooled in Rakhine or had any accredited formal education (Save the Children, 2018b). A few studied in community-owned schools that follow the Myanmar national curriculum or in madrasas (Shohel, 2020). Some Rohingya children could study at government schools in Rakhine or Sittwe University (Human Rights Watch, 2019). After the communal violence in 2012, however, the authorities segregated classrooms for Rohingya children. Some government teachers were unwilling to teach them, often calling them *Kalar* (a derogatory term for the dark-skinned Rohingya). Children were kept in concentration camps and not allowed into universities. The unfriendly environment, shortage of educational resources and poor infrastructure continued to keep the Rohingya away from schools (Letchamanan, 2013); reportedly, over 73% of the Rohingya in Rakhine self-identify as illiterate (BROUK, 2018).

Educational Inclusion of Rohingya Children in Bangladesh

Bangladesh is not a signatory to the 1951 Geneva Convention and its 1967 Protocol (Letchamanan, 2013). However, Bangladesh ratified the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Article 28 of the Convention promises all children the right to education, and it binds all signatory host states to provide free, compulsory primary and secondary education to all children irrespective of their legal status (Equal Rights Trust, 2014). Schools are considered an important place for refugee children to interact with people of the host community, and these play a significant function in building connections (Ager & Strang, 2008). By ratifying the Convention, Bangladesh committed to protecting the rights of all children under any circumstance, but the current non-formal education system for the children of Rohingya refugees in Bangladesh does not meet that standard (Human Rights Watch, 2019).

Rohingya Children and Non-formal Education

Bangladesh considers children citizens only if their parents were born in the country (*jus sanguinis*), identifies the Rohingya born in Bangladesh as residents of Myanmar (Xchange, 2018) and does not have an education integration policy for refugee children. The country does not let Rohingya children receive formal education at

public or camp schools, Bengali-language instruction or teaching in the national educational curriculum (Human Rights Watch, 2019). About 10,000 Rohingya adolescents of school-going age have little access to non-formal education. After the second influx of Rohingya in 1991–1992, 14 schools were constructed at the camps at Kutupalong and Nayapara, in Cox's Bazar district, by Concern Worldwide, an NGO (Letchamanan, 2013). Only 58.4% of the district's population completed primary school, compared to 80% of the country, and 45% of boys and 30% of girls dropped out of school (Save the Children, 2018b). The non-formal school education process at Nayapara Camp started after January 2000. To avoid having to deal with the issue of integrating refugees, the Government of Bangladesh initially did not allow schools inside the camps (MSF, 2002). However, from mid-1996, the government allowed non-formal education at the primary level but not at the secondary or tertiary level.

The schools provide education from kindergarten to grade 5, but the government did not list education as a basic service in its National Strategy on Myanmar Refugees and Undocumented Myanmar Nationals of 2013 (Global Partnership for Education, 2018). Along with primary education, adolescent and adult learning courses were arranged for improving literacy and arithmetic skills, but enrolment was poor. The World Food Programme had arranged a few vocational training programmes as 'self-help activities' for women and girls in 2001, but only 73 women registered (MSF, 2002).

In 2017, larger numbers of Rohingya started crossing into Bangladesh, and international NGOs (INGOs) such as UNICEF and UNHCR set up a technical working group in October 2017 with experts to develop a learning framework as an alternative curriculum. The framework was drafted in consultation with the Bangladesh government, and the draft was presented to the Education Sector Group at Cox's Bazar. Feedback was solicited from teachers, NGOs, Rohingya children and their parents in 2018 and used to revise the draft. The revised draft has been presented to various government offices for endorsement (Technical Working Group, 2019). Based on this, in 2019, UNICEF rolled out new structured learning programme, known as the Learning Competency Framework and Approach (LCFA) (UNICEF, 2019).

Bangladesh Collaborates with UNICEF and Save the Children

In collaboration with the Bangladesh government, UNICEF and SCI kicked off a basic education programme at the camps for refugee children of 4–14 years old. The INEE training packs were adapted to the context of the crisis and used in 2017 to train the teachers of Rohingya children in primary schools (Shohel, 2020). At present, more than 300,000 children and adolescents receive non-formal education at over 3,200 temporary learning centres (TLCs), most of which are run with UNICEF support, and over 18,000 Rohingya adolescents (15–18 years) receive training in numeracy, vocational skills and life skills (UNICEF, 2020b). UNICEF has also established child-friendly spaces, where Rohingya children can play board games and puzzles and engage in other activities in a safe, and welcoming environment.

All learning centres provide children's education initially based on the LCFA, approved by the government in 2019. Later, the government replaced the LCFA with the Guidelines for Informal Education Programming (GIEP) (Human Rights Watch, 2019). Over 90% of the students at the learning centres are enrolled at levels 1 and 2 of the informal education system; these correspond to the formal education system with the pre-primary level up to grade 2. At levels 1 and 2, children are taught mathematics, social science, English and Burmese languages, and life skills. Science is taught at levels 3 and 4, equivalent to grades 3–8 of formal education. According to the REACH (2021) assessment report, just over 52% of Rohingya children were promoted to level 2 from level 1, while the promotion rate is even lower from level 3 to level 4, at 7%. Additionally, between December 2018 and 2019, 43% of children were upgraded from level 2 to level 3, as the report claimed. For each class, two teachers are recruited: one Bangladeshi from the host community and one Burmese-language instructor from the Rohingya community. The REACH Report (2021) claimed that Bangladeshi teachers are more educated than Rohingya teachers, and 75% of Bangladeshi teachers have at least higher secondary or tertiary qualifications, compared with 15% of Rohingya. All the educational materials are centrally prepared, developed and printed by UNICEF and distributed to the learning centres through the education sector. UNICEF also provides professional development training to the teachers at the centres.

Education of Girls, Funding Facility and Infrastructures

With the support of its partner organizations, UNICEF has formed Learning Center Management Committees to manage each centre at a camp. Each committee comprises community members (50% of whom are women)—imams (religious leaders), block Majhi (community leaders), guardians, Rohingya volunteers, children's representatives and the members of site management committees. Learning centres are temporary bamboo structures in small spaces that accommodate 40 students at most. In the camps, space is at a premium, and learning centres provide education in three shifts, each of two hours, every day of the week (Human Rights Watch, 2019). Recently, a report claimed that 342 TLCs are in danger from landslides and flooding (Education Sector Disaster Risk Management Working Group, 2018). A government representative from the Ukhia Sub-district Primary Education Department of Cox's Bazar said that:

> The biggest challenge for the government is to allocate additional lands to establish more schools for Rohingya children in camp areas. The birth rate of Rohingya children is increasing every year, so ensuring their right to education will be a big financial challenge for Bangladesh and aid agencies in the future.[1]

In coordination with the Bangladesh government, UNICEF introduced the Myanmar curriculum on a pilot basis from grades 6 to 9 in the first 6 months of the year in 2020, but it postponed the programme because of COVID-19, which affected the

Rohingya camps (Chattoraj et al., 2021; Ullah et al., 2020). This pilot programme was intended to teach Rohingya children English, Burmese, mathematics, social studies and science. The programme planned to recruit 250 teachers from both communities and train them to teach more children and students in other grades and to add other subjects over time (UNICEF, 2020b).

The programme coordinator of the education sector, UNICEF, said:

> We plan to ensure the use of the Myanmar curriculum in all learning centers in the camps by 2023. At first, we have targeted 10,000 children; students will be selected through a placement test. Only children who pass the placement test will be eligible for Levels 3 and 4. Till now, we have not received any cooperation from the Myanmar government regarding the accreditation of Rohingya children's education. Therefore, UNICEF is continuing its efforts to get international accreditation for the education of Rohingya children. We are working with Cambridge University now to get international accreditation.[2]

Ismail (name changed), a Majhi, further added:

> Since the government of this country is not giving opportunities to our children in public schools, it would be very beneficial for our children to be educated according to the Myanmar curriculum in the camp schools. But the question is when we return to our country, will the Myanmar government recognize this education?[3]

Islamic Education and Its Relevance

Rohingya leaders have set up several unofficial, refugee-run schools, such as madrasas, or unofficial Islamic religious schools, that teach both religious and secular subjects (International Crisis Group [ICG], 2019). Most of these schools lack infrastructure, resources and supplies (Krishnan, 2019). Across the camps, nearly 317 teachers teach around 10,000 children. A report shows that 67% of children (between the ages of 6 and 14) are attending both madrasas and education centres, while 12% go to madrasas only (REACH, 2019).

The imam of the mosque at the Mega Camp explained:

> We got a community center from Islamic Relief, which is now being used as a mosque and madrasa. Since our religion is Islam, we have established this madrasa because we feel the need to give religious education to our children. We have 300–350 students here who study the Qur'an and Hadith from 6–8 am and 2–4 pm. Most of the boys and girls here are in the age group of 6–10 years. There are 2–3 religious teachers in this madrasa who work in regular teaching. Also, we have a mosque committee of four people; the members of this committee go from house to house to raise money to run this madrasa. We have not received any financial support from the Bangladesh government or NGOs to run this madrasa. So far, no obstacles have been encountered in running the madrasa.[4]

The Joint Response Plan for the Rohingya Humanitarian Crisis (JRPRHC) team was represented by the UN resident coordinator of Bangladesh, representative of

UNHCR Bangladesh and chief of mission IOM Bangladesh (ISCG et al., 2019) published several recommendations in its 2019 report, as did the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) (PRIO, 2019). The UNICEF works in close association with JRPRHC to implement their ideas, policies and programmes.

To implement these recommendations, a total of 24 partner NGOs are implementing around 126 education programmes at 34 refugee camps monitored and funded by UNICEF. In the 34 camps (including the 2 registered camps), there are around 3,483 TLCs. To manage the TLCs, there are several implementing partner NGOs working at each camp. These TLCs are implemented according to the student cluster size. Currently, nearly 253,000 children are receiving basic education under the Myanmar curriculum in the camps. These organizations coordinate with each other under the supervision of UNICEF so that they are evenly distributed in various camps and within various locations of a camp (Humanitarian Response, 2022).

In this article, we discuss four such cases in detail. We analyse the implementation of the programme by BRAC, CODEC, Mukti and YPSA at the Ukhiya and Teknaf camps of Cox's Bazar.

In the following sections, we also mark some important themes that emerged around the non-formal education of Rohingya children. These are collaborative works done by the government and the NGOs on issues of funding facilities, education of girls and Islamic education. We briefly return to these at the end.

Domestic Partner NGOs: Implementing the Educational Inclusion Programme

Programme Implementation by BRAC

BRAC has been running a non-formal primary education programme since 1976 in Jamalpur (and Thakurgaon), where its work on women started, and over the years, it established schools in the neighbourhood (Sweetser, 1999). BRAC, a partner organization of UNICEF and UNHCR, has been providing education to refugee children in Cox's Bazar. They have set up over 700 TLCs, where over 61,000 children (52% girls and 48% boys) have already enrolled to receive education. BRAC has recruited more than 1,600 teachers from both the host and Rohingya communities at these learning centres; the teachers run education programmes at 14 camps, including two at registered camps. The organization was aiming to enrol 100,000 children at 1,000 learning centres by 2021.

BRAC constructed a colourful two-storey centre at Kutupalong (Camp 4) of Ukhiya sub-district in Cox's Bazar in 2018. They already built around nine two-storey centres at the camps. Each centre has a toilet. The ground floor accommodates pre-primary students, and the first-floor accommodates primary students. These learning centres generally provide early-grade learning, basic education, maths, psycho-social assistance, life skills and life-saving information.

A Rohingya refugee at Camp 4 Extension, Ukhiya, Cox's Bazar, who lived in Bangladesh since 2017, said: 'Here, our children are getting free education in

collaboration with BRAC and UNICEF, which has brought opportunities for us, while in Myanmar we had to spend money on children's education.'[5]

A Rohingya male student at Camp 19, who lived in Bangladesh since 2017, said:

> The school teachers always taught us with care here. It was very difficult for us to understand the way teachers taught in Myanmar. Here we can easily learn everything; I will be able to get a job in the future and will be able to help my family financially.[6]

At 31 adolescent centres (aged 14–18 years), nearly 3,540 adolescents receive basic literacy, numeracy, life skills, and pre-vocational education. When all the learning centres were closed due to COVID-19, BRAC took some innovative steps to continue their education activities.

A sector lead at BRAC explained:

> During COVID 19, we engaged our Rohingya teachers and community mobilizers to visit Rohingya households, and [they were thus] able to monitor the education of more than 61,000 children. Parents were trained on how to continue the education of their children in this situation; also, children received lessons over the phone every week.[7]

Programme Implementation by CODEC

CODEC, a partner organization of UNICEF and UNHCR, focuses on early education for children and basic literacy education. Since receiving approval from the government in 2016, CODEC has been working with the Rohingya children living in camps. Initially, CODEC imparted life skills and literacy education without a syllabus; now, it provides Rohingya children with early learning and informal education. The organization has established 420 learning centres in the Teknaf and Ukhiya sub-districts of Cox's Bazar, where 420 Bangladeshi and 350 Rohingya teachers teach 38,500 children.

A Rohingya woman at Camp 24, who lived in Bangladesh since 2018, commented:

> My two children are studying at the camp run by CODEC and UNICEF. Because they attend this school, they get pens, notebooks, books, bags, raincoats, umbrellas, and nutritious biscuits from the school. The children can learn English and Burmese at school, and my children have changed a lot since going to school, so we are happy. At first, his father did not want to send them to school. Because they are needed for housework, I forcibly sent them to school.[8]

Teachers are given basic training and introduced to teaching materials, and monthly learning circle meetings and fortnightly refresher trainings are organized to address their questions. CODEC also arranges basic training on child safeguard policies and disaster risk and resilience programmes for technical officers, programme organizers and Burmese-language teachers. The organization arranges annual cultural events, education fairs and parental meetings to provide

psychological support. Learning centres serve as a safe space and also act to raise awareness about vaccination activities, health and hygiene.

A technical officer at CODEC explained some of the challenges:

> Rohingya girls over the age of 14 are not allowed to go out of the house. They are willing to study but cannot go out of the house as they get older. In the beginning, there were many obstacles; now they have decreased. It is often seen that parents leave a small child at home while collecting relief; other children in the family have to look after them, so they cannot go to school. Since they [place] more importance on religion, more emphasis should be placed on religious education, geography, and ethical issues. It is also a disaster area. Most of the schools are not strong in terms of infrastructure. The infrastructure of schools needs to be strengthened so that we can provide education to them during the monsoon season. There is a need to arrange class-based education. Also, there is a shortage of drinking water in many centers. The donor community needs to do more field assessments to increase cooperation in the education sector.[9]

Programme Implementation by Mukti

With financial support from UNICEF, Mukti provides Rohingya children in Cox's Bazar education within the syllabus approved by the sector and government. Rohingya children are taught mathematics, the English and Burmese languages, life skills and, outside the syllabus, hygiene and ethics.

A Rohingya female student at Camp 22, who lived in Bangladesh since 2017, said: 'We are learning manners from school, how to deal with adults, how to get into school, and how to stay clean. However, we are learning better here than in Myanmar.'[10]

To encourage the interest of Rohingya children and parents in education, Mukti strives to involve them in education fairs, receptions, parent meetings, educational competitions and awareness days.

A technical officer at MUKTI commented:

> When the Rohingya first settled here, they were unaware of many things. Through the education program, they have become aware of many things. Education brought about a positive change in their thinking and attitude. It has been possible due to the regular meetings with parents and home visits by the teachers.[11]

Mukti provides teachers with subject-based training during recruitment, orientation training on its rules and policies, and feedback. As an implementing body, Mukti takes all possible measures to maintain a child-friendly environment. A learning centre management committee is formed for each centre, and regular meetings are held with committee members. Every learning centre is kept clean and tidy. There are posters on the walls with various proverbs that help children receive moral education. Rohingya children spend a lot of time at the centres. When children enter, they look happy. The dropout rate of Rohingya children here is very low; if they migrate or relocate, Mukti helps them enrol at a learning centre nearby.

Programme Implementation by YPSA

YPSA, in collaboration with SCI, implements a non-formal education programme for Rohingya children. YPSA operates 100 learning centres (13 in Teknaf and 8 in Ukhiya) in 12 camps. They also have 40 home-based learning centres and nine girl-friendly spaces. The learning centres serve more than 10,000 Rohingya children.

The programme coordinator, education project, at YPSA, explained:

> While in Myanmar, 90% of the Rohingya children in our learning centers did not receive any formal education. They learned at the local *Nurani* madrasas. When they came to Bangladesh, we initially taught them only literacy and numeracy. Later, they will be educated according to the Learning Competency Framework and Approach (LCFA). At the end of the year, we check their level through a questionnaire approved by the education sector.[12]

A Rohingya refugee at Camp 24 said:

> In Myanmar, I used to send our children to madrasas only. Here our children can go to madrasas for religious education as well as learn English and maths in camp schools. These sorts of education will help them get a good job in the future.[13]

These learning centres employ more than 250 teachers who work to provide education. During recruitment, at each learning centre, YPSA provides teachers with basic, subject-based, monthly and refresher training, as well as training in psychological fast aid and social and emotional learning. They also host learning circles twice a week to exchange knowledge among them. Each learning centre is managed by an education coordinator. Each committee is made up of a camp imam (religious leader), block Majhi, parents and children's representatives. They are involved in community-level activities such as monitoring the presence or absence of children and advising any parent who does not want to send the child to learning centres.

Also, YPSA operates home-based learning centres in two shifts. In the morning shift, they use games to teach children over the age of 4; children of this age are mainly prepared for informal education. In the second shift, 12 adolescent girls are educated at each home-based learning centre. Most of these adolescent girls never went to school or stopped at the onset of puberty.

Zunayed, the teacher at an YPSA learning centre, explained that:

> They have a belief that when a girl reaches puberty, she no longer needs to go to school. It is taboo to go in front of their men at this time. That is why they forbid girls to go to learning centers. We usually provide health and hygiene education to these adolescent girls at these home-based learning centers so that they can be aware of their children in the future.[14]

At their girl-friendly centres, YPSA conducts educational activities two days a week, teaches girls to sew to generate income and provides various recreational facilities.

Discussion, Recommendation and Conclusion

The Rohingya have faced immense persecution in Myanmar, and research that analyses the trauma this has entailed is important. But it is also necessary to go beyond the phase of trauma to understand their ongoing problems in the host societies where they find refuge. There is a need to understand how they are developing resilience and adapting to new realities, the benefits that accrue to them and their agentic role in shaping their future.

Education plays a fundamental role in including the children of refugees and displaced persons in host societies by empowering them, reducing their dependency on others and contributing to long-term social harmony and cohesion. Schools can offer traumatized refugee children and community members a safe social space and forge bonds of trust, healing and support. Despite the sudden geopolitical crisis in the region and with its limited resources and a large number of poverty-stricken populations to manage, the Bangladesh government—in collaboration with international and local organizations—provides education to the children of Rohingya refugees and tries its best to manage the crisis. That is laudable, but the education programmes are literacy- and training-based, short-term and for emergency purposes only, with the longer term goals of education not being met.

Developed countries have greater resources than developing countries and better work, health and education opportunities; their definition of 'integration' is specific, realistic and pragmatic (Echterhoff et al., 2020). In developing countries however, 'refugee integration' is understood as an alternative to 'repatriation and resettlement' (Pace & Simsek, 2019). The countries of Southeast Asia, for instance, consider refugees a burden, and their education policies for Rohingya children often represent half-hearted attempts at managing an 'emergency'. Bangladesh is a small, resource-constrained, developing country formed only in 1971, and therefore its concept and practice of refugee inclusion cannot be fairly evaluated by any European standards (Bhambra, 2017). Yet, even within these restrictions, Bangladesh can probably educate its refugees better if it can learn from the experiences of Southeast Asia, particularly the Islamic countries. These countries may be persuaded to send teacher volunteers (especially women) to learning centres at refugee camps. Sharing their experience of educating refugee children would also help.

The UNICEF programme in Bangladesh, although only at a preliminary stage, has already achieved considerable success in the inclusive education of Rohingya refugee children. The programme partners impart academic and life skills, moral education and education in health and hygiene. They also conduct extracurricular activities, take care of mental health and provide nutritious food. The partners have developed good infrastructure in little time; around 3,000 TLCs practice this holistic approach to inclusive education, and enrolment is growing. Innovative pedagogical planning—taking education to the student—has helped the programme manage the COVID-19 crisis. Despite successes, however, the quality of education that the Rohingya refugee children receive at camp schools remains suboptimal as the implementation of the programme faces many constraints. Here, we propose a few measures—some that may work better within the existing constraints and others that seek to remove them—for the government and partners to consider.

Funding is limited and of the short term, little space is available, the school infrastructure is not fully developed yet, and most of the learning centres are at risk from natural disasters. The NGO Affairs Bureau authorizes the activities of NGOs and monitors them. While the Ministry of Education approves of educating the children of Rohingya refugees, the NGO Affairs Bureau does not, and they often reject foreign funding for educational programmes (Shohel, 2020). The education sector needs adequate school infrastructure, basic emergency preparedness and a response plan. The development partners, UNICEF, and other donor agencies need to raise fund by creating public awareness about the problem worldwide and persuading private organizations, companies and NGOs—at home and abroad—to donate to build the required infrastructure. Crowdfunding campaigns could be organized, too. All this can scale the programme and cover a wider population of Rohingya refugee children and adolescents.

Educating girl children is important; the partners strive to develop that awareness in society and make the programme gainfully inclusive. The partners have recruited Rohingya teachers and achieved some success in reducing the gender gap and inequality in access to education. But these programmes do not currently educate girls on issues such as reproductive health, contraceptive use and menstrual hygiene practices (Islam et al., 2021). If Rohingya women were recruited to teach and trained to educate girls in proper health care and also to prevent child marriage, those women would not only be gainfully employed, but their presence in schools would also help persuade families to educate their girl children. Within the cultural and religious context of Bangladesh, more women could be encouraged to participate, and the radicalization of Rohingya youth may be mitigated if madrasas and other institutions and organizations that impart religious education are involved in a progressive, regulated manner.

The government and donor agencies need to introduce a class-based education system at schools that separates older children from younger ones. Skilled subject teachers should be recruited and trained to teach Rohingya children; the curriculum should include geography, history, and the knowledge and skills related to survival and peace-building so that the long-term goals of education are embedded in the programmes. Adolescents should be provided with vocational education along with subject-based education. The Myanmar curriculum being piloted now for Rohingya refugee children must be evaluated and expanded to all the learning centres at Ukhiya and Teknaf in Cox's Bazar. More effort and collaboration are needed to improve its implementation and the quality of the GIEP.

Also, the government does not integrate the refugees; it bars refugee children from receiving formal, certified education at public schools. Secondary schools may not be set up at refugee camps. The Bengali language may not be taught. Refugee children are allowed only non-formal education at camp-based schools. All these restrictions reify the Rohingya refugees, as 'others', unequal to citizens.

The Rohingya feel that the educational and skills development programmes are not long-term programmes; this sense of uncertainty may impair their potential effectiveness. However, our interview quotations show that in interacting with civil society and the government and in participating in schools and their activity-centred

pedagogy, the Rohingya have gained a degree of resilience and developed hopes for the future, as the refugee quotes highlighted.

This is seen when the government works successfully and collaboratively with the NGOs, both international, such as UNICEF and SCI, and local, such as BRAC, CODEC, Mukti and YPSA, and facilitates them so that they can implement their programmes. In the process of these implementations, they have been able to express their voice, opinions and angst. There have been issues around funding despite the presence of international NGOs and CSOs, partly due to various government regulations. Issues also remain around the education of girls and the regulation and implementation of Islamic education among the youth. These issues need to be resolved over time through discussions that should involve the Rohingya themselves.

As for now, it is important to note that the Rohingya can voice their opinions that a subjective transformation in their choice-making capacity is taking place, and those new aspirations for better educational possibilities and a better future are emerging. They feel that their current circumstances are markedly improved compared to those in Myanmar, and the liminality of their pre-migration and trans-migration phases has reduced, even though they are still unsure about their future.

A holistic model of education facilitates the educational integration of refugee children and establishes relationships between needs, factors and policies. Educational integration is the need of the time. However, the current nature of policymaking remains top-down. Involving the Rohingya, along with civil society, would help to modify the policy to reflect their dynamic choices and the desires of both parents and children. Ensuring inclusive education for refugee children is a clear responsibility of the UN agencies and the host government and goes some way to address the Sustainable Development Goal 4 of ensuring 'inclusive, equitable and quality education for all' by 2030. A comprehensive, inclusive education policy for dealing with refugee and migrant children should be undertaken by the government. An inclusive education approach can contribute to executing the social and economic rights of refugee children, both girls and boys. Inclusive education can also promote social cohesion, stability and peace-building in society and create pathways for the Rohingya's longer term inclusion in society.

Acknowledgments

We are indebted to all the individuals from Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh, who participated in this research, without whose contribution writing this article would have been impossible, and to the two anonymous reviewers and their comments which helped us sharpen our argument. We are also grateful to the editor of this journal, Professor Geert De Neve, and senior peer review associate of SAGE India journal, Archik Sinha, for their careful handling and editing of this article, which enhanced its quality immensely.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The article was prepared within the framework of the Basic Research Programme at HSE University.

Notes

1. Telephonic interview, 20 November 2020.
2. Telephonic interview, 15 January 2021.
3. Interview, Camp 22, Teknaf, Cox's Bazar, 14 October 2020.
4. Interview, Camp 24, Teknaf, Cox's Bazar, 27 December 2020.
5. Interview, October 18, 2020.
6. Interview, 26 November 2020.
7. Telephonic interview, 26 January 2021.
8. Interview, 3 October 2020.
9. Interview, 10 December 2020.
10. Interview, 5 October 2020.
11. Interview, 9 December 2020.
12. Telephonic interview, 19 January 2021.
13. Interview, November 15, 2020.
14. Interview at Camp 19, Ukhiya, Cox's Bazar, December 10, 2020.

ORCID iDs

Md. Reza Habib https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0531-4194
Arnab Roy Chowdhury https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6626-3936
Artem Uldanov https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6273-0250

References

Ager, A., & Strang, A. (2008). Understanding integration: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *21*(2), 166–191.

Alam, J. (2018). The Rohingya of Myanmar: Theoretical significance of the minority status. *Asian Ethnicity*, *19*(2), 180–210.

Alam, J. (2020). The status and rights of the Rohingya as refugees under International Refugee Law: Challenges for a durable solution. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, *19*(2), 128–141.

Anderson, A., Hamilton, R., Moore, D., Loewen, S., & Frater-Mathieson, K. (2004). Education of refugee children: Theoretical perspectives and best practice. In R. Hamilton & D. Moore (Eds.), *Educational interventions for refugee children* (pp. 15–25). Routledge.

Bhambra, G. K. (2017). The current crisis of Europe: Refugees, colonialism, and the limits of cosmopolitanism. *European Law Journal*, *23*(5), 395–405.

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (1998). The ecology of developmental processes. In W. Damon & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology* (Vol. 1, 993–1028). John Wiley & Sons.

BROUK. (2018). *The right to education denied for Rohingya refugees in Bangladesh*. https://burmacampaign.org.uk/media/The-Right-to-Education-Denied-for-Rohingya-Refugees-in-Bangladesh.pdf

Brun, C., & Shuayb, M. (2020). Exceptional and futureless humanitarian education of Syrian refugees in Lebanon: Prospects for shifting the lens. *Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees*, *36*(2), 20–30.

Cerna, L. (2019). *Refugee education: Integration models and practices in OECD countries* [OECD education working papers, No. 203]. https://doi.org/10.1787/19939019

Chattoraj, D., Ullah, A. K. M. A., & Hossain, M. A. (2021). The COVID-19 pandemic and the travails of Rohingya refugees in the largest Bangladeshi refugee camp. In B. Doucet, R. van Melik, & P. Filion (Eds.), *Global reflections on COVID-19 and cities: Urban inequalities in the age of pandemic* (pp. 165–174). Bristol University Policy Press.

Dryden-Peterson, S., Adelman, E., Bellino, M. J., & Chopra, V. (2019). The purposes of refugee education: Policy and practice of including refugees in national education systems. *Sociology of Education*, *92*(4), 346–366.

Echterhoff, G., Hellmann, J. H., Back, M. D., Kärtner, J., Morina, N., & Hertel, G. (2020). Psychological antecedents of refugee integration (PARI). *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *15*(4), 856–879.

Education Cluster, Save the Children, & UNICEF. (2018, June). Joint education needs assessment: Rohingya Refugee in Cox's Bazar - June 2018 - Bangladesh. *ReliefWeb*. https://reliefweb.int/report/bangladesh/joint-education-needs-assessment-rohingya-refugee-cox-s-bazar-june-2018

Education Sector Disaster Risk Management Working Group. (2018). *Emergency preparedness and response plan for the Cox's Bazar education sector*. https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/sites/www.humanitarianresponse.info/files/documents/files/bd_emergency-preparedness-response-plan_education_sector.pdf

Equal Rights Trust. (2014). *The human rights of stateless Rohingya in Thailand*. https://www.equalrightstrust.org/ertdocumentbank/Equal%20Only%20in%20Name%20-%20Thailand%20-%20Full%20Report.pdf

Farzana, K. F., Pero, S. D. M., & Othman, M. F. (2020). The dream's door: Educational marginalization of Rohingya children in Malaysia. *South Asian Journal of Business and Management Cases*, *9*(2), 237–246.

Global Partnership for Education. (2018). *Leaving no one behind: Education for Rohingya refugee and host communities' children in Cox's Bazar district. Bangladesh*. https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/education-rohingya-refugee-and-host-communities-children-coxs-bazar-district-bangladesh

Guo, Y., Maitra, S., & Guo, S. (2019). 'I belong to nowhere': Syrian refugee children's perspectives on school integration. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Education*, *14*(1), 89–105.

Habib, Md. R., & Roy Chowdhury, A. (2023). The Rohingya refugees in Bangladesh: Conflict with the host community over natural resources in Cox's Bazar district. *Area Development and Policy*, *8*(3), 263–273. https://doi.org/10.1080/23792949.2023.2193246

Hamilton, R., & Moore, D. (2004). *Educational interventions for refugee children: Theoretical perspectives and implementing best practice*. Routledge.

Human Rights Watch. (2018, August). '*Bangladesh is not my country*'*: The plight of Rohingya refugees from Myanmar*. https://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/report_pdf/bangladesh0818_web2.pdf

Human Rights Watch. (2019, December 3). '*Are We Not Human?*' *Denial of education for Rohingya refugee children in Bangladesh*. https://www.hrw.org/report/2019/12/03/are-we-not-human/denial-education-rohingya-refugee-children-bangladesh

International Crisis Group. (2019). *A sustainable policy for Rohingya refugees in Bangladesh*. https://www.crisisgroup.org/asia/south-asia/bangladesh/303-sustainable-policy-rohingya-refugees-bangladesh

ISCG, IOM, UN RC Bangladesh, & UNHCR. (2019). 2019 joint response plan for Rohingya humanitarian crisis (January–December) [EN/BN]—Bangladesh. *ReliefWeb*. https://reliefweb.int/report/bangladesh/2019-joint-response-plan-rohingya-humanitarian-crisis-january-december-enbn

Islam, M. M., Khan, M. N., & Rahman, M. M. (2021). Factors affecting child marriage and contraceptive use among Rohingya girls in refugee camps. *The Lancet Regional Health - Western Pacific*, *12*, 100175. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanwpc.2021.100175

Krishnan, V. (2019, November 12). Rohingya-run schools push for education amid tight restrictions. *The New Humanitarian*. https://www.thenewhumanitarian.org/news-feature/2019/11/12/Bangladesh-Rohingya-schools-refugee-education-restrictions

Lerch, J. C., & Buckner, E. (2018). From education for peace to education in conflict: Changes in UNESCO discourse, 1945–2015. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *16*(1), 27–48.

Letchamanan, H. (2013). Myanmar's Rohingya refugees in Malaysia: Education and the way forward. *Journal of International and Comparative Education*, *2*(2), 86–97.

Malkki, L. H. (1996). Speechless emissaries: Refugees, humanitarianism, and dehistoricization. *Cultural Anthropology*, *11*(3), 377–404.

Missbach, A. (2017). Accommodating asylum seekers and refugees in Indonesia: From immigration detention to containment in "alternatives to detention." *Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees*, *33*(2), 32–44.

MSF. (2002, March 1). 10 years for the Rohingya refugees in Bangladesh: Past, present and future. *Médecins Sans Frontières-Holland*. https://www.msf.fr/sites/default/files/2002-03-01-MSFH.pdf

Muhaidat, M., Alodat, A., & Almeqdad, Q. (2020). Inclusive education practices for refugee children with disabilities in Jordanian schools. *International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education*, *12*(2), 147–153.

Pace, M., & Simsek, D. (2019). *The politics of integration: Adjusting to new lives in host societies* (pp. 1–14). SIRIUS. https://forskning.ruc.dk/en/publications/the-politics-of-integration-adjusting-to-new-lives-in-host-societ

Peace Research Institute Oslo [PRIO]. (2020). Education for Rohingya refugee children in Malaysia. *ReliefWeb*. https://reliefweb.int/report/malaysia/education-rohingya-refugee-children-malaysia

Rahman, U. (2010). The Rohingya refugee: A security dilemma for Bangladesh. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, *8*(2), 233–239.

REACH. (2019, April). *Education needs assessment: Preliminary findings*. www.humanitarianresponse.info/sites/www.humanitarianresponse.info/files/2019/05/1904_reach_ bgd_presentation_education_needs_assessment_april2019.pdf

REACH. (2021, March). *Bangladesh: Assessment of the education sector response to the Rohingya crisis—Rohingya refugee response*. https://reliefweb.int/report/bangladesh/bangladesh-assessment-education-sector-response-rohingya-crisis-rohingya-refugee

Roy Chowdhury, A. (2019). International–domestic linkages in a developing country context: The case of the Rohingyas in Bangladesh. *Policy Studies*, *40*(3–4), 303–319.

Roy Chowdhury, A. (2020). An 'un-imagined community': The entangled genealogy of exclusivist nationalism in Myanmar and the Rohingya refugee crisis. *Social Identities*, *26*(5), 590–607.

Roy Chowdhury, A. (2021). Against unjust laws: Civil society activism for the rights of the stateless Rohingya 'boat people' in Bangladesh. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, *120*(3), 670–676.

Roy Chowdhury, A., & Abid, A. (2022). Treading the border of (il) legality: Statelessness, ‘amphibian life’, and the Rohingya ‘boat people’ of Asia. *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, *23*(1), 68–85.

Save the Children. (2018a). *What is a refugee*. https://www.savethechildren.org/us/what-we-do/emergency-response/refugee-children-crisis/what-is-refugee

Save the Children. (2018b). *Bangladesh Rohingya response case study*.

Shohel, M. M. C. (2020). Education in emergencies: Challenges of providing education for Rohingya children living in refugee camps in Bangladesh. *Education Inquiry*, *13*(1), 104–126.

Shuayb, M., & Crul, M. (2020). Reflection on the education of refugee children: Beyond reification and emergency. *Refuge: Canada’s Journal on Refugees*, *36*(2), 3–8.

Silvya Sari, D. (2018). Indonesian government policy on Rohingya refugees. *Andalas Journal of International Studies*, *7*(1), 1–13.

Stubbs, S. (2008). Inclusive education. *Where there are few resources.* The Atlas Alliance.

Sweetser, A. T. (1999). Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee: Lessons from the BRAC non-formal primary education programme. https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNACE308.pdf

Technical Working Group. (2019). *Learning competency framework and approach (LCFA) for children of displaced person’s from Rakhine state, Myanmar Bangladesh*. Cox’s Bazar Education Sector. https://educationcluster.app.box.com/v/BangladeshLCFA2019

Thomas, R. L. (2016). The right to quality education for refugee children through social inclusion. *Journal of Human Rights and Social Work*, *1*(4), 193–201.

Tuangratananon, T., Suphanchaimat, R., Julchoo, S., Sinam, P., & Putthasri, W. (2019). Education policy for migrant children in Thailand and how it really happens: A case study of Ranong Province, Thailand. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *16*(3), 430.

Ullah, A. K. M. A. (2011). Rohingya refugee to Bangladesh: Historical exclusions and contemporary marginalization. *Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies*, *9*(2), 139–168.

Ullah, A. K. M. A. (2016). Rohingya crisis in Myanmar: Seeking justice for the ‘stateless’. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *32*(3), 285–301.

Ullah, A. K. M. A., & Chattoraj, D. (2018). Roots of discrimination against Rohingya minorities: Society, ethnicity and international relations. *Intellectual Discourse*, *26*(2), 541–465.

Ullah, A. K. M. A., & Chattoraj, D. (2022). Rohingya children in Bangladesh: Questioning the past and imagining the future. In K. Aljunied (Ed.), *Routledge handbook of Islam in Southeast Asia* (pp.190–203). Routledge.

Ullah, A. K. M. A., Hossain, M. A., & Chattoraj, D. (2020). Covid-19 and Rohingya refugee camps in Bangladesh. *Intellectual Discourse*, *28*(2), 791–804.

UNDP. (2015). *Sustainable Development Goals: United Nations Development Programme*. https://www.undp.org/sustainable-development-goals

UNHCR. (2013). *A new beginning: Refugee integration in Europe*. https://www.unhcr.org/protection/operations/52403d389/new-beginning-refugee-integration-europe.html

UNHCR. (2016). *Missing out: Refugee education in crisis*. https://www.unhcr.org/publications/education/57d9d01d0/missing-refugee-education-crisis.html

UNHCR. (2017). *Challenges and way forward in handling Rohingya refugees in Malaysia*. https://www.unhcr.org/news/latest/2017/3/59128a817/challenges-and-way-forward-in-handling-rohingya-refugees-in-malaysia.html

UNHCR. (2018). *Millions of refugee children going without schooling, UNHCR report shows*. https://www.unhcr.org/news/press/2018/8/5b862f424/millions-refugee-children-schooling-unhcr-report-shows.html

UNHCR. (2020). *Children*. https://www.unhcr.org/children-49c3646c1e8.html

UNICEF. (2017). *Outcast and desperate: Rohingya refugee children face a perilous future* (UNICEF Child Alert). https://www.unicef.org/publications/files/UNICEF_Rohingya_refugee_children_2017.pdf

UNICEF. (2018). *Inclusive education*. https://www.unicef.org/greece/en/what-we-do/inclusive-education

UNICEF. (2019, May 3). *Geneva Palais briefing note: Education for Rohingya children in Bangladesh*. https://www.unicef.org/press-releases/geneva-palais-briefing-note-education-rohingya-children-bangladesh

UNICEF. (2020a). *Child displacement*. https://data.unicef.org/topic/child-migration-and-displacement/displacement/

UNICEF. (2020b). *Expanding education for Rohingya refugee children in Bangladesh*. https://www.unicef.org/rosa/stories/expanding-education-rohingya-refugee-children-bangladesh

WeiQian, K. (2019). Refugee education in another perspective: The current state in Malaysia and its way forward. *The Bulletin of the Graduate School, Soka University*, *40*, 153–167.

Xchange. (2018). *'The Rohingya amongst Us': Bangladeshi perspectives on the Rohingya crisis survey*. http://xchange.org/bangladeshi-perspectives-on-the-rohingya-crisis-survey/