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ABSTRACT

Integration of refugees into host countries' National Education System (NES) is becoming increasingly popular. According to recent scholarly research, efforts to integrate refugees into the NES have proven tough. Existing research on refugee children from both the global south and rich nations has identified a variety of educational barriers for refugee children. Recurrent livelihood-related movement habits are one of these barriers. Urban refugee families migrate often within and outside of the city in quest of better living conditions, disrupting their children's integration into public schools. This study uses qualitative methods and a case study research design to focus on urban refugee children in Maputo and Nampula. Integration of refugee children into host countries' NES is crucial because it has the potential to improve their academic or school continuity, stability, access to high-quality education, local integration, and social development.

Keywords: Children, education, livelihoods, migration, refugees.

1. Introduction

Mozambique is a refugee-hosting country and party to the 1951 Refugee Convention, and it is committed to the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants and Global Compact on Refugees (UNHCR 2010, 1; General Assembly 2016; UNHCR 2019c, 2) and other instruments protecting the rights of refugees, including the education of refugee children. The country’s commitment to these instruments and its national implementation has some shortfalls that can challenge the education of these children (UNHCR 2010; Antoniak 2012; Dryden-Peterson et al. 2018).

1 Derio Anselmo Chirindza is a PhD candidate at OP. Jindal Global University - India and assistance lecturer of the subject – Inter-African Relations - in Joaquim Chissano University (UJC).
The comments of HE Dr Eduardo Bacião Koloma, Deputy Minister for MINEC (2006, 3) that Mozambique integrates refugees into national schools across the country indicated that there is an increasing interest in understanding and dealing with this issue in Mozambique. Also, the UNHCR Mozambique (2020) has recently expressed a strong interest in understanding and supporting the education of refugees.

UNHCR Mozambique (2020) is currently hiring an Education Consultant\(^2\) to examine “the learning, cultural and structural barriers for the successful school retention and completion of […] and quality learning in primary and secondary education as well as, particularly for refugee girls”. In line with this activity, UNHCR Mozambique (2020) has asserted that “Mozambique serves as a positive role model on the inclusion of refugees into national systems, including NES at all levels”.

However, this organisation (UNHCR Mozambique 2020) has also found that poverty and linguistic obstacles in the country are factors that prevent refugees, asylum seekers, and host communities from completing primary education. The disruption of refugee education can also arise from migratory practices of refugees as influenced by the pursuance of livelihood practices or the goal of resettlement (Kobia and Cranfield, 2009, 4; Dryden-Peterson 2015, 8; Mendenhall, Russell and Buckner 2017, 12; Erwin, Sewall, Tippens, Nyaoro and Miamidian 2019, 5).

This study looks at the influence of the livelihood-related migratory practices of refugee families on the integration of refugee children into the NES of host countries. The existing scholarly research (Kobia and Cranfield 2009, 4; Mendenhall et al. 2017, 12; Erwin et al., 2019, 5) has shown that, because of the high cost of living in urban settings, refugees constantly “move around to find more sustainable living arrangements” (Mendenhall et al. 2017, 12). However, very little research (Dryden-Peterson 2015, 8) has examined the context of these practices and their impact on the integration of urban refugee children into the NES.

This is critical given the possible good impact of refugee integration on urban refugee children. Efforts at integrating refugees into the NES lie on several rationales: pragmatism and access (Dryden-Peterson et al. 2019); cost-efficiency and sustainability (Culbertson and Constant, 2015, 56; Muchabaiwa, Mutambirwa, Tsokalida, and Abuhai 2019, 5), quality, social cohesion and the future labour market, (Culbertson and

---

\(^2\) “This consultancy is expected strengthen the capacity of UNHCR’s country team to engage with education and government partners both at national, provincial and district level to advocate for refugee enrolment in national schools and redefine its approach toward education activities, in line with the GCR [Global Compact on Refugees] commitment to strengthening national systems for the benefit of all learners” (UNHCR Mozambique 2020, emphasis added).
Integration into the NES appears to be the pragmatic option for refugees living in exile in the long term and inhabiting urban areas where there might not be separate schools or other affordable schools for them. In this case, integrating refugees into national schools helps improve the access of refugees to school and ensures their continuity with studies (Dryden-Peterson et al. 2019).

Examples of refugees inhabiting countries without refugee camps include Congolese refugees living in South Africa and Sudanese refugees residing in Egypt (Schockaert 2020). These two countries lack refugee camps and these refugee populations have lived in these countries for longer periods (Lewis 2009). Thus, integration into school is the most feasible option for them to access schools.

Given the limited possibility refugees have to return to their homes or resettle elsewhere (Dryden-Peterson et al. 2019, 15), integration into the NES is the most feasible option for them. Integration can enforce social cohesion (Cerna 2019, 8; Dryden-Peterson et al. 2019, 15). Integration can help refugees develop a sense of impartiality, equality and ownership of the educational opportunities in the host country (Culbertson and Constant 2015, 56; Dyden-Peterson et al. 2018; Cerna 2019, 8). Learning together may support the development of positive contacts among refugees and national peers, and so counter acts of xenophobia, bullying and stigma or any type of tensions between nationals and refugees in neighbourhoods and schools (UNHCR 2011a, 4; Dyden-Peterson et al. 2018; Dryden-Peterson et al. 2019, 15; Cerna 2019, 8).

The integration of refugees into the NES of the host country can pave the way for the economic integration of refugees more widely. The ability and skills refugees learn at school at a basic level may extend beyond the goals of learning to read, write and count, hence facilitating their successful participation in the labour market in the host country when they graduate (Dryden-Peterson et al. 2019, 20). Sharing the same schools may improve the recognition of the academic levels of refugees in the host country. From this gain, refugees may pursue post-primary education and transit to work more easily (Culbertson and Constant 2015, 56-61; Cerna 2019, 8).

Moreover, integration efforts into the NES may help refugees benefit from existing national education structures and services (UNHCR 2012, 8; UNHCR 2015a, 3; Culbertson and Constant 2015, 56; Muchabaiwa et al. 2019, 5). Also, it has been agreed that - in theory - this policy may offer high-quality education to refugee children by helping these children learn in accountable schools properly monitored and supervised by the Ministries of Education of the host country; giving children instruction from
qualified or trained teachers in schools; and enabling access to curricular materials and recognised examinations and certifications (UNHCR 2012, 8; Dryden-Peterson et al. 2019, 15). Access to these services, recognised examinations and certifications also enhances the sustainability of refugees’ education since it allows them to pursue further studies in the receiving country (Nicolai et al. 2017, 8; UNHCR 2015a, 3).

In case refugees return to their countries of origin or resettle, the skills they acquired through integration into the NES of the host country may enable their political participation in their country of origin when they return or facilitate a smooth integration into the third country (Dryden-Peterson et al. 2019, 27).

These rationales have been at the centre of UNHCR and other actors’ efforts to integrate refugees into their host countries’ economies. Through the UNHCR Education Strategy, the UNHCR has pledged to give technical assistance to host countries, involve all stakeholders, including the host government, in education provision, and promote the establishment of multi-year education initiatives. So, integrating refugees into host nations’ NES has become a top priority in the international system. Therefore, it is critical to discuss this problem in light of the policy and academic setting. The findings of this study could help Mozambican policymakers better understand and approach refugee education. As a result, the fundamental purpose of this study is to fill the academic and policy deficit in this field, as well as to provide empirical and analytical expertise on the issue.

This study drew on qualitative research methodology and a case study design. The case under study consists of urban refugee children aged between 5 to 12 years old - with exception of one refugee child age 13, one refugee child aged 15, and one refugee child aged 17 years old – living in Maputo and Nampula. This study selected the refugee population from the Congo (DRC), Mozambique has hosted a significant refugee population from this country.

Data collection consisted of participant observation of schools attended by refugee children and neighbourhoods of refugee families. Data was also collected through open-ended and face-to-face interviews of 86 research participants. The study participants included: refugee children and their parents; urban refugee community leaders in Maputo and Nampula; individuals of Congolese-heritage; members of refugee-based organisations in Maputo and Nampula - the Refugee Student Association of Mozambique (AEREMO) and the Episcopal Commission for Migrants, Refugees and Displaced Persons (CEMIRDE); an officer of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in Mozambique; the Head of Protection Officer/Coordinator of Social Protection Department. Apart from these participants, the study also engaged school teachers (n = 8) in Nampula through Focal Group
Discussion (FGD). To further enhance privacy, the enquirer used pseudonyms³ and codes in the section of the analysis, among other strategies.

This data was analysed using multiple methods and tools, such as content analysis, thematic analysis, the Model of Inclusion in refugee education and critical review of the data. The model of inclusion and the findings from the field contributed to framing the themes representing refugee child experiences.

There are five sections to this study. The first section is the introduction, which establishes the setting as well as the study’s main components: the objectives, research technique, and structure. This is followed by the Model of Inclusion in Refugee Education, an analytical framework for examining refugee educational experiences. The research findings come next. This section summarises the findings of the fieldwork done with refugee families (including refugee children) and other stakeholders in the provinces of Maputo and Nampula, as well as additional stakeholders listed in the introduction. The issue of migration and livelihoods is the focus of this section. Refugee child experiences in this part are shared, in part, in the form of personal case stories, as a key focus of the study is refugee child and parent perspectives, which are more effectively told in narrative form. All refugee names used in this part are pseudonyms. The fourth section discusses how the study’s research findings support, limit, or provide new insights into the debate over refugee integration into the NES. The conclusion is the paper’s fifth and final section. This section discusses the paper’s main points and suggests areas for future investigation.

2. Theoretical Framework

The Model of Inclusion in refugee education was developed by Sarah Dryden-Peterson, Michelle J. Bellino and other scholars (Dryden-Peterson, et al. 2018, 1). This Model systematises the key areas relevant to understanding the process of integration of refugee children, including structural and relational integration (Dryden-Peterson et al., 2018).

Structural integration involves the ability of refugees to “access services and institutions”. Precisely, this involves mainstreaming refugees into the national schools, teaching them alongside national learners, and using the curriculum of the host country and the national language of instruction (Heart 2016, 41; Dryden-Peterson et al. 2018, 10). Structural integration also carries other names, such as harmonisation, functional integration or mainstreaming of refugees into national schools (UNHCR 2015a, 2; 3The Head of Protection Officer/Coordinator of Social Protection Department and the officer of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in Mozambique opted to be identified by their proper names.
Relational integration is a socio-cultural process aimed at transforming and developing the identities of refugees necessary for their successful inclusion into the NES of the host country (Harrell-Bond 1999, 3; Dryden-Peterson et al. 2018).

The term ‘integration’ in this study reflects the general outcome of both structural and relation integration. The terms ‘structural’ and relational integration’ are important to use, as they may express the lived outcomes or the lived experiences of these policies, and the feelings and state of refugees as a result of the intervention under this policy. Thus, this study examines the extent to which the policy of Integration of refugees into the NES, fosters actual integration, with a lower case “i” (structural, plus relational), of refugees into the NES of Mozambique. Also, fundamental to understand in this study is that the term ‘National Education System’ (NES) comprises national schools, primarily, and all the related arrangements or actors, such as students, teachers, content and so on (Frick 2020). This study places much focus on schools, without ignoring education laws and other aspects that comprise the NES.

This paper looks at livelihood-related migratory practices of refugee families and how these practices influence the educational experiences of refugee children in Mozambican schools. This framework will help to define the research’s argument and determine if these students are successfully integrating into the Mozambican educational system. Second, this approach will be beneficial in capturing essential components of stakeholders’ opinions of effective integration.

3. Research Findings

3.1 Migration and livelihoods

The economic conditions of some families have meant that they are not able to stay stationary in one location inside and outside the country, and so their children are not able to have a consistent education. For instance, two refugee parents in Nampula commented that they are still based in the Maratane refugee camp, despite living in the city: “Until now I’m living in Maratane, [I] usually go there and stay” (RP15, Interview 23 April 2019). Another parent shared that, “Nowadays I have nothing. Totally nothing, I’m just as I am. I am living with the food I receive in the Maratane. If I did not receive it in the Maratane, I would not be able to handle the life of the city” (RP13, Interview 06 April 2019).

These two examples show that some refugees living in the city of Nampula are still based in the camp and, whenever necessary, they move with their families. Furthermore, these extracts highlight the difficulty refugees face to sustain their lives in the city, forcing
migration to improve the condition of their lives. “A refugee is that one who has no conditions; it is not the one who has money, it is the one who leaves the camp looking for better living conditions,” noted a member of AEREMO in Nampula (The Nampula AEREMO Member 02, Interview 23 April 2019).

These comments were echoed by the other three members of AEREMO in Nampula, a Congolese Heritage Secondary-School teacher (CHSST 02, Interview 03 April 2019); one refugee parent based in Nampula (RP13, Interview 06 April 2019); two refugee parents based in Maputo (RC01, Interview 01 October 2018 and RP06, Interview 30 January 2019) and the Head of Protection in the National Institute for Refugee Support (INAR), Mr Ivo Boaventura (Boaventura, Interview 16 January 2019). This suggests that refugees do not go to the city because they are already self-reliant, but because they want to pursue better living conditions there and become self-reliant.

One thing to note in these comments is that they relate livelihoods with refugee education and voluntary migration of refugees. They illustrate the impact livelihood concerns might have on the structural integration of refugee children into the NES of Mozambique by influencing their families to constantly move from one to another site. Indeed, one school teacher in Nampula reported that some of her refugee learners missed classes because their parents were constantly moving from Nampula city to Maratane refugee camp:

“They just want to know about business and they move around a lot. Sometimes they are in a maratane, or Pemba; they are not concerned with the education of their children [...]. Sometimes refugee children say that their parents went to pick up tomatoes or buy bran for chicken. These parents do not show up at school when their teacher calls them” (ST13, Interview 20 May 2019).

Similarly, another school teacher in Nampula also said:

"Here in my class I have a [refugee student]. He doesn't show up, I asked the parents, the parents don't show up. Besides asking, I already sent those neighbour kids to inform the father to come, but they said that the father of my refugee student told them that he has no time because he went to Maratane to pick up tomatoes, because he is raising chicken. It is a confusion day by day" (ST12, Interview 20 May 2019).

This comment suggests that the continuity of education is sometimes affected by internal movements from the city of Nampula to Maratane, but the reference to Pemba, another city of Mozambique, by the ST13 (Interview 20 May 2019) suggests that such internal movements of refugees are not limited to Maratane and Nampula, but also occur across other places or Mozambican cities. This is echoed in the comment below:
“Then he [a refugee [parent] goes to Nampula to do business or Maputo or even Inhambane, so that also makes it difficult for children to learn. If there is a good production of tomatoes in Chimoio, he goes to Chimoio, he does not think about the consequences of the child. He just thinks about his benefit. The child is dependent like any instrument (ST12, Interview 20 May 2019).

So, internal movements of refugee parents occur in multiple places and disrupt the education of their children with the pursuit of livelihoods coming at the expense of their children’s education. Moreover, sometimes these parents do not take the documentation of their children when they travel, which causes additional difficulties:

“When you call the refugee child’s parents, they don’t show up. Last year I had a boy [...] from Congo. He missed school a lot, he didn’t show up [classes], he didn’t write and I asked the guardian many times and he never showed up at school. [The refugee father] showed up at the end of the year when his son failed. At the end of the year, in grade 5, we asked for certification of attainment for grade 3 and grade 4. When I asked for these certifications, it was not possible for him to give me, because he studied grade 3 in Chimoio. The father left Chimoio, then went to live in Maputo, then he left Maputo and came to Nampula and when they leave there, sometimes they don’t take that documentation” (ST12, Interview 20 May 2019).

Concerning external movements, in Nampula, three school teachers also reported experiences of refugee families who were constantly moving from one place to another, inside and outside Mozambique. One school teacher said, “Refugee children do not stay permanently due to their parents’ movements. They are in constant displacement within and outside Mozambique. But when they return, the school receives them as assistentes [a Portuguese term to express a non-certified student]4” (SP03, Interview 17 May 2019). This view suggests that these movements have hampered the access/continuity of learning of refugee children. Another school teacher in Nampula reported that she had to encourage a refugee family not to travel abroad and wait until their children could finish the year:

“Four years ago, I witnessed a child’s problem, which I taught in the 5th grade, the parents were about to tell her to stop studying until October because they had to travel, but because I knew that the girl was smart and couldn’t take it [the certificate] without waiting for the end of the year, I [...] I went to her house, the girl cried, ‘teacher, I, I’, so I said ‘let’s go home together’, with the girl, I asked and talked to the parents, I said we are in the month of October, next month, they have

__________

4 A student under this condition means that he/she attends classes but does not get a degree. Still, the student takes classes normally as others and gets access to the same teacher, textbooks and all the available learning material in school and in the classroom.
exams, wait for the girl to finish, because the scores that the girl got hurt me a lot, the parents accepted, waited, before the exam they knew that she waived, we gave them and they traveled and ended up returning, soon she joined grade 6 because she already had documentation” (ST10, Interview 15 May 2019).

This view mirrors the comment of another school teacher in Nampula:

“They are children who study here today; it is normal to study in Nampula, tomorrow they will go to Maputo; the other day they go to America, or the other side, maybe, Tanzania. So, the student achievement is not favourable. But there are Congolese parents, who remain in Mozambique for a long time, but it is very rare” (ST13, Interview 20 May 2019).

This comment indicates that not all refugees constantly move from one place to another and that such cases are rare. Indeed, almost all research participants reported that refugee children often complete their primary education cycle in Mozambique without interruption. Nonetheless, even a minority of cases is important as it highlights how parent actions shape child education and emphasises the unevenness of educational experiences of refugee children. It also underlines the fact that public schools and the NES are not equipped to deal with pupil mobility.

4. Discussion

A key overarching finding of this study is that refugee families engage in recurrent livelihood-related migration practices. The existing scholarly research (Kobia and Cranfield 2009, 4; Mendenhall et al. 2017, 12; Erwin et al. 2019, 5) has shown that, because of the high cost of living in urban settings, refugees constantly “move around to find more sustainable living arrangements” (Mendenhall et al. 2017, 12). This study explains the linkage between these constant movements and the integration of refugee children. Also, this study shows that constant livelihood-related migration threatens to disrupt access to refugee education.

These experiences shed light on the impact of the socio-economic challenges of refugee families vis-à-vis their migratory movements and the education of refugee children. The finding on the barriers to refugee education as related to the migration to the camp in pursuance of livelihoods explains the relationship between camp, city, the education of refugee children and livelihood. They emphasise that the refugee camp becomes a backup for refugee parents when the living conditions in the city are hard.

At the same time, while shielding refugee families economically and socially, this movement disrupts the education of refugee children. This study’s finding adds to the existing literature on refugee affairs (Feldman 2005, 7) that the city-camp movement is prejudicial to the integration of refugee children. These findings highlight the need to

Moreover, in practice, the status of ‘urban’ and camp-based refugees is dynamic and moves forward and backwards between these two settings, thus challenging the education of refugee children. This article not only emphasises the changing character of refugee status, but it also backs up prior studies (Boze 2015; Dryden-Peterson 2015, 8) that have revealed the same.

That way, scholars, policy actors and readers need to capture these complex realities in order to better understand and ensure the effective integration of refugee children into schools. So, as Erwin et al. (2019, 2) argue, in addressing the integration of urban refugee children into schools, research and programing should not ignore family and household.

The findings of this study have also shown that, in some cases, these types of movements are adding an extra layer of disruption to education experiences (Dryden-Peterson 2015; Bengtsson and Dyer 2017, 35). This means that the findings presented in this section of this study support key debates within the wider current academic and policy literature on refugee education.

Relatedly, the findings of this study also correlate with other studies that show that structural integration can be limited by factors such as i) linguistic barriers (Horn et al. 2013, 9; Boze 2015, 18; Global Refugee Forum Education Co-Sponsorship Alliance 2019, 8; Pedró et al. 2019, 11); ii) limited school capacities (Dryden-Peterson et al. 2018); iii) instruction from untrained teachers on the needs of refugee children (Bengtsson and Dyer 2017, 10; Dryden-Peterson et al. 2018, 12) and iv) indirect costs of education (Grossman et al. 2013, 25; Horn et al. 2013, 9, Boze, 2015, 18; Mendenhall et al. 2015, 95).

The findings of this study give more insights (Meda 2013, 190; Muoka 2015, 13; Mendenhall et al. 2015, 121) into the factors that contribute and how they contribute to the adaption of refugees to the curriculum of the host country, or their relational integration. This study’s findings also provide evidence to support the claim of Walton et al. (2020, 2) that “A refugee identity intersects with other identities, and some refugee children and young people experience multiple and intersecting axes of oppression as a result of structural inequalities.” Therefore, policy initiates interventions to address their vulnerabilities and the need to be sensitive to these factors (Lee and Piper, 2013; Hashem 2017; Bešić et al. 2020).

Secondly, this study adds to the growing body of literature on urban refugee education in post-conflict and protracted contexts, therefore filling the existing gap in the extant literature that has focused on the education of refugee children in settlement structures.
and camp-based settings in the context of emergencies (Lubbers 2001, iii; Dryden-Peterson 2003, 1; Omata 2004, 8; Wetimane 2012, 72; Consolo 2015; Deane 2016; Bailey 2016, 8; Richardson et al. 2018, 12; Erwin et al. 2019, 2).

Thirdly, this study adds further empirical and scientific data to the existing literature on the education of refugee children that were much descriptive and documented for policy or programme orientation of goals (Burde et al. 2015; Deane, 2016; Bengtsson and Dyer 2017, 42; Richardson et al. 2018, 12; Crul et al. 2017).

This finding advances the model of inclusion in refugee education (Dryden-Peterson et al. 2018) that speaks of the barriers to refugee education, yet it is silent about this detail of livelihood-related migration practices. This framework mention two access barriers: physical and identity-based. “Physical barriers encompass resources and capacity, such as limitations in the number of school buildings or teachers and include the unequal distribution of these resources geographically”. Identity-based barriers encompass differential access to school and discrimination as a result of ethnicity, gender, language, religion, sexuality, or status as a non-citizen or refugee” (Dryden-Peterson et al. 2018, 11).

This explanation reveals that physical barriers are based on school constraints. Similarly, the above description of refugee experiences shows that livelihood-related migration practices are also physical barriers, but they are home-based barriers. Thus, these kinds of migration are not mentioned both in physical and identity-based barriers. Therefore, they also challenge the ability of refugee children to access education.

Finally, the few existing studies on 'low-income countries' have been concentrated on large cities (UNHCR 2016a; Dryden-Peterson 2016b, 478; Dryden-Peterson et al. 2018; Dryden-Peterson et al. 2019, 7) or some of the world’s largest or protracted crises, or simply the most current (Onuoha 2006; Boze 2015, 18; Culbertson and Constant, 2015; Haybano 2016; UNHCR, 2016a; Dryden-Peterson et al. 2018). So, in focusing on urban areas of Mozambique, this study extends the debate on the integration of refugee children into the NES of host countries in non-Western case studies, and non-UNHCR “priority” case studies (like Uganda).

These findings extend beyond the literature on refugee education. By explaining the link between refugee education and the livelihood of refugees in urban areas, they add new information to the literature on urban refugees’ livelihoods (Jacobsen 2004; Jacobsen 2005; Jacobsen 2006).

As it relates to Mozambique, this study also complemented the existing (HE Dr Eduardo Baciano Koloma, Deputy Minister for MINEC 2006; Chongo 2017, 3) literature on refugee education that commented on the mainstreaming of urban refugee children in Mozambican schools, but did not explain the factors, processes and mechanisms
underpinning such integration. This study contributes to filling the gap in the understanding of “the ways in which the approach of inclusion of refugees in NES is enacted at national levels and experienced by teachers and students in schools” (Dryden-Peterson et al. 2018, 9).

In particular, it contributed to filling the gap in the literature on refugee education presented by UNHCR (2011b, 42) and SPII and OSISA (2012, 50). As stated in the introduction, the UNHCR (2011b, 42) argued that “Children from the urban areas are not assisted by UNHCR and thus are unable to attend school […].” Similarly, SPII and OSISA (2012, 50) commented, “There is no mention of access to education for refugee children and students who are not living in camps, which is an area for further research.”

This study provides further details, or empirical evidence, to support the existing research (Dryden-Peterson 2015, 8; Bengtsson and Dyer 2017, 35) on how parents behave and refugee children themselves behave as influenced by these aspirations and opportunities. Besides, it emphasises that in the case of Mozambique where there are no separated schools and refugee children are mainstreamed in the Mozambican schools, refugee children fail to relationally integrate into the NES of Mozambique.

Another aspect that this study emphasises is that urban refugee children are not a homogeneous group. Not all refugee children experience the integration into the NES of Mozambique in the same way. Their experiences vary greatly according to their urban settings, place of birth, factors inside and outside of the home (e.g. parents and home life) as well as inside the classroom and so on. This study details the experiences specific to refugees in the context of Mozambique, i.e. the unevenness of refugee child integration experienced across urban settings.

**Conclusion**

This study examined the impact of livelihood-related-migratory practices of refugee families, especially refugee parents, on the integration of their children into the NES. First, the study revealed that urban refugee families engage in these behaviours, migrating from Maratane camp to Nampula or elsewhere in and beyond Mozambique in quest of better economic opportunities. Second, the study discovered that these behaviours limit refugee children’s educational continuity. As a result, these youngsters are unable to structurally integrate into Mozambique’s public schools. Consequently, the likelihood of refugee children completing their degrees is limited.

This barrier has been observed in past studies looking at various African situations, and this empirical evidence backs up previous research. This study adds to our understanding of the relationship between refugee livelihoods, migratory behaviours, and refugee children’s integration into the Mozambican national education system, and it calls for greater research into the interplay between the two.
In addition, whether evaluating or addressing refugee education, the approach to refugee education in Mozambique should take into consideration the changing status of urban and camp-based refugees.

Finally, further study across time, gender, refugee groups, and different urban contexts is needed to better understand the integration of urban refugee children into Mozambique’s NES as it pertains to the livelihood-related migration practices of refugee families.
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