

Curriculum Choice for Refugee Children at Jawi Refugee Camp, Ethiopia

Eyueil Abate Demissie¹
PhD Candidate at Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia
Ambissa Kenea Boru²
Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia

Background information

There is a debate on the choice of curriculum to be implemented in the education offered for refugee children and the debate is based on the status of refugee children and their future aspirations. UNHCR (2015) classifies the choice of curriculum in the education delivered for refugees into two: (a) parallel system and (b) mainstreaming. The parallel system refers to the use of the curriculum of the country of origin and it is described as a traditional model. In this system refugees access education in refugee-hosting schools that are managed by UNHCR or its partners. The case of Pakistan, Liberia, and Tanzania has been presented as example of curriculum choice along this system. Mainstreaming, on the other hand refers to the use of the curriculum of the country of asylum (or host country). This is the curriculum of choice by UNHCR Education policy. Refugees are mainstreamed into national schools and follow the host country's national curriculum. In the mainstreaming system, refugees access education either in a UNHCR (or partner-managed) refugee camp setting or in host community schools.

The question in this debate is which curriculum is the most suitable in education for refugee children and two opposing ideas have been identified from the literature reviewed (UNESCO, 2017; Education Development Trust, 2018; UNHCR, 2015; UNHCR, 2017). The first proposition recommends that refugees need to learn by the host country curriculum for overcoming problems related to material and teacher scarcity. This idea is mainly supported by UNHCR, UNESCO, and UNICEF, organizations who want to make sure that the children are accessed to some kind of education today. According to UNESCO the plan for inclusion of refugee students in the national education system need to be done before the emergency phase (UNESCO, 2017) and starting from 2012 UNHCR launched an inclusive educational strategy that requests teaching refugees through the host government education system (Education Development Trust, 2018). UNHCR encourages cooperation with national education authorities for early adoption and/or transition to using of the country of asylum curriculum in refugee settings. According to UNHCR use of the curriculum of the country of asylum provides access to accredited, supervised, and accountable education services (UNHCR, 2015). For the writer, this is because it is convenient for safe access to examinations and certification, access to teaching and learning materials, quality assurance, and improved access to national education services including options to continue education at higher levels and safe access to accredited certification and services associated with national systems. The example cited for this stand is the experience of Sudanese refugees in Chad. According to this example, Sudanese refugees in Chad attend their education by the curriculum of origin from 2003 – 2012 and Chad has a bilingual curriculum (French/Arabic),



TO CITE THIS ARTICLE PLEASE INCLUDE ALL OF THE FOLLOWING DETAILS:

Demissie, Eyueil Abate; Boru, Ambissa Kenea (2021). Curriculum Choice for Refugee Children at Jawi Refugee Camp, Ethiopia, *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry* 18 (1) p. 67-77

<https://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/tci/issue/<access date>>

which meant that students could continue learning in Arabic. Due to the continual conflict in Darfur, the refugees are far from repatriation and become less prepared for the professional demand of the host country. Therefore, the UNHCR has conducted a participatory assessment to examine the transition of the curriculum adapted from the country of origin to the country of asylum. Across the 12 refugee camps, the feedback of refugees was found to be mixed in that the transition has got support from refugees in some camps while it faces resistance in other refugee camps due to its danger to certification, education quality, a loss of national identity, culture, and religion. In order to implement the transition, training was given for 167 teachers and a joint activity was done by the UNHCR, UNESCO, UNICEF, and the MoE. It is also mentioned that an action plan was prepared and frequently monitored by stakeholders regularly. Despite the resistance observed from students in some camps, the implementation has been continued and the results were believed to be successful (UNHCR, 2015).

On the other hand, some scholars argue that refugees need to learn by the curriculum of the country of origin. The concept of "education for repatriation", using the home country curriculum, gained recognition during the 1990s. This system prepares students to re-enter schooling smoothly during repatriation. The system recommends that educated refugees need to be given the chance to be teachers. UNHCR, (2017), indicated that students feel a sense of security in a situation where their identity is respected, and learning in a familiar classroom gives them comfort. According to Sinclair, (2001), such a kind of education system is very important in the use of the language of origin as a medium of instruction and respecting student's religious as well as cultural values. UNHCR (2017) discusses that differences in curriculum and educational delay may increase trauma among refugee children.

In general, dilemma is observable as far as the curriculum choice for refugee children is considered. As presented above, studying the host country curriculum is advantageous in some situations (e.g., when repatriation is extended, when educational resources are scarce, etc.). Learning the home country curriculum is also advantageous from the view point of maintaining national identity, continuity in mental set-up, preparation for repatriation, etc. The other dimension of the complication is when the children aspire (and also have a possibility) to transfer to a third country from the immediate host country. Added to this is the fact that the particular third country is not readily known. Then, both the host and home country curricula may not be very relevant. Therefore, such complexity calls for detailed analysis. The South Sudanese children (the case community) in Ethiopia are learning the Ethiopian school curriculum following the Ethiopian school system. **Within the lens of the dilemma identified above, this study intends to examine whether the curriculum choice made for this group of refugee children is the best possible one.**

Material and Methods

This is a qualitative single case study in which schools in *Jewi* Refugee Camp are considered as a case for investigation. The camp is located in *Gambella* region in South-West Ethiopia Ethiopia. South Sudanese refugees reside in this refugee camp and most of them were from the Upper Nile state. The sources of data, sampling technique, tools used for data collection and the method of data analysis are briefly outlined below:

a) Source of data and tools: Interview, document analysis and observation serve as a data collecting tools in this study. Refugee students, national teachers, refugee teachers, parents, school leaders, and officials from ARRA, Save the Children Gambella Office, UNHCR, DICAC, and South Sudanese Embassy in Ethiopia took part in this research.

b) Sampling: For the selection of participant officials, principals, and parent teacher and students' association (PTSA) members the researchers used availability sampling technique – took those that were available by the time of the Camp visit. Convenient sampling technique



was applied in the selection of key informant teachers, whereas systematic random sampling technique was used for the selection of national teachers. Finally, the researchers used opportunistic (emergent) sampling technique for the selection of the refugee students in the primary schools.

C). Method of data analysis: A qualitative data analysis technique was used for analyzing the data gathered. Accordingly, the data collected from the research sites were organized, the audio files were transcribed, and the field notes were read and re-read. The analysis was assisted by MaxQda Software version 2018.3. The findings were presented and discussed in the subsequent section.

Findings and Discussion

The perception of respondents on learning through the host country curriculum

Most respondent seemed supportive of using the Ethiopian curriculum to educate the South Sudanese refugee children. For instance, respondent from the South Sudanese Embassy in Ethiopia indicated that students face no equivalence problem for resuming their education or get employment opportunities during repatriation. Admittedly, most respondents noted the prevalence of differences in the subjects taught in the schools of South Sudan and Ethiopia. For example, the majority of the respondent students and key informants identified the subject called Religious Education in South Sudan whereas it does not exist in Ethiopian school curriculum. In Ethiopia, education is separated from religion. However, the respondents tended to agree that the contents included in science subjects both in Ethiopia and South Sudanese curriculum are almost the same. Therefore, they see no problem of offering science education for refugee children through the curriculum of the host country (School Principal 1, 2019; School Principal 4, 2019; Education Expert from ARRA, 2019). Additionally, some respondents prefer to make students learn through the Ethiopian curriculum by mentioning the prevalence of better opportunities for them to join a university in Ethiopia than in South Sudan (Key Informant Teacher 2, 2019; Respondent from Development Inter Church Aid Commission, 2019; Key Informant Teacher 3, 2019). Furthermore, Education Expert of ARRA (2019) and Respondent Education officer from UNHCR Ethiopia (2019) indicated the problems of teaching South Sudanese refugee students that are found in Ethiopia through the South Sudanese curriculum. Lack of teachers, shortage of respurces, and, above all, mismatch to prepare the students for higher education in Ethiopia. Regarding this, one respondent stated the following:

Students are happy to learn the Ethiopian curriculum but not happy with the medium of instruction which is a mother tongue. Qualification of teachers in South Sudan is not advanced, so they like the education in here. Difficulty level of Ethiopian education is higher than the education in South Sudan. This is observable from to the fact that most of the refugee students struggle to understand the lessons at the beginning. Some of them openly complain that the lessons are more difficult than the ones they used to have in their country. Students love to learn a Civics subject. There is no training that provides orientation for national teachers on how to consider background information about the refugees in their lessons (School Principal 2, 2019)

Many respondent students and teachers stressed that the education provided in Ethiopia is by far more difficult than the education in South Sudan. The respondents believe



that the refugee children have got the opportunity to learn advanced concepts through the Ethiopian curriculum. Their reason is that in Ethiopia the contents in each subject and grade level are reasonably more difficult than what are given in South Sudan. Additionally, most respondent teachers and key informants consider learning Physics, Chemistry, and Biology at the primary school level challenge the capacity of the students as these subjects are offered for secondary school students in South Sudan. In connection with this, one respondent specified that most of the textbooks used in South Sudan have few topics with little volume. In comparison with Ethiopia, he contended, the textbooks prepared for students of the same grade level as well as subjects in South Sudan can be finished within a short period of time (Respondent from Save the Children International Gambella branch, 2019).

Despite this, there are not few children who lack interest to attend their education believing the education in Ethiopia has no use for their future life in South Sudan. As a result, they pay less attention to their current education. This part of the dilemma stated earlier in this paper. Some of these children lack interest in the medium of instruction (School Principal 2, 2019), some think that they would go back home or leave for another country of hope and that the education they get from Ethiopian school does not serve them. This situation deserves some kind of resolve. May be is it possible to hybrid the two systems of education? Would reconsider the issue of medium of instruction possible so that the children gain better skills of “bread winning language?” Would making parents and the children aware of the fact that the contents of the curriculum are only means to quire some developmentally appropriate skills and that contents are not ends in themselves help? These and similar thoughts need to be considered if the children are to make good use of the years they spend on schooling for education does not wait.

Emphasis given in their current education for original cultural orientation of students

The existence of a local community from a similar ethnic origin with refugees brings an advantage for refugee children to live in a culturally friendly environment. This factor has a constructive effect to provide culturally relevant education to some degree. There is still a serious complaint from respondent students about learning the culture, value, and system of the host country in some subjects. This research identified the prevalence of endemic issues in the lessons which are unfamiliar to foreigners taught in Ethiopia. These issues have been manifested in places and individuals as well as in textbooks mentioned as examples. It is also revealed in the study that students are unhappy in learning the geography or history of Ethiopia. Moreover, from most of the respondents, it is understood that in Civics and Ethical Education subject students learn about the constitution, democratic system, culture of conflict resolution, and flag of Ethiopia. Accordingly, some think that they are denied to learn the history or geography as well as government formation in their own country, i.e., South Sudan. Some teachers to initiative to introduce a situation in which children are encouraged to talk about their country. The experience of a respondent Civic and Ethical Education teacher is presented here as it is found to be crucial to resolve such complaints.

When we teach the Ethiopian constitution in Civics subject, there are lessons about the Ethiopian government organization and the Ethiopian flag. In teaching about the Ethiopian flag, I asked them to tell me about the flag of their country. After I taught the meanings of the colors in the Ethiopian flag, I asked them to tell me about the colors and their meanings in the flag of their country. I encouraged them to tell me about the constitution and government organization of their country (National Teacher 5, 2019)



This lived experience of this national teacher clearly communicates that teachers, if they can carefully consider the students in their classroom, can make the curriculum more relevant for the refugee children. Some respondent see advantage in the refugees' learning the Ethiopian curriculum. For instance, Program Head of Jewi Refugee Camp (2019) stated, one of the major reasons for teaching refugee students through the Ethiopian curriculum is to enable them to adapt themselves with the values and cultures of Ethiopia, i.e., the host country. (This, as to the respondents, helps to develop the people-to-people relation with the current and future generations. The values and cultures of Ethiopia which are new for refugee students have been reflected in the Ethiopian education system. But creating the platform is very critical if the education is needed to be highly relevant and to promote and embrace the original culture simultaneously.

Instructional language in refugee hosting schools

In Ethiopia one of the core advantages for refugees is that they settle in a community that speaks the same language and has a culture which is relatively close to theirs. For instance, Eritrean refugees in Ethiopia settle in *Tigray* and Afar region. Refugees from Somalia settle in a refugee camp built in the Somali Regional State. Similarly, refugees from South Sudan largely settle in Gambella and Benishangul Regional States (Education Expert from ARRA, 2019; Respondent Education Officer from UNHCR, 2019; Respondent from Save the Children International Gambella branch, 2019; School Principal 1, 2019). Therefore, the majority of the refugees in Ethiopia have a relative advantage to learn by their mother language. Despite this, Eritrean Kunama refugees who settle in a refugee camp that is found in Tigray Region attend their primary education through Tigrigna. In different from this, back home in Eritrea the refugees used to learn through Latin language (Education Expert from ARRA, 2019). Additionally, in a refugee camp found in Assosa, there were refugees from more than 16 countries. In such a situation, using a mother tongue as a medium of instruction is impossible. As a result, in this refugee camp English serves as a medium of instruction for primary education (Education Expert of ARRA, 2019 & Respondent Education Officer from UNHCR, 2019).

In refugee-hosting schools that are found in Gambella Region the medium of instruction for students from grade 1-4 is mother tongue. Six local languages serve as a medium of instruction from grades 1-4 and students from grade 5-8 attend their education in English (Respondent from Gambella Education Bureau, 2019; Education Expert from ARRA, 2019). A similar approach is followed in the four schools in *Jewi* Refugee Camp. This is because there are locals who speak the same language and there is a pre-existing experience to provide education using the *Nuer* language as a medium of instruction for *Nuer* communities in Ethiopia. Hence, as one of the respondents said, there is no problem of finding teaching materials by their mother tongue (Education Expert from ARRA, 2019).

Even though the researched students have got the opportunity to learn through their mother tongue, the students and other key informants criticize the Ethiopian education system for being highly dependent on mother language. Almost all the respondent students and key informants are not interested to use their mother tongue as a medium of instruction. According to them, it should have been used for informal communication outside of the classroom and in religious institutions. These respondents expressed that when they were in South Sudan, they attended their education through the English language. Some respondents pointed out that those students who learn through the Ethiopian curriculum are less competent in communicating in English and they fear for the occurrence of English language skills differences between students in South Sudan and refugee South Sudanese students in



Ethiopia. They consider this to affect the employability of the refugee students during repatriation.

Though the respondents expressed that they used to learn through the English language when they were in South Sudan, the researchers' observation, the responses of the national teachers as well as that of school principals revealed that the greater majority of the students are unable to communicate well using English language. Very few respondents mentioned that students in *Jewi* Refugee Camp are good in communicating through English and some teachers claimed that the majority of the students can comprehend things said in English. The researchers also confirmed that some of the students can communicate using English if the speaker talks slowly and clearly. Comparatively, it is true that students who have school experience in South Sudan were better in communicating through English than students who begin school only in Ethiopia.

Nevertheless, all the respondents underscored, students are facing a communication gap and it is posing a problem with their academic achievement. The results of the research also indicated the prevalence of a huge communication gap between national teachers and students in refugee-hosting schools. The remarks of a respondent students can be good evidence for this argument. "We face difficulty to communicate with Ethiopian teachers and our communication with them is very much limited due to language barrier" (Respondent Student 3, 2019). In contrast females are identified to be less confident in communicating through English language.

When I talked to a female student in English, she replied in Nuer. In such cases, I don't use boys as a translator because that may not be comfortable for her. Instead, I use assistant teachers as a translator (National Teacher 5, 2019)

To resolve the communication gap, national teachers and school principals pinpointed that they use translators from students and incentive teachers even though the capacity of the "student translator" on understanding what the teacher says is questionable.

Discussion

This research investigates the contrasting discourses in the curriculum of choice for refugee children and the practice in *Jewi* Refugee Camp. Results of the study identified that primary school students in *Jewi* Refugee Camp attend their education through the curriculum of the host country. In favor of this, UNHCR education policy recommends the use of the national education system. According to Peterson (2015), the reason for UNHCR to take this stand is that the protracted nature of conflicts makes the refugees wait a long period of time for repatriating to their country of origin. Peterson discusses that making refugee students learn by the national education system includes the use of the host country's language as a medium of instruction. This situation contradicts with the universal declaration of human rights as primary school students have the right to learn by their mother-tongue. The right of these children need not be negotiated only because they are found in the status of a refugee. The reason why children are advised to learn by their mother-tongue has its own reason and it has to be respected for children in a refugee setting. Luckily, the research identified that this will not be a problem in several refugee camps in Ethiopia in general and in *Jewi* Refugee Camp in particular. This is because the local communities are from the same ethno-linguistic groups. Nevertheless, refugee children in a country of asylum where they settle in a community which speaks a language different from theirs will be forced to learn through a strange language that is unfamiliar to them.



Language variance is found to be one of the major challenges for many refugee students in hosting countries. As Hamilton and Moore (2004) pointed out, as students are making a shift on the medium of instruction in the host country, they need to get adequate support. If they get the necessary support, children have the advantage to learn a new language faster than adults (Kennedy and Dewar, 1997 as cited in Hamilton and Moore, 2004). With regard to the importance of learning a host country's language, Claire Mason and Shannon Save the Children (2018) emphasized that developing competence to communicate through a host country's language brings a reduced level of depressive and disruptive behavior. According to them, students who are capable of communicating through a hosting country's language would have the advantage of making use of their previous educational experience for their current learning.

In the literature on learning language, females are identified to learn a new language faster than boys (Ellis 1994, as cited in Hamilton and Moore, 2004). Despite this, in this study female students are found to be very shy to communicate through the English language than boys. According to respondent national teachers, boys have better confidence to try to communicate through English. The culture of South Sudan does not encourage girls to speak freely in front of others and it instructed them to be shy. As a result, girls are less confident to speak in English.

Refugees flee their country to escape from persecution; they have passed through a life-threatening situation and they have lost their valuable assets including their loved ones. They are in trauma and need someone to understand and support them. At this time, the expected thing is trying to get them out of confusion rather than dragging them into confusion in language. We see that learning by the language that refugees do not know before makes them incompetent in their academics and leave them stranded in their education. Our argument aligns with the discussion presented by Peterson (2015). According to her, making children learn in a language that they do not know is making them learn for a long period of time without understanding what they learn. Therefore, our research experiences informed us the relevance of providing preparatory (bridging) language training for refugee children before making them directly attend an education that is provided in a strange language. As a result, we see the significance of giving the education through the first language of students at least until they develop basic skill in communicating through the medium of instruction in the hosting school. This is because developing a feeling of resuming education serves as a major tool to protect students from a psychological disorder and helping them to recover from the trauma. However, if they are set to be out of attending the main education under the name of language training, they may feel that they are going to lag behind from the grade level at which they are expected to be.

Rather than doing this, there has to be a new language policy for refugees that enable them to learn through the original language while developing the skills of communicating through the language of the host country. This requires a series of stages in the acquisition of the host country's language simultaneously by promoting children to exercise their original language. This situation benefits the children for their future life either in the host or home country. In the choice to use the host country's language as a medium of instruction, Hamilton and Moore (2004) indicated the importance of monitoring the expectation of the refugees from their new life and the expectation of the host country from the refugees. On the other hand, teachers play a crucial role in improving student's capacity to communicate through the host country's language. As to Rutter (1998), teachers need to take the responsibility of a smooth transition in instructional language, that is, from the language of origin to the host country's language. Additionally, Jones and Rutter (1998) discussed the needed to learn a new language. That is, to enable refugee students to learn through a second language requires the creation of a



friendly environment for students by making eye contact and smile. They also advise teachers to make themselves familiar with keywords from the first language of the refugee children. Doing this enables the teacher to communicate with students, to create trust between them, and to initiate them to learn the language of the host country. More specifically, these scholars indicated that speaking slowly in a clear intonation is very important to make students learn the second language faster and in this process the support of peers who are capable of speaking the new language is vital. Finally, the need to provide language training for students in addition to the regular class hour is very important for helping them record a speedy language skills development. With this regard, schools need to place strategies that can enhance the students' English language communication skills through extra-curricular and co-curricular activities in addition to the main teaching-learning process (Hamilton and Moore, 2004).

The other essential result of this research is the respondents are dissatisfied with the contents they learn in related to history, civics, and geography. The researchers acknowledge that most of the contents included in these subjects have a critical attachment to the social makeup of each child. Therefore, each child wishes to learn the history, geography, or aspects of governance of his/her country. If the students lack to see these elements in their education their motivation and appetite to learn may gradually diminish. In similar to this, Sudanese refugees who are set to learn through the Chadian curriculum were observed to challenge learning by the medium of instruction implemented in the host country, way of establishing an equivalence between the two countries education system, learning the contents included in history and geography subjects, and the reason why the Chad education system do not offer Islamic studies as it was part of the curriculum in Sudanese system (UNHCR, 2015). The major question in teaching History or Geography subjects is the issue of whose history or the geography of which country is going to be taught to refugee students.

The role of primary education is very significant in creating a smooth cultural transition and preparing students for their future life. Maintaining the cultural balance between the host and home country is very essential for the relevance of the education provided for refugees. UNHCR (1994), in supporting this view, stated that the education for refugees needs to serve as a tool to help them preserve the original culture and encourage students to communicate through their original language (UNHCR, 1994). Besides, it needs to foster healing the wounds that occurred to students as a result of the conflict. The culture of conflict management, negotiation, and reconciliation needs to be promoted through the education provided to bring long-lasting peace in the home country among the incoming generation. Equipping students with knowledge on the geography, history, state structure of their country, cultural activities, and other relevant issues is vital to make students capable of leading a smooth life during repatriation. Despite this the research result informed prevalence of a gap on incorporating contents that embrace the culture of refugees especially in Social Study and Civics and Ethical Education subjects. Concerning the contents provided for refugee students in the country of asylum, Peterson (2015) discussed that much of it is highly unrelated to the student's previous educational experience.

We see no problem in an effort to promote culture of the host country. Additionally attempts to aware refugee children on the values of the host country through the mainstream education need to be promoted. These are significant because it facilitates a smooth and speedy adaptation to the new environment. The problem is intentional or unintentional intervention that blocks refugees from promoting and learning their original culture. This is a systematic oppression that makes refugees detached from their original culture and the society around their original living area. To eliminate the oppression of the host culture over the home culture Mathieson (2004) recommends the use of a cross-cultural curriculum. According to this

scholar projects and topics assigned to be learned by refugees need to consider a cross-cultural context.

With regard to this issue, Peterson (2015) specified that there are many refugee-hosting classrooms in refugee camps that offer education for multilingual children. In such situations, as to this scholar, during instructional time plenty of time will be allotted for translating words which act as barrier for the communication. It is known in the research that there is no national teacher who is proficient to teach in the *Nuer* language and the two national teachers who claim to speak *Nuer* are found to be at the level of a beginner. According to respondent students, the textbooks contain local names which are difficult to be translated. Therefore, these pose challenges for them to understand things.

To make refugee's beneficiary the education provided needs to consider their background, current situation, and future aspiration. Jones and Rutter (1998) also indicated that a proper emphasis needs to be given for the previous educational background and current needs of refugee children before providing education. Likewise, Anderson, Hamilton, Moore, Loewen, and Mathieson (2004) emphasized that the education provided for refugee children needs to enable them see that their culture is respected. However, the research result revealed the prevalence of limitations in this area. Peterson divides the education period for refugee children into three. These periods are pre-resettlement, at arrival, and post-resettlement (Peterson, 2015). During resettlement in the host nation, there will be variations in culture, curriculum, and medium of instruction. Even though currently there is a shift in the curriculum of choice previously the UNHCR recommends teaching language and curriculum need to strongly align with the country of origin to facilitate a smooth transition during repatriation, (UNHCR, 2003 as cited in Peterson, 2015). On the other hand, a study conducted on urban refugee students in Nairobi indicated that the need to introduce a curriculum that provides some life skills and vocational training for refugees has been identified as an essential element in education for refugees (Karanja, 2010). Our research experience informed me that both the above arguments lack to see the whole picture. Learning the home country curriculum may enable children to have a smooth educational transition and prepare them for their future life if they repatriate to their home country. Despite this, it unable them from being competent in their future life in the host country. On the other hand, learning by the host country curriculum is favorable to get teachers, learning materials, and certification easily. But it doesn't consider refugee's future aspirations and lacks to prepare them for the life in their original country during repatriation and for the life in the third country. Additionally, it lacks placing the necessary processes for the transition from home to host country curriculum. Therefore, the researchers firmly believe in the need to use a negotiated curriculum that considers refugee student's future professional life in the home as well as the host country.

Conclusions and implications

The research results informed that the curriculum provided for South Sudanese children in Jewi Refugee Camp lacks to pay adequate emphasis for the cultural orientation, previous educational background, and the impact of the crisis on them. This is observed to have an impact on the motivation of students in their education. The two contrasting choices in the implemented curriculum for refugee students are reviewed and the perception of refugees in this area was presented. Even though the reasons provided in both propositions have a point, there is also a fact that does not get the necessary concern in both recommendations. The major argument in favor of the use of the host country curriculum focuses on the prolonged settlement of refugees in the hosting country and misses to see the feasibility of early repatriation. Even if most of the conflicts occurred globally has a longer lifespan there are also conflicts that are resolved in a short time. The Perplexity connected to either to staying in



host country (Ethiopia), to repatriate or to move on to a third country of asylum also has significant implication on curricular decisions for the refugee children.

Therefore, to resolve this problem we firmly believe in implementing a negotiated curriculum which is the product of mediation between the home and host country's curriculum. A mediated curriculum is relevant for making use of students' previous educational experiences, mediating the culture in education between the host and home country, and facilitating a smooth transition in education with regard to this. Additionally, a negotiated curriculum fosters a mechanism of providing an enhanced care and support for the students to recover from post traumatic experiences. The need to implement negotiated curriculum becomes substantial when one observes refugees who are set to learn through the same curriculum with nationals. The most important aspect to understand is that refugees are not attending their education under normal conditions and they are in trauma as a result of the crisis. They are in economic crisis and facing social, physical, psychological, and mental health problems as well. Additionally, they are displaced out of their will and it is a sudden incident in their life. As a result, the education provided needs to create a means for a smooth transition, save students from getting into confusion, help students to rehabilitate from the trauma they faced, and enable primary school children to learn by their first language. In addition to this, refugee children need to learn the history, geography, and other relevant concepts of their country to function properly during repatriation and fit with the community in their country of origin. Teachers play crucial role by using each and every instructional even to relate learning to the children's home country situation.

Notes

¹ abateyueil@yahoo.com

² kenea2004@yahoo.com

References

- Anderson, A., Hamilton, R., Moore, D., Loewen, S., and Mathieson F. K. (2004). Education of refugee children; Theoretical perspectives and best practice. In R. H. Moore, *Educational Interventions* (pp. 1-11). London: Routledge.
- Education Development Trust. (2018). *Teachers of Refugees: A review of literature*. ERIC - Education Resources Information Center. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED588878.pdf>
- Hamilton, R., & Moore, D. (2003). *Educational Interventions for Refugee Children: Theoretical Perspectives and Implementing Best Practice*. Routledge.
- Jones, C. and Rutter, J. (1998). *Refugee Education: Mapping the Field*. Trentham Books Limited.
- Karanja, L. (2010). The Educational Pursuits and Obstacles for Urban Refugee Students in Kenya. *International Journal for Cross-Disciplinary Subjects in Education (IJCDSE)* , 1 (3), 147-155.
- Peterson, D. S. (JUNE 2003). *Refugee education in countries of first asylum: Breaking open the*. Cambridge: Theory and Research in Education.
- Rutter, J. (1998). Refugees in Today's World. In C. J. Rutter (Ed.), *Refugee Education: Mapping the Field* (pp. 13-32). London: Trentham Books.
- Save the Children (2018). *Hear it From Teachers; Getting refugee children back to Learning*. Resource Centre | Save the Children. <https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/node/14237/pdf/hear-it-from-the-teachers-refugee-education-report.pdf>



-
- Sinclair, M. (2001). Education in emergencies. In C. T. Jeff Crisp, *Learning for a future: Refugee education in developing countries* (pp. 1-83). Lausanne: UNHCR.
- UNESCO (2017). *Protecting the right to education for Refugees*. Refworld | The Leader in Refugee Decision Support. <https://www.refworld.org/pdfid/5a5f41fc4.pdf>
- UNHCR (2015, July). *Curriculum choices in refugee settings*. ReliefWeb - Informing humanitarians worldwide. <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/560be1209.pdf>
- UNHCR (2017, December). *Working towards inclusion; Refugees within the national systems of Ethiopia*. UNHCR - The UN Refugee Agency. <https://www.unhcr.org/5a55ed8c4.pdf>
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (1994). *Refugee children: Guidelines on protection and care*. Refworld. <https://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b3470.html>

Submitted: August, 19th, 2021

Accepted: September, 13rd, 2021

