

The Out of Camp Scheme for Eritrean Refugees: The impact of the Scheme on their  
livelihood and Integration with the Host Community

By

Aida Erkihun

Addis Ababa University

School of Social Work

Advisor

Adamnesh Atenafu (Ph.D.)

*June, 2017*

Running Head: - OUT OF CAMP SCHEME IMPACT

The Out of Camp Scheme for Eritrean Refugees: The impact of the Scheme on their  
livelihood and Integration with the Host Community

A Thesis Submitted to School of Social Work, Addis Ababa University

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirement for the Degree of Masters in Social Work

By Aida Erkihun

June, 2017

Addis Ababa University

School of Social Work

The Out of Camp Scheme for Eritrean Refugees: The impact of the Scheme on their  
livelihood and Integration with the Host Community

By Aida Erkihun

Approval of the board of examiners

Advisor ..... Signature ..... Date .....

Internal Examiner..... Signature ..... Date .....

External Examiner..... Signature ..... Date .....

## **Acknowledgment**

First of I would like to thank the almighty God. Then my deep appreciation goes to my advisor Dr. Adamnesh Atenafu for her constructive comments and unreserved guidance.

I would also like to thank Administration for Refugees Returnees (ARRA) especially Ato. Haileselasia Gebremariam and Ato Bereket Gebreslasie for supporting me in selecting participants as well their overall support throughout the study. My appreciation also goes to Hana Hailu and the Jesuit Refugee services (JRS) in making this study fruitful.

My heartfelt gratitude also goes to the Addis Ababa University School of Social Work for providing me a permission letter and Dr. Com. Demelash Kassaye for being supportive without any reservation. I would also like to express my deepest appreciation for the participants of the study who gave me their valuable time and information by sitting on long interview hours and participating in the Focus Group Discussion.

Last but not least my profound gratitude goes to my family, especially, my mother Meseret Girma who always had my back.

## *Abstract*

*The study attempted to explore and assess the livelihood impacts, access to social services and integration experiences of Eritrean refugees under the out of camp scheme. It also assessed the perception of Eritrean refugees residing in Addis Ababa on the scheme as an alternative approach. The rationale behind this study was social constructivism. Qualitative research method was employed and phenomenological approach was found to be more applicable method for gathering data. Purposive sampling was used while selecting samples. The study was conducted in Addis Ababa in a specific area called 24 Kebele as mass Eritrean refugees were residing there. In this study, data was gathered using both primary and secondary sources. Semi structured interview and an FGD was conducted to collect primary sources of data. . Thematic analysis was employed to analyse the gathered information. It was found that the major source of income of the refugees was remittance. Regarding access to basic social services, it was indicated that there is better access in the city although it wasn't rendered as a free service. Majority of the respondents indicated that they had positive integration process given the cultural similarities of both nations but despite that a number of respondents had minimal exposure and integration due to limited language proficiency as well as lack of initiation from their side. Refugees live in a segregated manner as they all prefer to reside with fellow refugees. The overall reaction to the out of camp scheme was positive. As to strengthen and capitalize on the positive outcomes, the scheme should be formalized and have a much clearer guidelines. Major social work interventions should be on areas of refugees' livelihood support and on social integration.*

## *Acronyms*

<i>ARRA</i>	<i>Administration for Refugees and Returnees Affairs</i>
<i>HRC</i>	<i>Human Rights Commission`</i>
<i>IDP</i>	<i>Internally Displace People</i>
<i>KES</i>	<i>Kenyan Shilling</i>
<i>JRS</i>	<i>Jesuit Refugee Services</i>
<i>NGO</i>	<i>Non-Governmental Organization</i>
<i>OCP</i>	<i>Out of Camp Scheme</i>
<i>PAP</i>	<i>Project Affected People</i>
<i>UN</i>	<i>United Nations</i>
<i>UNHCR</i>	<i>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</i>
<i>UNMEE</i>	<i>United Nations Mission in Eritrea and Ethiopia</i>
<i>UNOCHA</i>	<i>United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs</i>

Table of Contents	Pages
<i>Abstract</i> .....	iv
<i>Acronyms</i> .....	v
<b>Chapter 1: Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background of the Study .....	1
1.2 Statement of the problem .....	3
1.3 Objective of the Study .....	4
1.3.1 General Objective .....	4
1.4 Research Question .....	4
1.5 Scope of the Study .....	5
1.6 Significance of the Study .....	5
<b>Chapter 2: Literature Review</b> .....	<b>6</b>
2.1 Refugees in Ethiopia .....	6
2.2 Eritrean Refugees .....	6
2.3 Out of Camp scheme .....	8
2.4 Livelihood .....	11
2.5 Integration .....	15
<b>Chapter 3: Methodology</b> .....	<b>18</b>
3.1 Research Design .....	18
3.2 Study Area .....	19
3.3 Study Participants and Eligibility Criteria .....	19
3.4 Sampling Techniques .....	20
3.5 Method of Data Collection .....	21
3.6 Data Collection Procedure .....	22
3.7 Method of Analysis .....	22
3.8 Ethical Consideration .....	23
<b>Chapter 4: Findings</b> .....	<b>25</b>
4.1 Sociodemographic Characteristics of the Participants .....	25
4.2 The livelihood impacts of the out of camp approach in terms of income .....	26
4.2.1 Source of Income of Eritrean refugees in Addis Ababa .....	26
4.3 Access to basic social services for Eritrean Refugees in Addis Ababa .....	31
4.3.1 Social Service provided Government .....	32

4.3.2 Provision of services by non-governmental bodies .....	33
4.4 The integration experiences of Eritrean Refugees with host community in Addis Ababa .....	35
4.4.1 Positive integration .....	35
4.4.2 Limited Interaction and Unsuccessful integration .....	38
4.5 Attitude of refugees towards the Out of Camp scheme .....	40
4.6 Policy Implication .....	47
<b>Chapter 5: Discussion</b> .....	<b>50</b>
5.1 Sources of income for Eritrean refugees in Addis Ababa.....	50
5.2 Social services for Eritrean refugees in Addis Ababa.....	51
5.3 Integration experience of Eritrean refugees with the host society .....	51
5.4 Attitudes of Refugees towards the out-of-camp scheme.....	54
<b>Chapter 6: Conclusion and Social Work Implication</b> .....	<b>55</b>
6.1 Conclusion .....	55
6. 2 Social Work Implication .....	56
6.3. Implication to policy .....	57
Annex 1: Consent Form .....	63
Annex 2: Interview questions (Refugees).....	65
Annex 3: Interview Questions (For key informants other than Refugees) .....	66
Annex 4: Focus Group Discussion Guide.....	67
Annex 5: Interview questions (Refugees)-Amharic የቃለመጠይቅ መምሪያ .....	68
Annex 6: Interview Questions (For key informants other than Refugees) የቃለመጠይቅ መምሪያ ለቁልፍ ተጠያቂዎች .....	69
Annex 7: Focus Group Discussion Guide: የቡድን ጠያቂዎች መምሪያ.....	70



## Chapter 1: Introduction

### 1.1 Background of the Study

A "refugee" is defined in the 1951 United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees as 'an individual who: "owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his/her nationality, and is unable or unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country. Recognizing that this definition of so-called "statutory refugees" did not cover situations of mass flight from war, regional bodies such as the Organization for African Unity developed agreements like the OAU Convention of 1969. These expanded the definition of refugees to include not only individuals' subject to persecution, but also every person who in the words of the OAU Convention "owing to external aggression, occupation, foreign domination, or events seriously disturbing the public order...is compelled to leave...to seek refuge in another place outside his country of origin or nationality."

On this basis, people who move as a group across international boundaries to escape war or civil conflict are also generally recognized as refugees on a group or prima facie basis in Africa and Latin America, and frequently in Asia and the Middle East as well. Poorer countries in these regions use the broader definition of refugees in part because they lack the administrative capacity to determine whether or not each individual meets the criteria for refugee status.

The concept of refugees as people fleeing persecution is central to efforts to aid and protect them. However, there are debates on what constitutes "persecution." Some parties ask whether the persecution must be state-sponsored and focused on individuals, or whether

widespread social practices and attitudes also qualify as grounds for persecution. Further arguments surround what constitutes a human rights abuse and what is a "cultural practice."

Such questions arise particularly in gender-related cases; for example, women subjected to female genital cutting or when people's sexuality is prohibited by law and its severe punishment. Gender-based factors have, on a case-by-case basis, been recognized as grounds for granting asylum and refugee status to individuals, but there remains no international consensus or standard for doing so. (Sharon, 2002).

Refugees live out of camp in urban areas under different circumstances. They live in contexts where social, health and other basic services exist but are often not readily available to them. Obstacles facing urban refugees as they try to access services include lack of information and of legal documentation; lack of understanding of refugee rights and obligations; cultural and linguistic barriers; limited access to transport; and active discrimination against refugees and perceived impunity for crimes against them. JRS seeks to help urban refugees to access existing services without creating parallel systems. (JRS, 2015)

The capital city of Ethiopia, Addis Ababa has also been dealing with refugees that came from various states (UNHCR, 2014). It was stated that Addis Ababa has hosted about 4,677 refugees mainly from Yemeni, Eritrea and Somali (UNHCR, 2016). The purpose they come to Addis Ababa vary from refugee to refugee. Usually most of them come to Addis Ababa due to medical reasons. But for Eritreans, the 'out of camp' scheme provides the opportunity for them to live in any city they want as long as they can sustain themselves. This study looked into how this scheme has affected their livelihood and how their integration with the host community is.

## 1.2 Statement of the problem

Ethiopia has opened its borders for refugees from neighbouring countries. Out of these refugees, it is estimated that there are 147,190 Eritrean refugees residing in Ethiopia as of August 2015 (UNHCR, 2015).

It is believed that the newly launched out of camp scheme is also a response to refugees' wishes and needs for strengthened people-to-people relations between the two countries. The government allowed an out of camp approach specific to Eritrean refugees as an alternative. Meaning, if an Eritrean refugee meets the requirement, he/she can go out of camp to live in any Ethiopian city they desire. Given the fact that Eritrea and Ethiopia were a single political entity before the 1993 referendum, An 'Out of Camp' (OCP) approach had been offered as an option for Eritrean refugees as of 2010.(Samuel Hall, 2014). A previous study have been conducted by Samuel Hall and Norwegian Refugee council (NRC) to assess the impacts of this scheme with regards to self-reliance, food security and protection. Livelihood impacts, Integration with host community, overall refugee's response to the scheme and policy implications are areas that needed to be explored and were identified as a gap in existing literature.

The purpose of this study is to bridge the gap in literature by exploring the impact of the scheme on the refugee's livelihood, access to social services and integration with the host community that they reside in and their overall reaction to the scheme. The study explored and assess OCP as an alternative for Eritrean refugees. Livelihood impacts in terms of income and access to basic social services were identified as well as integration experiences with the refugees overall response was assessed as to have a better picture of OCP.

### 1.3 Objective of the Study

#### 1.3.1 General Objective

The overall objective of the study was to explore and assess impacts of the out of camp scheme on the situation of Eritrean refugees under the ‘Out of Camp’ scheme residing in Addis Ababa and to understand the refugees’ response to it.

#### 1.3.2 Specific Objective

- To identify the livelihood impacts of the out of camp scheme on Eritrean Refugees residing in Addis Ababa in terms of income
- To assess impacts of the out of camp scheme on Eritrean refugee’s access to basic social services.
- To explore refugees’ experiences related to integration with the host community in Addis Ababa and their overall attitude towards the out of camp scheme.
- What are the policy implications?

### 1.4 Research Question

In order to meet the above objectives the following research questions are answered by the research

#### *1.4.1 Specific Research Question*

- What is the impact of the out of camp scheme on the livelihood of Eritrean refugees in terms of income
- What is the impact of the out of camp scheme on access to basic social services
- What are Eritrean Refugee’s integration experiences with the host community in Addis Ababa and their overall attitude towards the out of camp scheme?

- What are the policy implications of the out of camp scheme?

### 1.5 Scope of the Study

This study only assessed Eritrean refugees under the ‘Out Of camp’ scheme and who are residing in Addis Ababa, specifically in 24 kebele. The study focuses on the livelihood impacts only in terms of income and access to basic social services. It also explored integration experiences along with the overall attitude of refugees toward the scheme.

### 1.6 Significance of the Study

The proposed study helped acquire an understanding on the impacts of the out of camp Scheme on Eritrean refugee’s livelihood and access to social services. Experience of integration with the host community was also an area that was explored and identified as a gap in existing literatures. The conducted study will indicate the status of urban Eritrean Refugees on how the scheme has impacted them and reflect their current situations.

This study also serves as a feedback on the out of Camp Scheme policy as it has an implication of refugee’s response on the scheme and provides inputs for strengthening or re-evaluating the scheme. It also provides an idea on which components social workers may need to get involved in and indicate areas of intervention.

## Chapter 2: Literature Review

### 2.1 Refugees in Ethiopia

There are a total of 743,190 of refugee population residing in Ethiopia. Country of origin for most of these refugees is South Sudan, Somalia, Eritrea, and Sudan (UNHCR, 2016). There are also refugees from other nations. Out of these, 1 are 159,842 are Eritrean refugees; out of these 81,084 of them are believed to have spontaneously settled in Ethiopia. There were 15,031 Eritrean refugees who had signed up for verification in Addis Ababa. (UNHCR, 2016)The government of Ethiopia generally maintains an open door for refugees seeking protection and most of them are expected to settle in camps although there are some exceptions like Eritrean refugees under the out of camp scheme, those who are in urban areas for medical, security or humanitarian reasons (UNHCR, 2016).Majority of refugees originating from South Sudan, Somalia, Eritrea and Sudan. South Sudanese, Eritreans, Yemenis and Somalis from South and Central Somalia are recognized through light screening procedures. As being a party to the 1951 Refugee Convention, the 1967 Protocol and the 1969 OAU Convention the Government of Ethiopia provides protection to refugees from some 20 countries. To all others, individual refugee status determination is undertaken by the Government's Eligibility Committee on which UNHCR sits as an observer (UNHCR, 2016).

### 2.2 Eritrean Refugees

Over the last 30 years, more than one million Eritrean refugees languished in exile abroad, more than half of them in urban slums and rural refugee camps in Sudan. Although several hundred thousand people have returned to Eritrea, there are still an estimated 142,000 Eritreans in Kassala and Gedaref in Sudan.(UNHCR, 2015) The U.N. High Commission for Refugees has worked in collaboration with UNMEE (UN Mission in Eritrea and Ethiopia) to

repatriate a total of 36,500 Eritrean refugees from Sudan. An overwhelming majority of these refugees originally come from Gash-Barka, the western region of Eritrea. (UNHCR, 2015).

when looking at the present emergency-like conditions in Eritrea, it is easy to notice that the policies of the government have been especially felt by the young and the single—a group that forms a large majority of those who seek exile. The policies include national service required of all (regardless of whether or not one is a conscientious objector), the closure of independent media, the outlawing of political activities not condoned by the ruling People's Front for Democracy and Justice (PFDJ), and so forth (US Department of State, 2013).

Within Eritrea 50,000 were internally displaced. These IDPs have fled three times in the last 10 years, each time because of renewed military conflict. They lived in relatives' homes when lucky enough, but mostly they fled to the mountains, where they attempted to do what Eritreans do best: survive. Right now there is no Ethiopian occupation in Eritrea, but land mines prevent the IDPs from finally going home.

Eritreans that lived in Ethiopia were also expelled in 1998 when full-scale fighting broke out again. In 2000, when Ethiopia captured about one third of Eritrea's sands (the Gash Barka Zone), one million Eritreans fled, including tens of thousands of new refugees to Sudan. Tens of thousands of Eritreans had been permanently disabled, hundreds of thousands dead. A third of the population was displaced, a third of those people being children. It is estimated that every Eritrean family lost two or three members to the war. It is this deepest sacrifice of flesh and blood that makes the reality of the current emergency situation even more painful for Eritreans worldwide. The male population has been decreased dramatically, affecting the most fundamental socioeconomic systems in the country. Among the refugee population, an

overwhelming majority of families are female-headed, severely affecting agricultural production. For IDPs in particular, 80 percent of households are female-headed. (Selam, 2002)

### 2.3 Out of Camp scheme

The Out-of-Camp scheme established by the government is a welcomed initiative that opens interesting opportunities for Eritrean refugees. Exiled Eritrean refugees and politicians hailed Ethiopia's recent decision that allows Eritrean refugees to live out of refugee camps and settlements. The newly introduced scheme, which came into force after talks between the Ethiopian government and the UN refugee agency (UNHCR) allows Eritrean refugees residing in camps to independently live anywhere they chose across the nation, provided that they can sustain themselves financially or if they could sustain from supports of relatives outside. With increasing numbers of Eritreans crossing borders to Ethiopia daily, situation in the camps are crowded and are in a poor condition. Providing funds to support all the new arrivals is also a problem. (Tesfalem, 2010)

The question why Eritreans leave is attempted to be understood in terms of facts that, Eritrea is Africa's version of North Korea, a country with no constitution, court system, elections or free press. Outside of the metropolitan elite, most Eritreans must submit to a form of forced labour – lifelong military conscripts who have no choice about where they live or work. Any dissenters are sent to prison without any judicial recourse. (Patrick, 2015)

The Human Rights Council, found that systematic, widespread and gross human rights violations have been and are being committed in Eritrea under the authority of the Government. Some of these violations may constitute crimes against humanity. In the present report of 2016, the Commission shows how the initial promises of democracy and rule of law, incarnated in the



never-implemented Constitution of 1997, were progressively suppressed and then extinguished by the Government. It details how the Government has created and sustained repressive systems to control, silence and isolate individuals in the country, depriving them of their fundamental freedoms. Information collected on people's activities, their supposed intentions and even conjectured thoughts are used to rule through fear in a country where individuals are routinely arbitrarily arrested and detained, tortured, disappeared or extra judicially executed. The Commission also describes how, on the pretext of defending the integrity of the State and ensuring its self-sufficiency, Eritreans are subject to systems of national service and forced labour that effectively abuse, exploit and enslave them for indefinite periods of time. (HRC, 2015)

Refugees in camps are afforded assistance and protection as part of the UNHCR's mandate and as an incentive by the host government to keep them concentrated in one area. By contrast, in urban centres assistance to refugees can be sparse, unevenly distributed, and insufficient to meet basic needs – if it exists at all. For this reason, urban refugees exercise a higher degree of self-sufficiency than those in camps (Campbell, 2005). Refugees settle in urban centres to avoid dependence on rations, boredom, hopelessness, hardships and restrictions that prevail in camps. They use their skills and pursue opportunities provided by greater economic resources, such as education for their children (Campbell, 2005).

The survey of the Eritrean camps points at the limits of camp-based assistance for refugees. It confirms that encampment prevents the development of livelihood mechanisms amongst Eritrean refugees living in Ethiopia, leading to a very low level of self-reliance in the camps and to negative coping mechanisms. (Samuel Hall, 2014)

Many refugees settle in urban areas based on the assessment that this will make them relatively better off. A central factor to this decision appears to be the greater ability to earn a living. In some cases, refugees living in urban settings who do not do well economically return or migrate to camps. For urban refugees, employment in the informal sector is particularly common. In countries that have not ratified the 1951 Convention or that have not afforded refugees the right to employment, many refugees seek work informally to keep their refugee status hidden. (Kobia, Cranfield, 2009).

The available literature on urban refugees generally argues that conditions for urban refugees must be improved in the short term and does not emphasize the pursuit of durable solutions for urban refugees. The majority of current articles contain varying levels of discussion on local integration, resettlement and repatriation. Repatriation is rarely discussed and it is argued that most refugees cannot return to their homelands, and even those who can have little incentive to do so. Local integration and more specifically economic integration are very influential aspects. Resettlement also receives strong coverage, most often perceived as a limited solution but one that has ramifications on those refugees who remain in urban settings (Kobia, Cranfield, 2009).

Leaders of Eritrean opposition organizations and refugee representative praised the move by Ethiopian authorities as an important step forward to mend ties between people of the two neighbouring countries. (Tesfalem, 2010).

The alternative scheme has been put into place but yet, it has not led to the expected results so far, as some gaps in the policy limit the protection and access to livelihood of refugees once out of the camp (Samuel Hall, 2014). Assessing the living conditions of Eritrean refugees

living in the city showed access to livelihood and self-reliance remains a challenge for some of the refugees in urban settings and that the OCP provides limited protection mechanisms for refugees in the city. Some connections are still lacking to increase the impact of the OCP on refugees' access to self-reliance (Samuel Hall, 2014).

When we look at urban refugees in Kenya, according to many, men leave the camps and move to Nairobi in search of better economic opportunities. Kenyan labour law does not allow refugees working in the camps to earn salaries; instead, they are only permitted to receive 'incentives' from UN agencies and NGOs. These are well below the norm for an equivalent Kenyan member of staff's salary. As of early 2009, refugees in Kakuma earned between KES 1,800 and KES 5,500 (about \$23–\$71) per month, compared to KES 35,000 to KES 120,000(\$450 to \$1,500) for Kenyans (Sara, Samior, Sara, 2010). Another common push factor is the lack of secondary education and medical facilities in the camps. In Dadaab, 15% of the camp population are estimated to be out-of-school youth Living conditions more generally are poor. Camps are becoming increasingly overcrowded, particularly in Dadaab, where the population grew by 20% in 2009 following an influx of Somali refugees forced out by deteriorating security conditions at home. Dadaab is currently hosting four times more refugees than it was originally designed to hold (Sara, Samior, Sara, 2010).

## 2.4 Livelihood

Refugees in camps are afforded assistance and protection as part of the UNHCR's mandate and as an incentive by the host government to keep them concentrated in one area. By contrast, in urban centres assistance to refugees can be sparse, unevenly distributed, and insufficient to meet basic needs – if it exists at all. For this reason, urban refugees exercise a higher degree of self-sufficiency than those in camps (Kobia & Cranfield, 2009). In the same

study, the motivation for urban resettlement include lifestyle in the country of origin, more readily available services ( Health, Education etc.), increased communication with UNHCR and family, on in aspiration of improvements in personal safety and security. All these entails their assumption that they will be better off in the city. A major component for their decision is the ability to earn a better living.

States facing large influxes of refugees often try to restrict their movement to camps or settlements. Even those countries which allow refugees to settle in urban areas refrain from offering material assistance in cities and view urban refugees less than positively (Kobia, Cranfield, 2009). The justification behind this, may include security concerns, socio-economic and financial burdens.

Employment in the informal sector is particularly common for urban refugees. In countries that have not ratified the 1951 Convention or that have not afforded refugees the right to employment, many refugees work informally (Kobia, Cranfield, 2009). The case is also the same for Ethiopia. Even though Eritrean refugees can live freely in any city they chose, they cannot access formal jobs. Only informal jobs are available for them mostly jobs that are physical labor intensive.

There was a previously conducted study on Eritrean refugees under the out of camp scheme but the study focused on self-reliance, food security and protection. Integration with the host community and livelihood impacts are areas that needed to be explored further. Thus, it was the focus of the study. In the previous conducted study some key challenges of the OCP scheme for Eritrean refugees was indicated. The major ones include uneasy adjustment to urban life due to unreliable system of sponsorship, difficulty to access employment and livelihood opportunities, poor conditions of employment as refugees are restricted to informal jobs with no

legal protection and obstacles to local urban integration and labour market entry (Samuel Hall, 2014). Although limited livelihood opportunities and urban integration had been indicated as difficulties, the issues had not been explored.

The lack of work permit, the necessity to have an Ethiopian guarantor to be hired, language, lack of market information and lack of work experience can also be a barrier for business-related activities. Protection risks like Food insecurity and negative coping strategies (food restrictions, prostitution) might exist. Because they are supposed to be self-reliant, OCP beneficiaries receive little assistance once in the city. Support and monitoring mechanisms on their living conditions are very loose. This tough adjustment to urban life explains why refugees living in the city still see resettlement as the main durable solution that they could access. (Samuel Hall, 2014)

The livelihoods of urban refugees are diverse, and include work in the informal sector as labourers, running small businesses and reliance on overseas remittances and community support networks. The great majority of refugees who have access to work are engaged in the informal economy. Semiskilled and unskilled refugees are involved in the same type of work, mostly casual labour and petty trade. This includes jobs as shoe shiners, shop attendants, mechanics, waiters, car washers and herdsmen in peri-urban areas. Labourers are paid between \$50 and \$150 per month, but they have to work every day and have no days off. The majority of those who have lived in Nairobi for more than two years are self-employed through petty trade (Sara, Samior, Sara, 2010).

As indicated these refugees cannot be engaged in the formal labor sector, meaning that they are restricted to the informal jobs that they can secure or remittances from relatives.

Knowledge of how refugees are sustaining their life in the city as well as their coping strategy when one form of livelihood is no more viable for them is very important.

Looking at experiences of other countries' scheme allowing refugees to settle in urban areas, the applicability of the program seems similar. Although, the majority of refugees living in urban centers are presumed to do so illegally, refugees are legally allowed to settle amongst the urban population in Egypt and South Africa. Refugees with legal status in Johannesburg and Cairo have prompted studies into the effect of legal status on urban refugees' livelihoods and security (Kobia, Cranfield, 2009). This is a good indication that legal status is insufficient to protect urban refugees. It doesn't necessarily mean that it provides access to the rights guaranteed in the international treaties or to socio-economic opportunities.

The constraints applicable to all refugees by virtue of their flight and importantly, the economic climate of host countries, may negate the importance of legal access to employment and identity documents (Bailey 2004). The case in South Africa can further strengthen the case that the legal entitlements guaranteed in the country's specialized refugee legislation do not widely translate into access to jobs, social services and escape from abuse (Landau, 2006).

Both the positive and negative impacts of OCP should be assessed and identified. The livelihood they will lead in terms of becoming a legal urban refugee under the out of camp scheme is assessed in this study. The refugees are only viable for informal low paying jobs. There are limited opportunities for refugees who want to lead their livelihood independently in an acceptable manner.

## 2.5 Integration

Prospects for and challenges to local integration feature prominently in urban refugee literature. Local integration for urban refugees is not presented as a one size fits all solution, as host governments and local populations often treat ethnic, racial and country of origin groups differently (Buscher, 2003).

The case of Eritrean refugee's settling in Addis Ababa and their level of integration with the host community has not yet been explored. Studying the level of integration with host community and how the integration was influenced is an essential factor.

OCP is an innovative mechanism but requires additional support to address the missing linkages and protection risks. Much can be done to take advantage of the OCP legal framework developed by Ethiopian authorities. Three main articulations can increase the impact of the OCP on refugees' self-reliance:

1. A stronger link between refugees in the camp, who remain the most vulnerable and the least self-reliant, and the policy;
2. A stronger link between refugees living out of the camp and urban livelihood,
3. A stronger articulation between actors to optimize the impact of the OCP. (Samuel Hall, 2014)

Following the decision a great number of Eritrean refugees mainly based in remote and barren areas are planning to use the new opportunity and start to live a new life in urban areas. UNHCR has welcomed the change in policy, as it officially introduces a new approach for hosting refugees in Ethiopia. Besides allowing refugees to live in urban settings, it also improves their access to services and helps build bridges with host communities. It is envisaged that full

rollout of the scheme will significantly reduce the costs of looking after refugees, as those benefiting from the scheme will be sustaining themselves, mainly through family support mechanisms.(Tesfalem, 2010)

Under the governments out of camp scheme, Eritrean refugees are permitted to move to an urban area if they have lived in a camp for at least six months, if they have a sponsor who can assume responsibility for covering their expenses and if they do not have a criminal record. Around 1,500 Eritreans have been accorded this privilege.

Out of camp Eritreans are granted access to public school and health facilities, although many express dissatisfaction with the quality and cost of such services, as well as the logistical difficulties (Samuel Hall, 2014). Access to social services was one of the factors that was studied as part of the livelihood impacts of the scheme. And the findings are different and contradicting from the ones stated above and will be discussed in the findings part.

Eritrean refugees are technically able to reclaim family bank balances and assets that were held before the large-scale deportations of 1988, although the extent to which this has happened remains unclear. Officially, ‘out of camp’ refugees are only allowed to work in the informal sector. But there is some confusion with respect to the meaning of this restriction. Irrespective of this issue, many of the Eritreans complain that they are subject to discrimination in the labour market, making it difficult for them to find a job or to earn a living wage.(Samuel Hall, 2014)

In addition to the two groups of urban refugees described above, there are an estimated 180,000-200,000 Somalis residing in Addis Ababa in an area predictably known as ‘Little Mogadishu’. A brief drive through the neighbourhood indicated a strong sense of cultural



identity and a high level of informal sector activity. The exact origins and composition of this group remain unclear, but it appears to include both ethnic Somali Ethiopians and Somalis from Somalia. With respect to those originating from Somalia, their presence is evidently tolerated by the authorities, is unrecognized in UNHCR's refugee statistics and untouched by the organization's urban refugee program.

The primary goal of providing assistance to refugees is to stabilize their lives, but a critical component of stability livelihoods is indirectly and inadvertently undermined by a service delivery system that requires refugees to spend an excessive amount of time and money getting to the offered assistance, particularly in urban settings. Refugees are left with less time to seek employment or earn an informal income, and a small but noticeable percentage of the money they do manage to earn must be spent to access services. For refugees caught in this cycle, rather than working to achieve their independence, they are working just to maintain their dependence. (Martin Anderson, 2012)

As more refugees are considering OCP as an alternative, a good reflection of its actual impact will provide a good insight not just for refugees but also implementing and policy making bodies. The three aspects, livelihood, integration and psycho social influence will help in understanding the lives of Eritrean refugees in Ethiopia.

## **Chapter 3: Methodology**

This chapter demonstrates the method of research used in the study. It explains the research design, study area, study participants and eligibility criteria, sampling technique, data collection instruments, method of analysis and ethical consideration.

### **3.1 Research Design**

The assumption behind this study was social constructivism. Social constructivism assumes that the goal of research is to rely as much as possible on the participants' views of the situation being studied and also to focus on the specific contexts in which people live and work, in order to understand the historical and cultural settings of the participants (Creswell, 2009). Based on this the study focused and relied on the responses of refugees who resided in Addis Ababa under the out of camp scheme.

For the purpose of exploring refugees reaction to the Out of Camp Scheme, qualitative research method was employed. Qualitative research helps to explore individuals' lives, experiences, behaviors, emotions and feelings as well as about organizational functioning, social movements, cultural phenomena, and interactions between nations (Creswell, 2009). A qualitative method has been chosen as it served better in exploring the impacts of the out of camp scheme. This research method also makes more sense in answering the basic research questions and objectives of the proposed study. In addition to this; from the five approaches used while employing qualitative research method, phenomenological approach was found more applicable method for gathering data on the basis of human lived experience. The phenomenological approach is exploratory in nature and, as such seeks to describe a particular phenomenon from those with first hand experience with the phenomenon. The description of the

experience should be as free from unexamined presuppositions on the part of the researcher as is possible (Spiegelberg, 1975). Descriptive or hermeneutical phenomenology – It refers to the study of personal experience and requires a description or interpretation of the meanings of phenomena experienced by participants in an investigation.

As Kruger and Newman (2006) stated, the strength of such approach relies as it tries to come out with findings that tell how a specific individual's life look like regarding the subject matter under study. Based on this, the study focused on obtaining experiences of subjects as to understand and explore the impacts of the 'Out of Camp Scheme'. It has let respondents to compare their life experiences in the camp setting versus their life in Addis Ababa.

### 3.2 Study Area

For the convenience of finding research respondents, purposive sampling method was used while choosing the study area. Since mass Eritrean refugees were residing in a place called 24 Kebele, this area was used to find out the respondents for the research questions. Besides, the research has used this area to find respondents for gathering data from both the interview and focus group discussion tools.

### 3.3 Study Participants and Eligibility Criteria

The participants of the research are Eritrean refugees residing within the vicinity of Addis Ababa, specifically 24 Kebele that are under the Out of Camp scheme. Participants were selected on the basis of their legal refugee status and beneficiary of the out of camp scheme, location, age (above 18 years), minimum one year of stay in Addis Ababa and accessibility. The set forth criteria were used while selecting respondents for both the interview and Focus Group

Discussion. The minimum 1 year of stay requirement was posed as to serve the purpose of assessing their integration process with the host community.

Location was also requirement as 24 kebele was one of the first settlement sites for Eritrean Refugees as per the discussion with Authority for Refugees and Returnees (ARRA). A total of eighteen respondents had participated in the study. Twelve of them had taken part in an in-depth interview. Ten refugees under the out of camp scheme and two program administrators from ARRA and JRS were interviewed. Six others were part of the Focus Group Discussion. Looking at the gender segregation, six male and four female respondents had participated in the interview. The FGD had 3 male and 3 female participants. It was attempted to have equal gender participation but due to the willingness of some selected female respondent initially, it wasn't possible to entertain equal participation in the interview. The interviewees from the responsible organization were all male. These samples were selected because, they are population that are of interest and believed to answer the research questions.

### 3.4 Sampling Techniques

The researcher employed non probability sampling design as the study was conducted in Addis Ababa around an are called Haya Arat kebele. Reaching a conceptual definition of a forced Eritrean migrants settled in Addis Ababa was the first step in developing a proper sampling strategy. Implementing such a strategy was, however, remarkably difficult with urban refugees, the majority of whom are self-settled among host populations. In urban settings, settlers were more heterogeneous, that is why it makes it difficult to physically locate the 'type' of people one is interested in researching, therefore, require considerably more effort than in other environments. That is why purposive sampling was employed to select sample population for this study. It was not possible to attain the full list of refugees from the Administration for

Refugees and Returnees Affairs (ARRA) as that information was treated with a high degree of confidentiality. Thus, samples were selected during the Eritrean refugee's registry that took place in Addis Ababa by the authority. Then subjects for the Focus Group discussions were identified in the study site (24 kebele).

### 3.5 Method of Data Collection

In this study data was gathered using both primary and secondary sources of data. Among the numerous data collection tools, this particular study has applied an in-depth interview and an FGD (both were semi structured) to collect primary sources of data. In addition to this, Secondary Sources of data were collected by reviewing previously conducted related studies, researches, journals, articles and books.

From these tools, the main instrument of collecting data was the interview guide with twelve semi structured questions and an FGD guide. Both the interview and FGD guides basically focused on getting refugees response on the livelihood impacts, success to social services and integration experience.

The interview guide was used while interviewing the ten selected Eritrean refugees as to come up with findings to the research questions. In-depth interviews (two) were also conducted with key informants as well that are part of the scheme) implementing bodies like ARRA and Jesuit Refugee Services (JRS) to get a sense on how the scheme is being implemented.

On the other hand one focus group discussion guide with 5 questions was also employed as to strengthen the research findings for the stated questions. Researcher's observation also had a major input.

### 3. 1 Data Collection Procedure

The data collection of this particular study began in the field, at the time of interviewing, as the researcher identified problems and concepts that appear likely to help in understanding the situation. Data was collected from the interviewees as well as a focus group discussion by going to Haya Arat kebele. The first round of interview took place with a key informant from ARRA. After the interview, the authorities connected me with an experienced Eritrean refugee translator. Using the translator paved the way for the researcher to avoid challenges that might have resulted due to language barriers and suspicion.

Most of the interviews took place in the houses of respondents as per their convenience and around their neighbourhood. The Focus Group Discussion took place at the translator's house. Public places were avoided as all of them expressed that they would be comfortable in a more private setting. Moreover, the researcher took the role of collecting data through the entire data collection period. The responses from the interview and FGD were recorded and notes were taken. Besides the interviews that took place were on the basis of face to face interviews had undertaken which let the researcher to see some of the observational facts.

All the interviews were conducted in September and the FGD was held in mid-October 2016. The interview with key informant from JRS was conducted in January 2017 as per his availability.

### 3.7 Method of Analysis

In this study the recorded data from the semi structured interview and focus group discussion was transcribed. Thematic analysis was employed for its benefit of being reliable and replicable (Braun & Clark, 2006) to analyse the finding. Furthermore, as it is described above,

the present study has centred on phenomenological study design. This design on the other hand is very much linked to thematic analysis method (Hancock, 2002). In the book written by Braun and Clark (2006), thematic analysis method is the fit method for analysing the findings through phenomenological approach. Kruger and Newman (2006) also pointed out that such methods are very much applicable to show written individual experiences for the subject matter under study.

While doing the analysis method in thematic manner, the first step the researcher perused was transcribing the recorded data from the semi structured interview and focus group discussion. Data was directly described and categorized based on the common responses. Then these common ideas and thoughts were categorized in a more categorical, analytic and theoretical level of coding by using these codes the information was reduced as much as possible. Data at this stage was reduced to classes that share common categories or codes. In the next phase codes were analyzed on how they combine to form themes and the themes are extensively reviewed until a set of potential themes have achieved. Finally the potential themes were analyzed in terms of making meaningful contribution to answering the research questions.

### 3.8 Ethical Consideration

Formal communication was made with Administration for Refugees and Returnees Affairs (ARRA) as to get consent and support with a formal letter from Addis Ababa University Department of Social Work along with the proposal. After discussion with the administration head a focal person was assigned to facilitate the data collection process. The purpose of this study was clarified to the study participants. In the process of selection of participants, the extent of confidentiality was discussed initially to make sure that they are well informed before giving their consent. The researcher prepared consents paper to get and confirm willingness of participants. The participants had the right to withdraw from the interview as well as the focus

group discussion at any time. The participants' response and the information collected were kept confidential. Based on the consent of the participants, the researcher recorded participant's responses by taking notes and a recorder during the interviews and discussion.



## Chapter 4: Findings

The findings are presented in sequence with the research questions. The first finding deals with the livelihood impacts of Out of camp scheme, Access to basic social services and integration experience with the host society.

### 4.1 Sociodemographic Characteristics of the Participants

This section shows the demographic status of respondent who were participated in the interview. The major variables assessed are sex, age, religion, and marital status, duration of stay in a refugee camp and in Addis Ababa.

From table 1 one can see that most of the respondents were within the age group 18-25. It is also observable that most of them are Orthodox Christians. Most of the participants attended first cycle primary education. Moreover, among the participants most respondents have stayed in camp or in Addis Ababa for years in average between 1-2 years.

Table1. Socio-demographic characteristics participants

Characteristic	Eritrean Refugees	
Religion	Orthodox	8
	Muslim	2
	Protestant	6
Age	18-25	9
	26-35	5
	Above 35	2
Educational level	Primary	8
	Secondary	5
	College	3

Marital status	Single	10
	Married	5
	Widowed	1
Year of stay in camp	1-2 years	10
	3-4 years	4
	Above 4	2
Year of stay in Addis Ababa	1-2 years	10
	2-4 years	6
	Above 4 years	-

## 4.2 The livelihood impacts of the out of camp approach in terms of income

### 4.2.1 Source of Income of Eritrean refugees in Addis Ababa

Out of ten interviews and one FGD with six participants, only 2 refugees generated their own income. The rest were dependent on support from other family members here in Addis Ababa or those who resided abroad. Although receiving remittance or living dependent on others was not the preferred and ideal way to lead their livelihood, it was articulated by most respondents that job opportunities were very limited as other fellow refugees.

In order to analyze the responses, the following themes were classified based on their source of income. Accordingly, 3 themes have emerged and categorized to describe the sources of income for these refugees. These are presented as follows

#### 4.2.1.1 Income through remittance

Majority of the interviewees are categorized under this theme as their livelihood relies on the remittance they receive from their family members, close relatives or friends. As stated by six

of the respondents, their source of income was mainly generated from others who reside abroad.

While explaining this, Abrha has stated the following

*“I came to Addis two years ago. Since then, my survival relied on my brother. He lives in Sweden. It has been 5 years since he went there. He is not only supporting me, but also other family members in Eritrea. Sometimes, I feel so uncomfortable when I ask him to send me money. But I feel that I don’t have any other alternatives to generate sufficient income to cover for rent and food.”*

Saron also added the following,

*“My husband has been living in Canada for the past 7 years working as a daily laborer. He is the one who told me to move to Addis. My son, who is 8 years old and I are dependent on him and we lead our lives with the remittance he sends us. He sends money at least once in two months. I always prioritize and make sure house rent is the first thing I pay for when I receive the money as it is my biggest worry. We manage to allocate the remaining amount to cover for our other basic needs.”*

On the other hand, Aysha also indicated that her uncle who lives in Sudan was the one who is supporting her by sending money regularly. She always reaches out to him to cover for her needs. She said that she desperately wants to be independent and being able to fulfill her own needs.

In addition,

Other 2 respondents have stated that they were sustaining their livelihood with the help of their close friends. As Solome stated,

*“I have been in Addis since last year. I had spent more than 2 years in Mai ayni camp. My friend and I have fled to Ethiopia together. She went to the US 2 years ago. She is the one who is sending money for fulfilling my needs every since. I*

normally spend about 3500 birr every month so the 150\$ she sends me basically covers the rent fee I split with my friend and the amount I spend for food. The only thing that worries me and my roommate is the alarmingly increasing rent fee. We can afford it now but not sure if that will be the case in the near future.”

Mebrehatom, father of 7 has also mentioned that he came to Addis in 2015. His sons who went to Israel before 3 years have been helping him out. When he described about his living conditions, he said that

*“I came to Ethiopia because all my sons migrated to other countries and I couldn’t cope up with the loneliness. I sustain my life here with the money they send me at the end of each month. I normally receive around 200USD per month.”*

Additionally 4 of the Focus Group |Discussion Participants said that they depend on the remittance sent by relatives and friends

Majority of the refugees allocate the remittance received to house rent, food, communication, social activities and health. Most of them live in rented houses and the rent fee ranges between 1800-6000 birr. The fact that the amount of money they spend for social activities is among their top expenditure list indicates that the value they give to their social ties. They usually spend their days chit chatting with other refugees. They are closely attached to each other within their circles. They also spend significant amount on communications as they are committed to their relatives and friends abroad sending remittance, family members and other fellow refugees elsewhere.

It has been indicated that remittance is commonly sent through informal means meaning through someone who is traveling but if it being sent for an emergency it is sent through the bank as it might take a while to find someone travelling under short notice.

#### 4.2.1.2 Income through sponsorships by relatives in Addis Ababa

In this theme, respondents that are being supported by their relatives residing in Addis Ababa are included. Two of the respondents and other 2 Focus Group Discussion participants stated that they were living with their relatives. While explaining her living condition, Selamawit shared the following:

*“Since I couldn’t handle the camp life, I decided to move to Addis to live with my aunt. She has lived here for more than 30 years. She was a mother of 4 and was living with her husband at that time. All the family welcomed my daughter and I. we share their home, eat with them and became additional members of that family. Since my husband is a new settler in Canada, he hasn’t started any job yet. We are totally relying on this family until he gets settled and start supporting us.”*

Kibrom on the other hand stated that he was living with his nephew. He arrived in Addis 3 years after him. Since he doesn’t have any other close relative that can support him permanently, he has relied on him. When he elaborated his living conditions, he said:

*“I lived with my nephew since my arrival in Addis. He is regarded as legal refugee as he was experiencing heart related disease and was given the permission to live in Addis. He came to Addis from camp 3 years ago. He is getting monthly support from UNHCR and other bodies. He also has other relatives abroad that support him permanently. Since he needs someone to take care of him and I need a place to stay as I have no one to support me and send me money, I am living with him.”*

In addition, Sewit and Yilma were sponsored by their relatives and are living with them.

It has been indicated that all of their sponsors provide housing and food. Although it is not a frequent, they support and provide them with a bit of cash as pocket money every

now and then. The refugees under this category also expressed that at times they feel like they are burdening their sponsors but still prefer to stay rather than going to camp again. They try to help out with house chores whenever they can.

One thing that was mentioned by the program administrator is an issue with sponsors. It is common for refugees to convince someone to pretend to be their sponsor so that they become eligible under the out of camp scheme as the procedure requires a sponsor. Once the process is finalized and they leave camp and they are on their own with no source of income/ supporter and no service provision. The only chances they are left with is either going back to the harsh conditions of the camp or find some other coping mechanisms (be it positive or negative) Among the positive ones are finding jobs in the informal sector Like becoming a daily laborer or hairdresser and some of the negative coping mechanisms are prostitution or some other criminal activities.

#### 4.2.1.3 Engaging in informal sectors

Two respondents have stated that they work in informal sectors to cover for their basic needs. As Gashaw stated, he has been working as daily laborer since his arrival. As there was no family member or relatives that could support him, he has been working to generate his own income. On the other hand, Goytom has mentioned the following

*“I am working as a daily laborer in a construction company. I have been engaged in this job since the remittance I receive from my sister is not sufficient enough. She sends me 100 USD in four or five months. This amount can't even cover my house rent. So I decided to look for work. The only job I was viable for and was available was my present occupation. Although I am facing obstacles to meet my needs, I am very happy since I am independent.”*

It has been indicated from the interview with the program administrator from ARRA, the common jobs that the refugees can potentially secure in Addis Ababa are as mechanics, daily laborers, hair dressing and so on. The income they attain from such jobs insufficient to cover for their basic needs thus raises questions on refugees protection in urban settings. House rent and food is the major difficulty this group highly suffers from as indicated by the authority and the refugees themselves. House rent kept on rising from month to month thus affecting their purchasing power for other basic necessities like food. Some of them get supported by friends and relatives once in a while on top of the small amount of income they generate but it is not regularly. The daily income one generate s as a daily laborer is between the ranges of 80-110 birr.

For the majority, the fact that they prefer the out of camp scheme is not just because of the pull factors in the urban setting but also attributed to the push factors. The push factors mainly consist of the harsh climate in the camps, sense of insecurity and sense of dependency. The people categorized here indicated that if food assistance is provided in the city their lives would be easier and that they will just have to be worried about covering for rent.

#### 4. 1 Access to basic social services for Eritrean Refugees in Addis Ababa

Concerning the provisions of social services for refugees under the Out of camp scheme in Addis Ababa, respondents have cited that such services were available. All of them have also articulated better provision of such services in their new settlement as compared to the service they had access to in camp. Besides their availability, some problems were encountered while attaining them. The social services that have been mentioned by these refugees were categorized in themes.

These themes were developed based on the provision bodies. Accordingly, the agents that were included in providing such services were governmental and non-governmental organizations.

#### 4.3.1 Social Service provided Government

Within this category, services that were rendered by the Government of Ethiopia and accessed by refugees were included. The overall services that were mentioned by these refugees were categorized on the basis of the types of the services. These includes health and educational facilities.

Health facilities – in this subcategory, respondents have mentioned that subsidized health facilities were provided mainly by government bodies. Health examinations, health counseling services (reproductive health) and medicines were accessed by these refugees. Although most of them preferred to go to private clinics for gaining better services, they have stated that such clinics give their services relatively with a higher cost. Moreover, as these refugees came from the camp with a permission to live in the city, health services were being provided to them and they have been attaining those services just like the host community. As Selamawit explained,

*“Once, I was really sick and my aunt told me to go to a health post close to our Kebele. Since they might ask for an identification card, I took my refugee ID with me. I showed them and without any hesitation I gained the services including free examination. I also bought the medicine form the institution. Even though I had to pay, all the services in the institution were attained with low fee.”*

Goytom on the other hand has stated he has been to such health institutions before. Although he finally attained the service, he explained that he had faced some problems at first. He said



*“They suspected me and I was told to wait in the reception room. I saw the receptionist talking with some guy who seemed like he works in administration. After a couple minutes they allowed me to see the Doctor.”*

Education facilities - Eritrean refugees have also mentioned that formal education was available in the city. They mainly get such services from governmental institutions. These institutions have been giving such services with no or very little fees. Even though they have to sit through serious examinations related to peace and security, they have stated that such services were being provided. Abrha is a student who has joined Addis Ababa University in 2016. As he stated,

*“I started learning journalism and communication in Addis Ababa University. I also know other Eritrean refugees who are learning in other governmental institutions. To be honest, I didn’t expect that I was going to get such opportunity. But I am now benefiting as I am allowed to pursue my education and I am very glad about it.”*

Selamawit on the other hand has added the following,

*“My daughter is learning in a governmental school after I requested the woreda administration to grant her access for free education. Initially, I wanted her to learn in a private school located in our locality. I approached the school but they rejected our application as I couldn’t fulfill the required documents which was understandable. This is faced by many refugees as they usually do not have their documentation with them and it is required when submitting application.”*

#### 4.3.2 Provision of services by non-governmental bodies

Within this theme, respondents have mentioned that organizations such as UNHCR (United Nations Higher Commission for Refugees) and JRS (Jesuit Refugee Service) were giving some

support for refugees. Even though the provided support was not obtained by all and is very limited, some refugees have stated that they have benefited from the provided services. In accordance with the type services, 2 categories were developed. These are basic need services and non-informal trainings.

Basic need facilities – under this category, UNHCR was the provider of such services such as house rent and food subsidies. Some of the refugees have obtained house rent subsidies. As Goytom stated:

*“Once I heard that UNHCR was giving support for refugees under the out of camp scheme. When I went to the compound of JRS (Jesuit Refugee Service), I was given Birr 2000. I told my friends that money was being offered. But, by the time they reached there, they were informed that the budget was over. So they returned back home empty handed. It was the only time that I have received such assistance from them.”*

On the other hand, these refugees also informed that food subsidies were offered to them. As they stated, 5 kilo of rice and a liter of oil have been delivered to them annually. Respondents have also mentioned that such services were permanent. However, the organizations do not prioritize and indicate who should get those services first.

Non informal training and education – from the responses gained, all of the respondents have articulated that they were familiar with the services that were rendered by JRS. From the interview that took place with the project manager of JRS, training services were open to these refugees. He also noted that no prerequisites were required other than being a legal refugee. The trainings being rendered include basic computer skills, foreign language literacy and other short term informal trainings were included. As Gashaw responded he knew the accessibility of such

services in the organization. But since he has to work and make money to survive, he stated that he has missed the opportunity. Selamawit on the other hand was learning foreign language and basic computer skills in the organization. Moreover Selamawit also added that her daughter also goes to this center to play.

#### 4.4 The integration experiences of Eritrean Refugees with host community in Addis Ababa

To interpret the findings related to integration experiences of Eritrean refugees in Addis Ababa, Two categories were used to indicate how these refugees have integrated with the host society. Some of them have stated that they have good relation with the host community while others said that they have very limited communication with Ethiopians. By looking at their experience, the themes positive integration and negative integration were developed.

##### 4.4.1 Positive integration

This theme is used to show respondents experience of having healthy and good relationship with the host community. Eight respondents have stated that they have been integrating and interacting with Ethiopians around their locality. They have summed up that their relationship has a positive manner. While stating their integration experience, they have put the various cultural practices as the main parts they have been involved in. Most of them have boldly indicated the cultural similarity between Eritrea and Ethiopia. According to these respondents, this similarity has played a great role for easing their integration within the community. While explaining their experiences and their involvement with the host community, the following components were identified. Based on their responses on the cultural practices, the categories below were used to show their response.

Culinary and dressing styles- based on the responses attained from the respondents, Ethiopians cooking and dressing habits are very similar with that of Eritreans. They have added

that, this in turn has helped them to feel familiar and to easily integrate with the host community.

When Goytom clarified this, the point he stated the following.

*“After I came to Addis Ababa, I have been living with the host community in peace. My familiarity to the culture has helped me to integrate easily. Look at us (Ethiopians and Eritreans) we look the same starting from our skin color. We have the same eating habit. Injera is what is preferred by most of us which is the staple food of Ethiopians as well. Our ladies wear habesha kemis (traditional clothe) during holidays. This makes it hard to draw a demarcation line between the two cultures. It is like you live in a new place but it is so familiar to the extent it makes you wonder 'Am I really in a new country?’”*

On the other hand Abrha has also included the following

*“Even though Ethiopia and Eritrea are two different countries, their people have lived together. We have so many things in common. How we eat, dress, the holidays we celebrate and our overall lifestyle is pretty similar. This has helped us and made it easier to interact with them. Although the two countries are claimed to be enemies, its not reflected in our daily lives. Sometimes, it amazes me how we see each other. Ethiopians are so peaceful to live with and I feel very happy to live with the society.”*

Similar social gatherings – as mentioned by some of the respondents, social gathering such as weeding and funerals are pretty similar among the two cultures. This on the other hand have led for these refugees to live along the host community. As Hana stated, *“How can you differentiate the weeding, funeral and other kinds of ceremonies between these two states? They are the same.”* Solome on the other hand has also included the following

*“I have participated in multiple social gatherings when my Ethiopian acquaintances invite me. I have never felt like an outsider. I have never felt alienated and was never mistreated by them. I was most welcome in the homes of my Ethiopian friends. I have danced at their weddings and shared sad moments with them. Sometimes, I feel like I’m in my own country.”*

Similar religious practices –under this subcategory, respondents have stated that most of the religions and religious practices in Eritrea are the same as Ethiopia. All of them have stated that they have attended various kinds of religious gatherings freely. Followers of the Orthodox Christian church said that even the language used in Mass service is the same (Geez). As Goytom stated,

*“Geez was what churches in Eritrea used to lead Mass. It is also the same in Addis. There is no difference between these two religious practices.”*

*Moreover, respondents who were followers of Islam stated that mosques were using Arabic language as the main language to lead religious practices. This has helped them to participate on such gatherings.*

Traditional Music– Tigrigna songs, were the most preferred music by the respondents. It was mentioned that it has the same beat and style both in Eritrea and Ethiopia, thus making it enjoyable to them. They also mentioned that Amharic songs are their second choices. As Kibrom said

*“I listen to most Amharic songs and I really like them. They have much similarity with ours making it easy to relate”*

Most of them are constrained within their circle and have strong relationship and bondage with fellow refugees. Their choice of settlements follow an imitative pattern meaning they all settle

in neighbourhoods where there is a large number of Eritrean refugees. They are active participant in religious settings and practices. But none of them are part of social associations like Ekub, Edir and Mahiber with the host community. Some have formed religious maheber among themselves. As indicated in the findings part dealing with livelihood, they spend significant amount of the money they have on their social gathering. They intensely visit each other and spend a lot of time and resource among their social ties and fellow refugees. The support mechanism among themselves is very strong, like if someone is in need they will mobilize funds among themselves and make sure that person is supported.

#### 4.4.2 Limited Interaction and Unsuccessful integration

Under this category, some respondents have stated that they have not yet been well integrated with the practices of the host community. As Solome and 2 others stated, they have limited interaction and unsuccessful integration experience with Ethiopians. She said the following when she explained about her integration experience

*“ I came to Addis Ababa with my cousin. He has been in the city before and I relied on him for any communication with Ethiopians. Since he knew Amharic, I never cared about interacting with the host community. But recently, he went to Sudan and I have been challenged when I need to communicate even with my landlord. I feel like I should have made some effort but the fact that I’m just here till I am permanently resettled elsewhere discouraged me a bit. ”*

As these respondents mentioned, the main causes for their limited integration experience can be categorized in to low language proficiency, segregated way of life and short period of stay in the city.

Low language proficiency – according to some of the respondents, limited language proficiency, mainly Amharic has led them not interact with the host community. Since they saw language as the main means of interaction, respondents have stated that this has restricted them to interact with host community and limit their interactions with fellow refugees only. As explained by Aysha

*“I have been living in the city for more than 2 years. But I never wanted to go along with or integrated with Ethiopians. I couldn’t speak Amharic so I feel uncomfortable. I normally use translators when I need to communicate with them.”*

Segregated way of living – As per the researcher’s observation, their segregated way of life can be seen with respect to their settlement. Most of them prefer to settle with close proximity to other Eritrean refugees. Thus some neighbourhoods have a lot of Eritrean refugees. Majority of the refugees live in 4 major areas in Addis; these are 24 Kebele, Mebrat Haile, Gofa, and around Kotebe. As the researcher’s observation, these refugees were living in an isolated manner. They have stated that the first thing they are aware of when they come to Addis Ababa is name of these neighbourhood. As Aysha stated,

*“When I first came to Addis, I told the driver to take me to 24 Kebele. I knew my friend whom I’m staying with lived in this area so I went there. Then witnessed that there were many Eritrean refugees in that locality. I felt like I was in my home town. I never wanted to make the extra effort to connect with the host community. There are other Eritrean refugees in our compound and I am always in touch with them.”*

According to the respondents, this was stated as one of the main reasons for their segregated way of life. As Solomon stated, *I lived in Addis with other Eritreans and I had*

*limited contact with Ethiopians. My neighbours are Eritreans. I managed to keep a very close relationship with them.*

One common thing among all the refugees that responded was, all of them believe that they are here for a limited amount of time till their application and process is complete to permanently resettle elsewhere. It has been observed that this has also kept them from making strong efforts to integrate as they feel that they are only here temporarily so it doesn't really matter if they strengthen their relationship and invest in their social capital here. Even though Ethiopian culture has similarities with that of Eritrea, it's still not home.

#### 4.5 Attitude of refugees towards the Out of Camp scheme

The last question in relation to finding answers to the attitude of the refugees for the out of camp scheme was gained using mainly FGD tools along with in-depth interview. As it was mentioned by the refugees, most of them have witnessed changes in their life. Their attitude towards the out of camp scheme was themed based on the pros and cons of such life. Consequently, there answers were categorized under 2 themes cited as positive and negative attitude. These will be presented as follows.

Positive attitude of out of camp scheme - under this theme, respondents have stated that living in the city has many positive outcomes. As it was mentioned by all of them, this new scheme was much better choice than their life in the camp. As Goytom stated *"I don't know how to compare my present life with the previous one. It is different in so many ways."* Respondents have pointed out their reasons for having such attitude. The main reasons that made life unfavourable in camps are categorized below.



1) Environmental Conditions: The camp environment was stated as a major factor that made camp life difficult to live in. It was the major reason that led the refugees to favor the out of camp scheme. The respondents have stated that the camp was such uncomfortable place to live in. They have pointed out the following reasons for stating its unsuitability.

a) Harsh climate condition of the camp – as being the major factor, the hotness of the camp was stated as causing harsh living condition. Most of them have experienced or observed health related problems as a result of the very hot temperature. When Aysha expressed the incident, she said the following:

*“I will never forget how extremely hot the climate was. Sometimes, we felt like we were burning. It made my two years stay very difficult. We couldn’t do anything about it since there was no solution. How can you reverse what nature has brought? It was a very common incident for us to see people getting sick; mostly heart related cases. We used to take off our clothes or spill water on ourselves, but none of these helped.”*

Moreover, all of them have also mentioned that the city was a much better place to live in. And also the weather is conducive. This on the other hand has led these refugees to prefer the out of camp scheme.

b) Wide spread diseases: - on the other hand, the environment was also seen as a factor that fostered transmission of different kinds of both communicable and non-communicable diseases. They have stated that malaria and infectious diseases were very common in the area. Among the respondents, most of them have stated that the environment as it was characterized by warm climate has summed up for such kinds of diseases to occur. As Selamawit stated,

*“The environment was very harsh to live in. Almost all of us had malaria at some point. Since the temperature was very warm, the environment was very conducive for such kind of insects to breed. We saw our neighbours and relatives die because of malaria. Sometimes, I couldn’t believe that my daughter and I are standing here alive.”*

Not only malaria, but most of them have also faced so many other illnesses. They have stated that flue, typhoid, typhus and other diseases were repeatedly experienced.

2) Scarcity of facilities – services that were necessary for sustaining life had limited access in a camp setting as compared to the city. Although the service was provided for free, accessibility to all was a major issue. Thus, it became a major factor that increased the hardship of camp life. Facilities related to health, food and accommodation were mentioned as being unmet and if met it was provided in poor quality. For these refugees, living in Addis as being an out of camp refugee has partially solved their problem. As the availability of services was in better status, they favoured living here as compared to the camp. The mentioned facilities as being unmet are the following.

a) Accessibility health facilities – health examinations and medical attention was required frequently by most in camp settings. This however challenged the daily service delivery. Not only the scarcity, but the poor quality of such service was also mentioned as a major factor. During the focus group discussion, refugees have stated that health related services were seriously insufficient. They described that there was a long waiting list so it took days for medical consultation it even took long hours to get such services even if there is an emergency.

In addition, they have also mentioned that such delays have led for other health complications and put most refugees' life in jeopardy. As Solome stated

*“I have seen a boy who was paralyzed as a result of the delayed health provision service when he had malaria.” Kibrom also added saying “There are many of us who are still living with permanent health problems/complications due to poor access to health services back when we lived in camps.”*

Such challenges were even greater when it comes to children. As Selamawit stated

*“Once my daughter got malaria and I took her to the camp clinic. We waited long hours to get medical examinations even though it was an emergency. And even getting the medicine took time and we got it only the next day. It took more than a month for my daughter to recover. I have suffered a lot during that period and so did my daughter. This was among my main reasons to decide and move to Addis to live with my aunt.”*

While comparing their camp and city life in relation to health facilities, refugees have stated that Addis Ababa is suitable for them as these services were better in quality and accessibility in terms of availability. This in turn has led for these refugees to prefer living in Addis Ababa. Service provisions provided by the government in the cities are affordable and are provided in a much better quality than those provided in camps. These services are also provided by private institutions but they charge much more than that of a government one.

Accessibility of basic necessities- though the provision of food from organizations was somehow better in camps as it was permanently provided as compared to the city, it was limited in varieties and was a bit far from being nutritious. On the other hand, they have only received 10

kilo of wheat flour and a liter of edible oil while they lived in the camp. Food choices were scarce and they usually eat what was obtained in the camp. In the group discussion, refugees have stated that the *enjera* they have been getting was very poor in quality. Moreover, they usually ate *shiro*. As compared to the camp, living in Addis has offered accessibility of food choices although it costs them much more as it was free in camps.

In addition to this, the main shelter that was built up in these camps were made of corrugated iron. These houses made it difficult and harder to cop up with the harsh weather. In addition to this, they have also stated that one shelter was shared among many refugees. Privacy was unthinkable and there were lots of problems as a result of the suffocation and it contributed to the wide transmission of infectious diseases. While comparing this with how they live in Addis, respondents have stated that the quality of homes was much better. Although these shelters come with a much higher cost, they have mentioned that personal life and privacy was obtained. While elaborating this, Solome has stated that,

*“I am now living in a rented one room house around 24 Kebele. The price is high. But it is much better compared to the shelter in the camp. I used to share the camp shelter with other 20 refugees and I never had any privacy.”*

Access to information – telephone network and access to internet was one of the reasons that attracted refugees towards the out of camp scheme. They have discussed and stated that the better access to network is so much better and this has helped them connect with their family members abroad. The accessibility and availability of internet had also made it easier for them to find any information. This in turn has led these refugees to prefer city life as compared to the camp.

## Negative attitudes towards out of camp scheme

Under this theme, respondents have stated some shortcomings of city life. The cons of living in the city have created negative attitudes toward out of camp scheme. These cons/shortcomings are mostly related to high costs of basic necessities. In addition, they have also stated that supports from organization are very limited. According to their responses the following reasons were categorized as being shortcoming of the out of camp scheme.

High costs of basic necessities – despite accessibility, basic necessities were very costly in Addis Ababa. House rent was the first thing that was mentioned by these refugees as being expensive. According to the respondents, more than half of their income is used to pay their rent. Dawit said that, *“The house rent fee is very expensive. I am living with my cousin and we pay Birr 1,600 per month for one room. This is too much for us.”* On the other hand, they have also stated that other basic needs including food and other facilities were overpriced. As elaborated by Gashaw,

*“Sometimes I don’t feel it is reasonable to impose that much cost on some of the needs such as injera. We have to pay birr 4.50 for 1 piece of injera. Sometimes, I might not get the money to cover for my needs. It is extremely difficult for me to comfortably cover for my basic needs.”*

In addition to this, better quality services in respect to health and other facilities which are usually are provided by the private sector costs are not affordable by these refugees. When it is very necessary, these refugees might go to these sectors. As Saron explained,

*“I have been to a private clinic to see the doctor for my son. I knew that the clinic cost was very expensive and I could have gone to a government health post but since he was sick during night time, the only available place that I found was this*

*clinic. The clinic was very expensive but nonetheless, I was happy as he recovered very soon.”*

Limited support from organizations – refugees under out of camp scheme are expected to be capable of supporting themselves. Thus, various supports from Non-Governmental Organizations are not provided. According to the respondents, the only benefit they found was the food support and house rent fee. But the main shortcoming of these supports was that it was given once a year. Not only this, respondents have also added that such supports were not uniform. They have stated *“it is provided on a first come first serve basis. If you are late, then the budget will be over and you will go home without a thing.”* This on the other hand was seen as the one of the cons of city life. As Kibrom stated,

*“Since my arrival at this city, I never gained any support from anyone. I have heard my friends saying money was being given. But I think I was late when I went to the institution. They told me that they have finished the budget and that I should have been there earlier. There wasn’t a formal way of notifying us before hand”*

Some of them have also added that they would have benefitted if organizations work together at least to offer some trainings that can help them to start generating their own income. As most of them were dependent on others, they have mentioned that such provisions might help them change their livelihood. Kibrom went on saying:

*“I know that I am old enough and I can take care of myself. But I am always looking out to my nephew to fulfill my needs. I feel that I can’t do anything about this. I don’t know the language. I have no skills. I came out of my country without*

*education. Who is going to offer me a job? I will be so honored if some of the organizations supported me to change the status I am in.”*

#### 4.6 Policy Implication

Looking at the international law status, Ethiopia signed the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees on 10 Nov 1969 and its 1967 Protocol in Nov 1969. It is a party to the convention with reservations to its article 8, article 9, Article 17 (2) and article 22. Article 8 obliges states to exempt refugees from measures which may be taken against the person, property or interests of nationals of a foreign State. Article 17(2) prohibits states to impose restrictive measures that may be imposed on non-citizens or the employment of non-citizens for the protection of the national labour market, to refugees) and article 22(that obliges states to accord to refugees the same treatment as is accorded to nationals with respect to elementary education ). Ethiopia is also a party to the 1969 Convention governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa (African Refugee Convention) regionally.

In the constitution in its article 32 also expressly provides non- national (which means including refugees) the freedom of movement within Ethiopia and the freedom to choose residence in the following words: "any ... foreign national lawfully in Ethiopia has, within the national territory, the right to liberty of movement and freedom to choose his residence, as well as the freedom to leave the country at any time he wishes.”

Ethiopia has also adopted a proclamation 409, 2004 that specifically deals with refugees regulating factors related to refugees in almost similarly as refugee convention provides. The Ethiopian refugee proclamation, under its article 21, provides that a refugee shall be permitted to remain within Ethiopia, issued with identity card and travel document to travel outside of Ethiopia. In reality, it is the government with UNHCR that decides on refugees' written applications for

international travel documents for educational, work-related, or urgent personal reasons. The proclamation is in line with the rights recognized under both the refugee and the OAU refugee convention. But on the contrary, the proclamation under its sub article 2 provides that the Head of the Authority may designate places and areas in Ethiopia within which recognized refugees, persons who have applied for recognition as refugees, and family members thereof shall live, provided that the areas designated shall be located at a reasonable distance from the border of their country of origin or of former habitual residence. As indicated before, the Constitution of Ethiopia states that ‘any ... foreign national lawfully in Ethiopia has, within the national territory, the right to liberty of movement and freedom to choose his residence, as well as the freedom to leave the country at any time he wishes.’ This shows that, the proclamation authorized the head of ARRA to designate areas where refugees and asylum seekers must live, thereby imposing residential restrictions, which means it is contradicting the constitution. In most camps, ARRA permits refugees to travel off camp (medical, educational, safety or other reasons) thus restricting refugee’s freedom of movement but with exception of Eritrean refugees.

The out of camp scheme allows Eritrean Refugee to live off camps given that they fulfil the eligibility requirements. This also indicates that the scheme is in contradiction Article 2 of the 2004 refugees proclamation which states where refugees shall live ‘The Head of the Authority may designate places and areas in Ethiopia within which recognized refugees, persons who have applied for recognition as refugees, and family members there of shall live, provided that the areas designated shall be located at a reasonable distance from the border of their country of origin or of former habitual residence. It also contradicts the non-discriminatory nature of the proclamation, that stated ‘This Proclamation shall be applied without discrimination as to race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group, or political opinion’. Eritrean refugees have the third largest



population after South Sudanese and Somalia refugees but this privilege is only awarded only to Eritrean refugees and clarity on this decision is still lacking.

With regards to jobs, Article 21, Sub article 3 of the proclamation imposes restriction on the rights refugees could enjoy in Ethiopia; 'Every recognized, refugee, and family members there of shall, in respect to wage earning employment and education, be entitled to the same rights and be subjected to the same restrictions as are conferred or imposed generally by the relevant laws on persons who are not citizens of Ethiopia.'

Concerning the right to education, the proclamation limits access to publically funded services to citizens. But under out of camp scheme accorded to Eritrean Refugees, they are allowed to study outside the camps and also to access higher education with the special arrangements made between ARRA and UNHCR.

To conclude the informal out of camp scheme is in contradiction with the Refugee Proclamation 409/2004. Given that it's in practice, the scheme should be formalized and complete alignment with the refugee proclamation.

## **Chapter 5: Discussion**

This section of the study presents major research findings in relation to relevant researches. It has tried to look into areas that are related to the out of camp scheme and integration experiences. The findings are discussed in association with relevant literatures. They are presented in accordance with the major sub-topics. However, it should be noted that there is limited literature related to this topic in our country context.

### **5.1 Sources of income for Eritrean refugees in Addis Ababa**

As it was stated in the findings section that, most refugees have relied on remittance to support their livelihood. They have indicated that the main source of remittance was either from family members, friends or relatives. As stated on UNHCR 2016 report, livelihoods of most urban refugees depends on the remittance from their families or other bodies. In accordance to this report, these urban refugees living in various host countries were waiting on financial assistance from abroad to sustain their life. On the other hand, there were also respondents who stated that they were living with their relatives in Addis Ababa. In Addition to this, some respondents stated that they have engaged in non-informal sectors. As a new policy for Eritrean refugees, the out of camp scheme has described that refugees can live in Addis Ababa or other cities of the country if they can support themselves). This has enabled these refugees to live in the city either supported by themselves or others. A study done by Samuel Hall about self-resilient refugees in Addis Ababa has also indicated that the out of camp scheme has enabled some refugees to engage in informal sectors. This in turn has helped them to be dependent although the amount they make is not sufficient enough.

## 5.2 Social services for Eritrean refugees in Addis Ababa

As indicated in the finding part, Eritrean refugees have been receiving some social services by the Ethiopian Government as well as Non-Governmental Organizations. The main services obtained from the government were from health and educational facilities. As described in the literature published by UNHCR (2016) on the provision of educational facilities for refugees, the Ethiopian government has given various opportunities to many refugees to be educated mostly in higher education, colleges and other institutions. Besides, UNHCR and JRS have also been stated as the only service providers to these refugees. This being the fact, refugees have also stated that these services were not obtained by all and were very inconsistent. It was indicated in a prior study that the refugees were dissatisfied with the cost of such services. Access to social services was one of the factors It was studied as part of the livelihood impacts of the scheme Out of camp Eritreans are granted access to public school and health facilities, although many express dissatisfaction with the quality and cost of such services, as well as the logistical difficulties (Samuel Hall, 2014). But the findings are different and somehow contradicting from the ones stated above as these services were provided by the government with low cost to all. Educational fees for the refugees are also subsidized by the government. Free trainings in a couple of areas is also being provided by JRS with no entry requirement other than being a refugee. In addition, counselling programs were also being rendered by JRS. As per the report by JRS (2016), it was indicated that the only service provider in relation to non-informal trainings and counselling was this organization.

## 5.3 Integration experience of Eritrean refugees with the host society

Out of camp Eritreans are granted access to public school and health facilities, although many express dissatisfaction with the quality and cost of such services, as well as the logistical

difficulties (Samuel Hall, 2014). Based on the interview result from the refugees, it was identified that most of them had an integration experience that was regarded as positive. They have stated out that they have been in contact with the host community and their interaction was frequent. The interviewed refugees have also indicated the similarity of two state cultures and it made it easier for them to be in contact with the host society. The major cultural practices that have been mentioned by the refugees as being practiced included culinary, dressing, religious practices and social gathering habits. When we cite related literature concerning this issue, most new comers seem to integrate with the new setting which had cultural similarity.

For instance this integration experience as a result of similarity between cultures goes in line with the literature written by Eurocities, 2016. Within this publication, the role of cultural similarity was indicated as the main reason for integration of migrants in new settings. In addition, a study done on Ethiopian women who migrated to the Middle East has showed the negative integration experience of these women as a result of unfamiliarity to the culture of the host community (Hiwet, 2016). Based on this, it can be concluded that Eritrean refugees have benefited from similarity with cultural practices of the host society. On the other hand, the cultural relation of the state of migrants with the state of host was also put up as an influencing factor for migrants to interact with the host society. In the work of Berry 2005, it was stated that the political relation of the two states could determine the individual reactions to the cultural contact. On his publication, Berry has cited that the positive relation of the two states will add up on integration practices of individuals. On the other side, if countries have negative political relation then it might lead for individuals to alienate themselves from the new community. In contrary to these statements, the present paper has showed that most of the interviewed Eritrean refugees had positive integration experience and those who have not yet been integrated to the

society didn't mention such reasons for their limited interaction and unsuccessful integration. Ethiopia and Eritrea are two states that are in hostile situations (Young, 2007). This might have happened due to the background history of the two states. Ethiopia and Eritrea have people who have lived together for long periods and there are lots of cultural similarity that falls in between the two states).

Moreover there were also respondents who indicated that they have no integration experience with the host society. These respondents have also included reasons for their segregation. These factors included low language proficiency, segregation way of life and limited amount of time with host community. For these refugees, their level of language proficiency has restricted their communication with the host community. Various studies have also indicated and showed the indirect relationship of non-proficiency in host language and integration experience. From these studies, Mussarat (2012) and Anamara (2008) could be stated. In accordance with the finding of these researches, the inability of the migrants to speak and understand the language of the host will impose negative impact on their integration process. Due to this major factor, refugees and other types of new settlers have separated from the host community. On the other hand, the living condition of migrants in the new settlement has also impacted their integration experience. In a study done by Aysha (2016) on acculturation strategies of Somali refugees in Addis Ababa, it was indicated that Somali refugees were living in an isolated manner. It was indicated that these refugees have chosen such living condition mainly due to language problems and the need to maintain their culture. This in turn has led for their segregation from the host society. This finding goes in line with this study present.

#### 5.4 Attitudes of Refugees towards the out-of-camp scheme

Attitude of Eritrean refugees towards the out of camp scheme as compared to the camp life as presented in the finding part, all of the respondents have mentioned their present life was much better as compared to the camp life. They have stated that environmental conditions were much better and facilities were available compared to camp. Moreover, access to information was also far better in the city. Based on the report of UNHCR (2016), Eritrean refugees have been facing problems related to the harsh environmental conditions of the camp. The same report has also pointed out that the out of camp scheme has favoured many Eritrean refugees in many ways including availability of necessities. On the other hand, these refugees have also indicated some negative aspects of out of camp scheme. From the stated gaps of the scheme, high costs of basic necessities and limited support from agencies were indicted. In the report for refugees under such scheme, the policy has clarified that only refugees that can support themselves fully can benefit from the proposed scheme.

## **Chapter 6: Conclusion and Social Work Implication**

### **6.1 Conclusion**

This study believed to have a contribution in advancing the existing knowledge in Ethiopia regarding the out of camp scheme from the refugee's perspective. The study looks in to the experience of sixteen Eritrean refugees living in Addis Ababa.

Based on the findings of the research, most of the refugees depend on remittance to lead their livelihood while some of them indicated they had limited income as they were living with their sponsors and were not generating their own income. Very few were engaged in informal sectors working as daily laborers and generated their own income. The refugees who are dependent on remittance receive from 100\$-200\$ per month. The most common expenditure was house rent and food. The refugees that are engaged in informal sectors are working as daily labourers and receive from 60-80 birr per day.

Regarding social services, most of them have stated that subsidized health and educational services are readily available at governmental institutions. However the respondents have stated that attaining such services is had a beuaroucratic process. Very few respondents have obtained rent and food subsidy provided by non-government entities. The main reason for limited number of beneficiaries is the inconsistency and insufficiency of the services.

Respondents found it easier to live in the city given commonalities in culture but some were unsuccessful due to language barrier, segregated way of life and lack of interest.

As explored on the study, the livelihood of the majority of the refuges depend on the remittance from family and friends. It has been difficult for them to be financially dependent since they do not have access to the formal job market. Only few are engaged in low paying

informal sectors. They do have access to social services including health and education although it wasn't provided for free as it was in camps (the quality of the service was really poor). The integration experience for most refugees was positive. The similarities of both cultures in terms of culinary, religious practices, social gatherings and even traditional music was indicated as factors that made it easy for the refugees to integrate. On the other hand, significant number of the refugees explained that they had limited or no integration due to low language proficiency, the habitual segregated way of life the refugees follow and lack of one's own initiation.

Finally the out-of-camp scheme was indicated as a better alternative compared to camps. The main reason behind this were the harsh conditions of the camp.

## 6. 2 Social Work Implication

Social work is a kind of profession that works towards the better life of vulnerable groups of people. As it is indicated in the study Eritrean urban refugees are one of the vulnerable groups of people in Ethiopia. And as part of the out of camp scheme, they are allowed to live in any city in Ethiopia as long as they are legible. These refugees are vulnerable to different kinds of challenges. Therefore, different social work intervention are needed to address their challenges. As the study indicated the challenges encountered by refugees to integrate within the host community, and guidance to support their livelihood.

The responsible bodies like ARRA, UNHCR and other Non-Government Organization that work with refugees and more specifically urban refugees are demanded to minimize possible negative consequences both on the host community as well as people in Addis Ababa and the refugees themselves since migration cannot be free from problems such as economic, psychological, social, cultural, political, and environmental problems. The existence of positive



relationships between different social network characteristics and migration decision among the Eritrean refugees has an important implication to different organization working in the area of migration to think about the point where to intervene. It is important to see that despite some similarities in culture and way of life, there was limited social integration for a significant number of the interviewed refugees. The scope of social work practice with these refugees can potentially include, Strengths-based comprehensive psychosocial support as to help them become more self-reliant, working with groups, organisations and communities to respond to shared goals, Linking of individuals and families to community networks, facilitating social services rendered to this group like health, welfare and other systems to ensure good outcomes and assist client aspirations.

### 6.3. Implication to policy

This study will have a significant policy implication. As indicated above, the Ethiopian government has supported an out-of-camp scheme allowing some Eritrean refugees to live outside camps. However, so far no formal policy document on the out-of-camp policy has been adopted. The informal out-of-camp scheme, whose parameters and scope are unclear, allows in practice some Eritrean refugees to live outside refugee camps as long as they fulfil the indicated parameters like having a sponsor. To further strengthen the applicability of the Scheme, it should be formalized and have clearer guidelines. There should also be some follow up as to assess and monitor the success of the scheme and also to capitalize on positive outcomes for further intervention.

The government had pledged to expand the Out-or-Camp Policy Ethiopia has been implementing an out of camp policy to allow some refugees to live outside the camp during the Obama Leaders' Summit held on 20th September 2016. The government pledged to expand the

Out-of-Camp-Policy to all refugees as defined by the policy documents of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE) and subject to the laws of the country. This pledge is intended to benefit 75,000 refugees or 10% of the current total refugee population in Ethiopia. If resource allows, the number of beneficiaries is intended to grow progressively. If such plans had been made by the government, it is within the belief of this study that the scheme should be formalized and have a proper legal framework. This will contribute to the development of the scheme and will make administrating easier. The selection criteria will also be more transparent for applicants.

It should be developed in a way that benefits both the refugees, host community and government. The aim of the scheme should be clearly set. For example, if it is to encourage resettlements here in Ethiopia or if it is just a strategy to support refugees till they repatriate or resettle elsewhere. This way it helps the GoE, and development partners to prioritize in their intervention plans and support mechanisms. This in turn shapes the integration of refugees and provide alternative meant to support their livelihood.

The scheme should not be contradictory of the refugee proclamation 409/2004 as per the discussion in the findings part and should be completely aligned with the constitution and the refugee proclamation 409 of 2004.

## **References**

- Anamara R., Daniel W. and Jennifer B. (2008). *The Role of Acculturation, Parenting, and Family in Hispanic*. Latino Adolescent Substance Use: Findings From a Qualitative Analysis, 7(3), 304–327. doi: 10.1080/15332640802313320
- Bailey, Sarah (2004). “Is Legal Status Enough? Legal status and livelihood obstacles for urban refugees.” The Fletcher School, MALD Thesis.
- Berry, John. (2005). Acculturation Living successfully in two cultures. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 29 (2005) 697–712
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3 (2). Pp. 77-101. Retrieved January, 2017, from [https://www.eprints.uwe.ac.uk/11735/2/thematic analysis revised](https://www.eprints.uwe.ac.uk/11735/2/thematic%20analysis%20revised).
- Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration Washington, DC. 2012, Report of a Joint UNHCR-PRM Mission to Review Urban Refugee Issues in Uganda and Ethiopia. <http://www.state.gov/j/prm/releases/releases/2012/208926.htm> (Retrieved on 25/12/2015.)
- Buscher, Dale (2003). "Case Identification: Challenges posed by Urban refugees." Annual Tripartite Consultations on Resettlement Geneva, 18-19 June.
- Campbell, Elizabeth H. (September 2005). “Formalizing the Informal Economy: Somali Refugee and Migrant Trade Networks in Nairobi.” Global Commission on International Migration 47.

- Creswell, W.J. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* (2nd ed). London: New Delhi
- Eurocities (2016). *Refugee reception and integration in cities, Brussels, Belgium*
- Hancock, B. (2002). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. University of Nottingham
- Hanna, H. (2016). *Perception on the Host and Language Proficiency as Determinant Factors for Acculturation Strategies among Assisted Somali Refugees in Addis Ababa* (unpublished MA thesis). Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- Hiwot, E. (2016). *Mental Health Services for Female Migrant Returnees from Middle East Countries in Agar Ethiopia Charitable Society: Types and Challenges* (unpublished MA thesis). Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- Human Rights Council (2015). *Report of the detailed findings of the Commission of Inquiry on Human Rights in Eritrea*.
- Jesuit Refugee Service (2016). *Eritrean refugees favoring out of camp scheme*. Switzerland : Author. .
- Kofi Kobia and Leilla Cranfield (2009), *Urban Refugees*, (published MA thesis) Norman Paterson School of International Affairs, Carleton University. Canada
- Kreuger, L. and Neuman, W. (2006). *Social Work Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Applications*. Boston New York San Francisco.
- Landau, Loren B, and Karen Jacobsen (January 2004). "Refugees in the New Johannesburg." *Forced Migration Review* 19: 44-46.

- Martin Anderson. 2012, the cost of living: an analysis of the time and money spent by refugees accessing services in Nairobi. Policy Development and Evaluation Service, UNHCR. Geneva, Switzerland
- Mussarat, K., & Kathryn, E.(2012). Attitudes toward Muslim Americans Post-9/11, 7(1). doi: 10381607.0007.10
- Patrick Kingsley, September, 2015. Refugee crisis: apart from Syrians, who is travelling to Europe? The Guardian, (retrieved 11/01/2016)  
<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/sep/10/refugee-crisis-apart-from-syrians-who-else-is-travelling-to-europe>
- Sara Pavanello, Samir Elhawary and Sara Pantuliano. 2010. Hidden and exposed: Urban refugees in Nairobi. Kenya Humanitarian Policy Group Overseas Development Institute. London, United Kingdom
- Samuel Hall Consulting (2014), Living out of Camp: Alternatives to Camp-based Assistance for Eritrean Refugees in Ethiopia, Nairobi, Kenya
- Selam Daniel 2002, On the Refugee Problem in Eritrea. Murj Volume 6 report
- Sharon Stanton Russel (2002) Refugees: Risks and Challenges Worldwide, (<http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/refugees-risks-and-challenges-worldwide>) Retrieved on 15/12/2015.
- Tesfalem Tekle. 2010, Exiled Eritreans hail Ethiopia's 'out-of-camp' policy shift, (<http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/refdaily?pass=52fc6fbd5&id=4c68f1498>). (Retrieved on 25/12/2015.)

United Nations Higher Commission for Refugees UNHCR (2014, 2015), Ethiopia  
factsheet, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

United Nations Higher Commission for Refugees (2016). Statistical manual for numbers  
of refugee in the world. London. England: Author. London. England : Author.

US, Department of State, 2013. Eritrea Human Rights Report 2012.

<http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/204328.pdf>.

Young, J. (November 2007). Armed groups along the Ethiopia–Sudan–Eritrea frontier  
(PDF). Geneva: Small Arms Survey, Graduate Institute of International Studies.  
p. 32 (PDF 17). ISBN 2-8288-0087-3.

## **APPENDIX**

### Annex 1: Consent Form

My name is Aida Erkihun I am a prospect graduate student at Addis Ababa university school of social work. I am conducting this research for the partial fulfilment of the Master degree of Social Works (MSW) at Addis Ababa University.

#### **Purpose:**

The purpose of this study as I have mentioned it above is for academic purpose only. However, the finding of the study can be used to in similar studies.

#### **Procedures:**

If you agree to take part in this research study, you will be interviewed with questions focused on the specified title. The interview should take 30-45 minutes. The questions will include background information, your livelihood base, and income level and employment status. All information that you will give will remain anonymous and confidential. Moreover, your participation in this study is 100% based on your willingness. If you agree, we will continue. If not, I will stop. You can also change your mind at any time, even if we start the interview. If you have any questions about the study, you can ask me or call the School of Social Work at (telephone number 0911048250).

If you do not have any questions, would you be willing to participate in this interview?

Thank you.

Participant agrees \_\_\_\_\_

Participant refuses \_\_\_\_\_

Code of participant \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of the researcher \_\_\_\_\_



## Annex 2: Interview questions (Refugees)

1. Please introduce yourself?
2. When did you come to Addis Ababa? How long have you stayed in a refugee camp (which one?)
3. What's your occupation?
4. What is your source of income?
5. How much do you get each month, and on average how much do you spend? What are your major expenditures?
6. How do you describe your relationship with (Your Sponsors, Fellow refugees in the city Refugees in the camp & Surrounding community)
7. How do you describe your access to social services (Health, Education, etc)
8. What's your housing condition like (rental, with Sponsors, living with someone else)?
9. What were the easiest and hardest parts of integrating with the society for you?
10. How is your relationship with the host community as well as fellow refugees?
11. Can you refer to an experience that you had related with integrating with the host community?
12. What do you think of the Out of Camp approach? How has it changed your life? (If it did)?

### Annex 3: Interview Questions (For key informants other than Refugees)

1. How do you see the Out of Camp Scheme?
2. Do you think that it has changed livelihoods of Refugees? In what way has it impacted them?
3. What are the difficulties of implementing the scheme?
4. Have you witnessed struggles of refugees while integrating with the host community?
5. What are the strong attributes of this scheme?
6. Do you see any implementation gaps or factors that the scheme should include?

#### Annex 4: Focus Group Discussion Guide

1. How do you see the Out of Camp Scheme?
2. Can you give a comparison of camp life and now? What are the major changes in your livelihood?
3. How do you evaluate being under the out of camp scheme (positive impacts and negative side)?
4. How was the integration process with the host community? (initially and now)
5. How do you characterize your relationship with the host community and other fellow urban refugees?
6. How do you describe your access to basic social services provided back in camp Vs now?
7. What are the strong attributes of this scheme?
8. Do you see any implementation gaps or factors that the scheme should include?

Annex 5: Interview questions (Refugees)-Amharic የቃለመጠይቅ መምሪያ

1. ራሶትን ያስተዋውቁን?
2. መቼ ወደ አዲስ አበባ መጡ፣ ካዛ በፊት በካፕ ምን ህል ጌዜ ቆዩ? የትኛው ካምፕ ነው የቆዩት?
3. ስራዎት ምንድን ነው?
4. የገቢ ምንጭዎት ምንድን ነው?
5. በወር ምን ያህል ገቢ የገኛሉ? በአማካይ ወጪዎትስ ምን ያል ይሆናል? ምን ዋና እና ቋሚ ወጪዎች አሉቦት?
6. ከስፖንሰሮች ጋር ያለዎት ግንኙነት ምን ይመስላል? በምን መለኮስ ስፖንሰሮች ይደግፎታል?
7. ምን አይነት የማህበራዊ አገልግሎቶች ያገኛሉ? አገልግሎቱን እንዴት ይገልጻሉ?
8. የቤት ሁኔታዎትን እንዴት ይገልጹታል? (ኪራይ፣ ከስፖንሰር ጋር፣ ከሌላ ሰው ጋር)
9. ከማህበረሰብ ጋር በመቀላቀል ላይ የገጠሞትን ይግለጹልን?
10. ከማህበረሰብ ጋር ያሉትን ግንኙነት እንዴት ይገልጹታል? ከሌሎች ስደተኞችስ ጋር?
11. በአጠቃላይ ሰለ ከካምፕ ውጪ የሚኖሩ ስደተኞች ምን ያስባሉ?

Annex 6: Interview Questions (For key informants other than Refugees) የቃለመጠይቅ መምሪያ

ለቁልፍ ተጠያቂዎች

1. የከተማ ስደተኞችን አሰራር እንዴት ያዩታል?
2. ይህ ፖሊሲ የስደተኞችን ኑሮ በምን መልኩ ቀይሮታል ብለው ያስባሉ?
3. ፖሊሲውን ለመተግበር ምን አስቸጋሪ ነገሮች አሉ?
4. ስደተኞችን ከማህበረሰቡ ጋር የላቸውን ግንኙነት እንዴት ይገልጹታል?
5. ይህ ፖሊሲ ምን ጠንካራ ጎኖች አሉት; መሻሻልን የሚገባው?
6. የአሰራር ክፍተቶች አሉ ብለው ያስባሉ; ካሉ ይግለጹልን?

Annex 7: Focus Group Discussion Guide: የቡድን ውይይት መመሪያ

1. የከተማ ስደተኞችን አሰራር እንዴት ያዩታል?
2. በፖሊሲው መሰረት በአኗኗሮች ላይ ምን ለውጥ አይተዋል?
3. የአሰራሩን በጎ እና ጉድለት ያለባቸውን ጎኖች ቢነግሩን?
4. ከማህበረሰቡ ጋር ያሉትን ግንኙነት እንዴት ይገልጹታል (መጀመሪያ ላይና ትንሽ ከቆዩ በኋላ)?
5. ከሌሎች ስደተኞችስ ጋር ያለው ግንኙነት?
6. የምን አየነት ማህበራዊ አገልግሎቶች ተጠቃሚ ናት? አገልግሎቱንስ እንዴት ያዩታል?
9. በአሰራሩ ላይ ምን አይነት ነገሮች መካተት አለበት?

## **Declaration**

I, undersigned hereby declare that the work in this thesis is entirely my own, except where stated. Materials were gathered online database and printed texts and all work referenced is included in the reference list. No help was sought from an external professional agency and there was no use of other students' past work and has not been submitted for assessment at this or any other university.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

As a supervisor, I have approved this paper to be presented for defense.

Supervisor's name: Adamnesh Atenafu (Dr.)

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_