Factors associated with educational needs among Rohingya refugee children: evidence from UNHCR's multi-sectoral needs analysis

Harry J Wilson[1*]

[1] School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

[*] Corresponding author

Harry.J.Wilson@UNSWalumni.com

Abstract

Background

Approximately 1.2 million Rohingya refugees currently reside among the 33 refugee camps located in Cox's Bazar near the Bangladesh-Myanmar border where educational needs remain a critical humanitarian concern. This study aimed to estimate the prevalence of educational needs among Rohingya refugee children, elucidate predominant reasons for these needs, and identify characteristics associated with educational needs to inform targeted humanitarian relief efforts.

Methods

This study utilized participant data collected during the 2023 Joint Multi-Sectoral Needs Assessment - a representative cross-sectional household survey. Education age children within the sampled households were assigned a severity score categorized as either stressed, severe or extreme based on responses to questionnaire items that capture educational access, learning conditions, and protection factors. Multinomial logistic regression was used to examine factors associated with children in severe and extreme educational need.

Results

Among 8,408 education age children surveyed from 2,959 households, 29.6% of children were found to be in severe educational need and 10.1% of children were in extreme educational need. After adjustment for individual characteristics and household vulnerability factors, severe educational needs were associated with head of household age 45-59 (aRRR= 1.24 [95%CI: 1.00–1.53]), head of household age 60+ (aRRR= 1.39 [95%CI: 1.09–1.76]), female headed households (aRRR= 1.30 [95%CI: 1.09–1.54]), early education age boys (aRRR= 4.33 [95%CI: 3.44–5.46]), early education age girls (aRRR= 5.01 [95%CI: 3.88–6.46]), teenage boys (aRRR= 3.81 [95%CI: 3.18–4.57]), and teenage girls (aRRR= 16.07 [95%CI: 12.79–20.20]; $p<0.001$) relative to their primary school age counterparts, primary school age girls (aRRR= 0.75 [95%CI: 0.61–0.93]) relative to primary school

age boys, and teenage girls (aRRR= 3.18 [95%CI: 2.65–3.83]) relative to teenage boys. Post adjustment, factors associated with extreme educational needs included head of household age 18-24 (aRRR= 1.73 [95%CI: 1.09–2.74]), age 45-59 (aRRR= 1.57 [95%CI: 1.13–2.18]) and age 60+ (aRRR= 1.55 [95%CI: 1.07–2.25]), female headed households (aRRR= 1.58 [95%CI: 1.24–2.00]), early education age boys (aRRR= 3.44 [95%CI: 2.12–5.60]), early education age girls (aRRR= 2.44 [95%CI: 1.50–3.97]), teenage boys (aRRR= 6.82 [95%CI: 4.79–9.69]), teenage girls (aRRR= 34.60 [95%CI: 25.12–47.65]; p<0.001) relative to their primary school age counterparts, and teenage girls (aRRR= 5.86 [95%CI: 4.63–7.43]) relative to teenage boys.

Conclusion

Educational needs remain highly prevalent among Rohingya refugee children driven by structural deficiencies and further aggravated by household vulnerabilities. Over 20 projects led by local humanitarian authorities are currently providing targeted relief to those in educational need but are threatened by funding cuts that continue to jeopardize the educational rights of Rohingya refugees.

Keywords: Rohingya; Humanitarian Emergency; Refugee; Refugee Camps; Human Rights;

Introduction

Eight years on from the mass displacement events in late 2017, approximately 1.2 million Rohingya refugees are currently sheltering within 33 congested camps of Cox's Bazar near the Bangladesh-Myanmar border. Meeting the humanitarian needs of Rohingya refugees remains imperative for the international community but has met a critical juncture. While the human rights violations have worsened displacing an additional 150,000 people, the international attention to the protracted crisis has waned, and the global commitment to unequivocally affirm the rights of Rohingya refugees has withered [1-3]. The multifaceted challenges that confront Rohingya refugees are characterised by deteriorating humanitarian conditions, entrenched population vulnerabilities, aid dependencies, concurrent domestic needs to support host communities in Bangladesh and resurgent persecution in Myanmar that has dashed hopes of repatriation [1-5]. The timing of these intersecting factors occurs amid a backdrop of changing geopolitical landscapes and receding humanitarian budgets that has jeopardized the delivery of essential humanitarian relief services [4-8].

This study builds upon prior analysis investigating the sector-specific drivers and household determinants of humanitarian needs among Rohingya refugees surveyed during the 2023 Joint Multi-Sectoral Needs Assessment (J-MSNA). The 2023 J-MSNA marks the fifth annual needs analysis conducted by the Inter-Sector Coordination Group (ISCG) to strategically inform the humanitarian response plan. Prior findings highlighted the education sector as the predominant driver of extreme humanitarian needs. Preliminary analysis foreshadowed gendered effects that disproportionately impact young girls and raised serious child protection concerns that require more sensitive in-depth

sector-specific analysis. As such, this study aimed to estimate the prevalence of Rohingya refugee children experiencing educational needs, elucidate predominant reasons among children in need to inform sector-specific interventions and identify characteristics associated with educational needs to strengthen targeted relief efforts by local humanitarian authorities.

Methods

Study design, population and sampling strategy

This study draws upon anonymized participant data from the 2023 J-MSNA, a representative cross-sectional survey of Rohingya households within the 33 refugee camps of Cox's Bazar [9]. The primary data collection was conducted by the REACH Initiative in conjunction with sector-specific authorities and local enumerators. The dataset was accessed on the 27th of March 2025 under license approved by UNHCR. The study population included all Rohingya refugee households registered within the 33 camps of Cox's Bazar [10,11]. An exhaustive sampling frame of household addresses was compiled by camp authorities [10,11]. A total of 3,465 households were selected for data collection using a stratified (camp specific) simple random sampling technique [10,11]. The number of households selected for sampling at each camp were guided by a single proportion sample size calculation that derived the minimum number of households needed to ensure camp-specific results could be concluded with a minimum level of precision (10% margin of error) at a 95% confidence level [10,11]. The sample size was adjusted for the finite household population that were eligible for selection at each camp and inflated by an additional 10% to mitigate non-response [10,11]. Of the 3,465 households selected for sampling, a total sample size of 3,400 households (response rate exceeding 98%) were surveyed between August 27th and September 17th 2023 with complete data (without missing fields) pertaining to 18,172 household members.

Data collection

Data were collected through in-person household interviews administered by trained enumerators using a validated structured questionnaire that captured standardized humanitarian indicators and sector-specific items [10,11]. Gender-balanced field teams (comprising male and female interviewers) conducted interviews with an adult (age 18 or older) respondent of the same gender (self-identified) [10,11]. Responses were digitally recorded using the KoBo Collect application on mobile devices and routinely uploaded to a secure UNHCR server [10,11]. Raw participant data was cleaned according to the REACH Initiative's minimum standards protocol with a final de-identified dataset provided for statistical analysis [10,11]. Verbal informed consent was secured from all household respondents and formally recorded in the deidentified dataset. Respondents were informed of the survey's objectives, the voluntary nature of their participation, measures to protect response confidentiality and

prerogative to decline any question or discontinue the interview at any time. Enumerators were educated on the principles of participant safeguarding and trained to provide formal referral protocols upon discovery of urgent protection or health concerns.

Variables

The primary outcome was education severity score assigned to each education age child (age 3-18) based on responses to questionnaire items that capture the four dimensions of educational access, learning conditions, protection and aggravating circumstances. Education severity scores were assigned based on recommended criteria outlined in the global education cluster severity classification manual, Joint Intersectoral Analysis Framework (JIAF) and Multi-Sectoral Needs Index [10,12,13]. Severity was scored according to the JIAF five-point intersectoral severity classification scale ranging from minimal (score=1) to catastrophic (score=5). The five-point scale was adapted to a three-point scale in line with the J-MSNA due to the absence of formal education services required to assign the minimal severity score and participant/household level data rather than response level data required to infer catastrophic sectoral collapse (score=5). The adapted three-point scale categorised each child's education severity score as either stressed (score=2), severe (score=3) or extreme (score=4). Stressed (score=2) was defined as accessing non-formal education in a protected environment offering acceptable learning conditions. Severe (score=3) was classified as either not accessing education due to non-aggravating circumstances, or accessing non-formal education in a protected environment but experiencing poor learning conditions or minor safety issues that do not present an immediate threat to the child's wellbeing. Extreme (score=4) was defined as either not accessing education services due to aggravating circumstances, or attending an unprotected learning environment due to serious safety issues that endangers the child's well-being. Aggravating circumstances correspond to the most severe accessibility barriers such as marriage or pregnancy, child paid and unpaid labour to support the household instead of attending school, recruitment by armed groups, discrimination and safety threats whilst travelling to or at school [10,13]. Unprotected learning environment included armed group recruitment, school attacks, gender based or sexual violence, and discrimination based on the child's ethnic, gender or religious identity [12,13]. The underlying reason for each child's education severity score were utilised as secondary outcomes to evaluate predominate drivers of educational needs.

Individual characteristics of education age children and household vulnerability factors evaluated for association with educational needs were identified from previous J-MSNA research, Refugee Influx Emergency Vulnerability Assessments (REVA), and funding impact analysis conducted by the World Food Programme [6,7,14,15]. Age groups were assigned according to previous camp levels findings and appropriate cutoff points identified from trends observed over increasing age [16]. Subgroups among education age children (age 3-18) included early education age children (age 3-4), primary school age children (age 5-11) and teenage children (age 12-18). Head of household age was

categorized into 10-year age groups. Marital status was collapsed into a binary variable that included married and single participants (no partner/separated/divorced/widowed) due to limited observations. Head of household disability status was classified as a binary variable corresponding to participants citing either “a lot of difficulty” or “cannot do it at all” to any of the six functional domains as per the Washington Group Short Set (WG-SS) guidelines [18]. Monthly household income per capita (household members) was categorized according to quartiles and utilized to investigate associations with financial vulnerability.

Statistical analysis

All results were computed using Stata version 19.5 survey functions that accounted for the stratified sampling design, adjusted for the clustering of education age children within the same household and controlled for differential probability of household selection between the camps (strata) using survey weights computed as the inverse probability of selection [17].

Descriptive statistics were used to analyse demographic characteristics of sampled households and education age children. Weighted frequencies and percentages were reported for categorical variables. Median and interquartile range (IQR) or mean and standard deviation (SD) were reported for continuous variables depending on symmetry. Prevalence estimates regarding the proportion of children and households experiencing educational needs were reported as weighted percentages with 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs) for precision.

Education severity scores and their attributable reasons were disaggregated by age and gender. The distribution of severity scores and reported reasons were assessed over increasing age and by gender to assess linear trends. Multinomial bivariate and multivariate logistic regression analysis was conducted to investigate individual characteristics and household factors associated with severe and extreme educational need. Unadjusted relative risk ratios (RRR) and adjusted relative risk ratios (aRRR) were reported for bivariate and multivariate estimates respectively. A threshold value of $p \leq 0.05$ was used to conclude statistical significance and 95% CIs were reported for precision using design-adjusted standard errors computed via Taylor series linearization.

Potential effect modification was considered between head of household gender and marital status to investigate concentrated effects among single female headed households. Two-way age and gender interactions among education age children (age-gender and gender-age) were investigated using both stratified analysis and interaction terms. Gender-age interactions were investigated using stratified (by gender) analysis reporting the relative risk associated with age groups among boys and among girls. Age-gender interactions were investigated using interaction terms to evaluate the relative risk associated with girls relative to boys within the same age group. Pairwise correlation and variance inflation factor (VIF) analysis were conducted to evaluate potential problematic multicollinearity.

Results

Participant characteristics

Among the 3,400 total households sampled, 441 households did not contain education age children (age 3-18) and were excluded from subsequent analysis (Table 1). A total of 8,408 education age children were surveyed from the remaining 2,959 households across the 33 camps. The number of households without education age children (n=441) did not significantly differ between the camps (p >0.05). The proportional contribution of each camp to the overall sample showed minimal variation (mean change= +0.5%; range: -12.6% to +8.7%) before (N=3,400) and after (N=2,959) the exclusion of households without education age children. The number of households and education age children sampled per camp was approximately normally distributed with a mean of 90 households (SD= 35; Table 1) and 255 education age children (SD= 95; Table 1) respectively. The median head of household age was 39 years (IQR: 30 – 50; Table 1) and the majority of households were male headed (79.8%; Table 1). Approximately half of surveyed children were aged between 5-11 years (47.4%; Table 1) and the proportion of boys sampled (50.3%; Table 1) was slightly higher than the proportion of girls (49.7%; Table 1). Less than two-thirds of education age children were enrolled and regularly attending informal education within the camps (60.3%; Table 1). The prevalence of children in educational need was 39.7% (95% CI: 38.4% – 41.0%) and almost two-thirds of households contained at least one child in educational need (65.7% [95% CI: 63.8% – 67.5%]).

Table 1. Characteristics of sampled households (N= 2,959) and education age children (N= 8,408)

	Summary*
Households per Camp, Mean (N= 2,959)	90 (SD: 35)
Education Age Children per Camp, Mean (N= 8,408)	255 (SD: 95)
Head of Household Age, Median (N= 2,959)	39 [IQR: 30 – 50]
18-29	688 (23.2%)
30-49	1414 (47.8%)
50+	857 (29.0%)
Head of Household Gender (N= 2,959)	
Male	2361 (79.8%)
Female	598 (20.2%)
Education Age Children per Household, Median (N= 2,959)	3 [IQR: 2 – 4]
1-2	1465 (49.5%)
3-5	1284 (43.4%)
6-9	210 (7.1%)
Age, median (N= 8,408)	10 [IQR: 6 – 14]
3-4	1,165 (13.9%)
5-11	3,985 (47.4%)
12-18	3,258 (38.7%)
Gender (N= 8,408)	
Boys	4233 (50.3%)
Girls	4175 (49.7%)
Education Sector Severity (N= 8,408)	
Stressed (Severity Score=2) [a]	5070 (60.3%)

Severe (Severity Score=3) [b]	2488 (29.6%)
Extreme (Severity Score=4) [c]	850 (10.1%)
Prevalence of Educational Need	
Children in Educational Need (N= 8,408) [d]	39.7% [95% CI: 38.4% – 41.0%]
Households in Educational Need (N= 2,959) [e]	65.7% [95% CI: 63.8% – 67.5%]

* Estimates are relative to either the total number of sampled households with education age children (N= 2,959) or the total number of education age children surveyed within the households (N= 8,408). Summary statistics are weighted frequency and weighted percentages for categorical variables, weighted median (IQR) for asymmetrically distributed continuous variables, weighted mean (SD) for symmetrical continuous variables, or weighted population prevalence (%) and 95% CIs for outcome variables.

[a] Stressed was defined as accessing non-formal education in a protected environment offering acceptable learning conditions [10,12,13].

[b] Severe was defined as either not accessing education due to non-aggravating circumstances, or accessing non-formal education in a protected environment but under poor learning conditions or minor safety issues that do not present an immediate threat to the child's wellbeing [10,12,13].

[c] Extreme was defined as either not accessing education due to aggravating circumstances, or attending an unprotected learning environment due to serious safety issues that endangers the child's well-being [10,12,13].

[d] Children in educational need was classified as severe or extreme education severity scores (severity score=3+) as per MSNI [10]. Children in education need defined as per JIAF and education cluster guidelines - Education age children in the areas affected by crisis who do not have access to protective education and acceptable learning conditions, which can negatively impact (i) their physical and psychosocial wellbeing, (ii) cognitive development, and (iii) their ability to meet their future needs [12,13].

[e] Households in educational need categorised as households with at least one child in educational need as per MSNI [10].

Educational Needs by Age and Gender

Approximately half (54.3%; Figure 1A) of early education age children (3-4 years) were enrolled and regularly attending informal education with similar results observed among boys (52.4%) and girls (56.1%). An additional 40.4% were found to be in severe educational need mostly attributable to "unable to register or enrol" (26.5%; Figure 1B), "too young" (5.3%; Figure 1B) and "education is not a priority" (3.3%; Figure 1B). A further 5.3% of early education age children were experiencing extreme educational need predominantly due to "protection risks while commuting to school" (4.3%; Figure 1B).

Most primary school age children (5-11) were enrolled and regularly attending informal education (83.3%; Figure 1A) with similar results observed between boys (81.8%; Figure 1A) and girls (84.9%; Figure 1A). An estimated 13.9% of primary school age children (5-11) were in severe educational need predominantly attributable to "attending madrasa instead" (4.9%; Figure 1B), especially among boys (7.4%; Figure 1B) compared to girls (2.3%; Figure 1B). A relatively small proportion of primary school age children (5-11) were found to be in extreme educational need (2.8%; Figure 1A). Only a third (34.4%; Figure 1A) of teenage children age 12-18 were enrolled and regularly attending informal education with significant heterogeneity observed between boys (49.1%; Figure 1A) and girls (20.1%; Figure 1A). Most teenage children were experiencing severe educational needs (44.9%; Figure 1A) with greater prevalence observed among teenage girls (50.6%; Figure 1A) compared to boys (38.9%; Figure 1A).

Figure 1A. Education severity scores among education age children by age group and gender.



[a] Stressed was defined as accessing non-formal education in a protected environment offering acceptable learning conditions [10,12,13].
[b] Severe was defined as either not accessing education due to non-aggravating circumstances, or accessing non-formal education in a protected environment but under poor learning conditions or minor safety issues that do not present an immediate threat to the child's wellbeing [10,12,13].
[c] Extreme was defined as either not accessing education due to aggravating circumstances, or attending an unprotected learning environment due to serious safety issues that endangers the child's well-being [10,12,13].

Figure 1B. Attributable reason for education severity scores among education age children by age group and gender.



[a] Stressed was defined as accessing non-formal education in a protected environment offering acceptable learning conditions [10,12,13].

[b] Severe was defined as either not accessing education due to non-aggravating circumstances, or accessing non-formal education in a protected environment but under poor learning conditions or minor safety issues that do not present an immediate threat to the child's wellbeing [10,12,13].

[c] Extreme was defined as either not accessing education due to aggravating circumstances, or attending an unprotected learning environment due to serious safety issues that endangers the child's well-being [10,12,13].

[d] Rarely reported severe reasons (<1%) observed among all cohorts were recoded as "other" rather than individually categorised for visual clarity. "Other" includes the following reasons and percentages:

Children Age 3-4: Lack of Schools (0.3%), Language Issues (1.3%), Decline/Do not Know (0.6%)
Boys Age 3-4: Lack of Schools (0.2%), Language Issues (1.5%), Decline/Do not Know (0.7%)
Girls Age 3-4: Lack of Schools (0.4%), Language Issues (1.2%), Decline/Do not Know (0.4%)
Children Age 5-11: Illness (0.1%), Lack of Schools (0.2%), Decline/Do not Know (0.5%)
Boys Age 5-11: Cannot Afford Education Costs (0.1%), Illness (0.1%), Lack of Schools (0.1%), Decline/Do not Know (0.5%)
Girls Age 5-11: Illness (0.1%), Lack of Schools (0.4%), Decline/Do not Know (0.4%)
Children Age 12-18: Cannot Afford Education Costs (0.2%), Child Uninterested (0.3%), Home Based Learning (0.4%), Inadequate Curriculum (0.2%), Decline/Do not Know (2.4%)
Boys Age 12-18: Cannot Afford Education Costs (0.3%), Child Uninterested (0.5%), Home Based Learning (0.7%), Inadequate Curriculum (0.1%), Decline/Do not Know (1.8%)
Girls Age 12-18: Cannot Afford Education Costs (0.1%), Child Uninterested (0.1%), Home Based Learning (0.1%), Illness (0.1%), Inadequate Curriculum (0.2%), Decline/Do not Know (3.0%)

The analysis of education severity scores over age and by gender illustrated that boys and girls were largely coupled between ages 3-11 (Figure 2A). An inverse proportional relationship was also evident between stressed and severe education severity scores with a steady proportion of children age 3-11 experiencing extreme educational needs. A sharp decline in the proportion of children enrolled and regularly attending school was observed over age 12-18. Gendered disparities regarding severe and extreme educational needs emerged between ages 11-12 (Figure 2A). A rapid proliferation of severe educational needs was observed among adolescent girls age 12-15 (Figure 2A), predominantly attributable to “education is not a priority” (Figure 2B) and “inadequate male-female separation” (Figure 2B). A linear trend between extreme educational needs and increasing age was evident among girls age 11-18 (Figure 2A). The increasing trend in the proportion of girls age 11-15 experiencing extreme educational need was mostly attributable to “child helping at home instead” (Figure 2B), or not attending due to “protection risks while commuting to school” (Figure 2B). In contrast, the continuous rise in extreme educational needs among girls age 16-18 was primarily due to “marriage or pregnancy” (Figure 2B). Educational needs among boys remained relatively constant between age 12-15 then increased between 16-18 predominantly attributable to “education is not a priority” (Figure 2B) and “child helping at home instead” (Figure 2B).

Figure 2A. Education severity scores over increasing age (3-18) and by gender (children, boys, girls).



Figure 2B. Reported reason for educational needs over increasing age (3-18) and by gender (children, boys, girls).



Household characteristics associated with Educational Needs

In unadjusted analysis, severe and extreme educational needs were associated with all head of household age groups relative to those age 25-34, female headed households, early education age boys and teenage boys relative to primary school age boys, early education age girls and teenage girls

relative to primary school age girls, early education age girls relative to early education age boys, and teenage girls relative to teenage boys.

After adjustment in multivariable analysis, severe educational needs were associated with head of household age 45-59 (aRRR= 1.24 [95%CI: 1.00–1.53]), head of household age 60+ (aRRR= 1.39 [95%CI: 1.09–1.76]), female headed households (aRRR= 1.30 [95%CI: 1.09–1.54]), early education age boys (aRRR= 4.33 [95%CI: 3.44–5.46]) and teenage boys (aRRR= 3.81 [95%CI: 3.18–4.57]) relative to primary school age boys, early education age girls (aRRR= 5.01 [95%CI: 3.88–6.46]) and teenage girls (aRRR= 16.07 [95%CI: 12.79–20.20]; $p<0.001$) relative to primary school age girls, primary school age girls (aRRR= 0.75 [95%CI: 0.61–0.93]) relative to primary school age boys, and teenage girls (aRRR= 3.18 [95%CI: 2.65–3.83]) relative to teenage boys.

Post adjustment, extreme educational needs were associated with head of household age 18-24 (aRRR= 1.73 [95%CI: 1.09–2.74]), age 45-59 (aRRR= 1.57 [95%CI: 1.13–2.18]) and age 60+ (aRRR= 1.55 [95%CI: 1.07–2.25]), female headed households (aRRR= 1.58 [95%CI: 1.24–2.00]), early education age boys (aRRR= 3.44 [95%CI: 2.12–5.60]) and teenage boys (aRRR= 6.82 [95%CI: 4.79–9.69]) relative to primary school age boys, early education age girls (aRRR= 2.44 [95%CI: 1.50–3.97]) and teenage girls (aRRR= 34.60 [95%CI: 25.12–47.65]; $p<0.001$) relative to primary school age girls, and teenage girls (aRRR= 5.86 [95%CI: 4.63–7.43]) relative to teenage boys.

The multivariate model indicated adequate fit over a null model ($p<0.001$) and no evidence of problematic multicollinearity was observed. All pairwise correlations between independent variables were below 0.7 and the mean VIF was 1.5 with no extreme outliers (VIFmax <10). No statistically significant effect modification was present between female headed households and marital status with main effects reported in consequence.

Table 2. Individual factors and household characteristics associated with severe and extreme educational needs

	Severe Educational Needs				Extreme Educational Needs			
	Unadjusted		Adjusted		Unadjusted		Adjusted	
	RRR (95%CI)	p-value	aRRR (95%CI)	p-value	RRR (95%CI)	p-value	aRRR (95%CI)	p-value
Head of Household Age								
25-34	1.00	–	1.00	–	1.00	–	1.00	–
18-24	**1.75 (1.27–2.39)**	**0.001***	0.95 (0.69–1.31)	0.752	**3.42 (2.20–5.31)**	**<0.001***	**1.73 (1.09–2.74)**	**0.020***
35-44	**1.30 (1.10–1.54)**	**0.002***	0.98 (0.81–1.19)	0.855	**1.80 (1.33–2.44)**	**<0.001***	0.91 (0.64–1.28)	0.585
45-59	**2.12 (1.79–2.52)**	**<0.001***	**1.24 (1.00–1.53)**	**0.047***	**4.46 (3.34–5.95)**	**<0.001***	**1.57 (1.13–2.18)**	**0.007***
60+	**2.69 (2.19–3.30)**	**<0.001***	**1.39 (1.09–1.76)**	**0.007***	**5.00 (3.60–6.95)**	**<0.001***	**1.55 (1.07–2.25)**	**0.020***
Head of Household Gender								
Male	1.00	–	1.00	–	1.00	–	1.00	–
Female	**1.37 (1.18–1.60)**	**<0.001***	**1.30 (1.09–1.54)**	**0.003***	**1.80 (1.45–2.23)**	**<0.001***	**1.58 (1.24–2.00)**	**<0.001***
Female: Married [a]	1.00	–	1.00	–	1.00	–	1.00	–
Female: Single/Divorced/Widowed [a]	1.26 (0.95–1.66)	0.104	1.10 (0.81–1.50)	0.549	1.08 (0.74–1.57)	0.699	0.90 (0.60–1.37)	0.634
Head of Household Disability Status								
No Disability	1.00	–	1.00	–	1.00	–	1.00	–
Living with a Disability [b]	1.16 (0.98–1.36)	0.076	1.05 (0.87–1.26)	0.622	1.26 (0.99–1.60)	0.056	1.05 (0.79–1.38)	0.757
Household Income [c]								
1st Quartile	1.00	–	1.00	–	1.00	–	1.00	–
2nd Quartile	1.03 (0.87–1.22)	0.732	1.11 (0.92–1.34)	0.266	0.93 (0.73–1.19)	0.574	1.08 (0.83–1.41)	0.576
3rd Quartile	0.94 (0.79–1.12)	0.508	0.98 (0.81–1.19)	0.852	0.81 (0.63–1.05)	0.106	0.91 (0.68–1.21)	0.509
4th Quartile	1.14 (0.94–1.38)	0.173	1.19 (0.96–1.47)	0.112	0.99 (0.77–1.28)	0.968	1.09 (0.82–1.45)	0.536
Boys: Age Group								
Boys: Age 5-11	1.00	–	1.00	–	1.00	–	1.00	–
Boys: Age 3-4	**4.20 (3.35–5.26)**	**<0.001***	**4.33 (3.44–5.46)**	**<0.001***	**3.44 (2.13–5.55)**	**<0.001***	**3.44 (2.12–5.60)**	**<0.001***
Boys: Age 12-18	**4.16 (3.49–4.95)**	**<0.001***	**3.81 (3.18–4.57)**	**<0.001***	**7.79 (5.52–11.00)**	**<0.001***	**6.82 (4.79–9.69)**	**<0.001***
Girls: Age Group								
Girls: Age 5-11	1.00	–	1.00	–	1.00	–	1.00	–
Girls: Age: 3-4	**4.86 (3.78–6.24)**	**<0.001***	**5.01 (3.88–6.46)**	**<0.001***	**2.49 (1.55–4.00)**	**<0.001***	**2.44 (1.50–3.97)**	**<0.001***
Girls: Age 12-18	**17.66 (14.16–22.03)**	**<0.001***	**16.07 (12.79–20.20)**	**<0.001***	**41.28 (29.85–57.08)**	**<0.001***	**34.60 (25.12–47.65)**	**<0.001***
Age 3-4: Gender								
Age 3-4: Boys	1.00	–	1.00	–	1.00	–	1.00	–
Age 3-4: Girls	0.87 (0.67–1.12)	0.269	0.87 (0.67–1.12)	0.291	0.81 (0.47–1.42)	0.467	0.82 (0.47–1.43)	0.486
Age 5-11: Gender								
Age 5-11: Boys	1.00	–	1.00	–	1.00	–	1.00	–
Age 5-11: Girls	**0.75 (0.61–0.93)**	**0.008***	**0.75 (0.61–0.93)**	**0.010***	1.13 (0.77–1.65)	0.545	1.16 (0.79–1.70)	0.463
Age 12-18: Gender								
Age 12-18: Boys	1.00	–	1.00	–	1.00	–	1.00	–
Age 12-18: Girls	**3.19 (2.65–3.84)**	**<0.001***	**3.18 (2.65–3.83)**	**<0.001***	**5.96 (4.70–7.56)**	**<0.001***	**5.86 (4.63–7.43)**	**<0.001***

* Statistically significant at $p \leq 0.05$ and emboldened.

[a] Estimates from a duplicate model with interaction terms applied to investigate effect modification among single/divorced/widowed female headed households relative to married female headed households. Note that estimates reported for female headed households represent the main effects among all female headed households rather than the subgroup of married female headed households. These additional estimates have been reported to evidence the absence of statistically significant effect modification between female headed households and marital status. All multivariable estimates were adjusted for main effects only.

[b] Disability classified as per Washington Group Short Set (WG-SS) guidelines: Respondent cited “a lot of difficulty” or “cannot do it at all” to any of the six functional domains (seeing, hearing, walking or climbing stairs, remembering or concentrating, self-care, and communication) [18].

[c] Monthly household income per capita.

Discussion

The demographic characteristics of households with education age children closely mirror the characteristics of all sampled households previously analysed [19]. Prior findings demonstrated the strong concordance between all households sampled during the 2023 J-MSNA and the population characteristics from UNHCR's database of registered Rohingya refugees [19]. The insignificant difference between the number of households without education age children excluded across the 33 refugee camps (n=441), retention of the demographic profile observed among all sampled households, and the demographic profile's close alignment with the population characteristics of all Rohingya refugees registered in UNHCR's database strongly support the representativeness of sampled participants and hence generalisability of our results [19].

Notwithstanding extensive humanitarian relief efforts delivered by local authorities, the findings highlight that almost two-thirds of households (65.7% [95% CI: 63.8% – 67.5%]; Table 1) and 2-in-every-5 children age 3-18 were in educational need (39.7% [95% CI: 38.4% – 41.0%]; Table 1). Disaggregation by age group illustrated the higher prevalence of educational needs among early education age children (age 3-4) and teenage children (age 12-18). Further disaggregation by gender evidenced the similarities among boys and girls between ages 3-11, followed by the rapid divergence of educational needs between ages 12-18. These coupled-decoupled age-gender dynamics are best illustrated by the distribution of educational needs and their attributable reasons over increasing age. Additionally, the age-gender and gender-age dynamics are further reinforced by the logistic regression results that demonstrated that educational needs were significantly associated with age groups among girls, age groups among boys, and girls relative to boys within the same age group. The predominant reasons for educational needs by gender and over increasing age vividly illustrate the gendered dimension that emerges among teenage children to drive the widening disparity observed between teenage boys and teenage girls over increasing age.

The associations observed between educational needs and the age-gender characteristics of education age children persisted with limited attenuation after adjustment for common household vulnerability factors. These findings suggest the predominant role of structural factors and systemic issues within the education sector rather than primarily influenced by household vulnerability factors. These quantitative results align with previous sector-specific analysis that highlight the limited learning opportunities for teenage girls and lack of reintegration support for out-of-school teenagers transitioning from at-home to face-to-face learning as COVID-19 restrictions subsided [5,14,20,21]. In contrast, the elevated risk associated with female headed households, young adult (18-24) headed households and elderly (age 45+) headed households draw focus towards the survival pressures that provoke households to deprioritise their children's education. These pressures are reinforced by the underlying reasons attributed to education severity scores and their gendered impacts that are highly concentrated among teenage girls. The trends regarding deprioritization and educational needs

highlight the intersections between the education sector and the broader survival pressures within the camps that provoke households to adopt negative livelihood coping strategies. In addition, the rising prevalence of childhood marriage and early pregnancy reveals the inextricable links between deteriorating educational needs and serious child protection issues that demand prompt remediation efforts.

Limitations

The findings should be interpreted within the context of multiple strengths and limitations. Selection bias was minimised through stratified simple random sampling of households within each camp. Sampling bias was mitigated through the use of survey weights that adjusted for the disproportionate probability of households selected for sampling between the 33 camps. The face-to-face interviews conducted by gender-balanced enumerator teams prevented the sampling bias observed during previous J-MSNA iterations conducted during COVID-19 restrictions that collected data through phone interviews and led to an overrepresentation of male respondents with higher rates of phone ownership. However, the findings are predominantly limited by the use of self-reported data collected from proxy respondents on behalf of the household that may consequentially introduce measurement bias and undermine the accuracy of the results.

Implications for Practice

More than 20 projects are currently providing relief to Rohingya refugee children in educational need led by humanitarian agencies, international authorities and non-government organisations [5]. These projects include school feeding programs for disadvantaged students, reuptake programs for out-of-school children, accelerated learning programs for students who are at risk of falling further behind and restructuring of learning centres to provide female-only classrooms that redress sociocultural barriers among teenage girls [2,8]. The continuity of these projects are critical to affirm the right to education among Rohingya refugee children yet remain desperately underfunded at just 15% of their stated requirements [22]. The detrimental impacts of funding cuts among the shock-prone education sector are vividly evident having forced the closure of 43% of learning facilities that denied access to education for approximately 200,000 Rohingya children [23,24]. Rapid restructuring efforts in conjunction with community adaptation have secured the gradual recovery of the education sector. However, these gains remain fragile and unable to deliver the sustained relief that the protracted crisis and their multidimensional complexities demand.

Conclusion

Educational needs remain highly prevalent among Rohingya refugee children in Cox's Bazar. Approximately a third of children age 3-18 were found to be in severe educational need and one in ten were experiencing extreme educational need. The findings reveal pronounced age-gender dynamics with teenage girls experiencing dramatically elevated educational needs driven by intersecting structural challenges, survival pressures, sociocultural barriers and child safety threats that continue to jeopardize the wellbeing of vulnerable children. Addressing the educational needs of Rohingya refugee children remains imperative to heal the gendered harms and generational impacts of the protracted crisis. Ameliorating the scale of children in educational need, their complexities and intersectoral dependencies requires not only intensive but sustained humanitarian efforts that remain undeliverable within the confines of receding financial support from the international community that continues to jeopardize the rights of the world's largest stateless population.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to formally acknowledge those whose collective efforts have made this research article possible. Specifically, the Inter-Sector Coordination Group (ISCG), UNHCR, IOM, ECHO, the REACH Initiative, enumerators, other study personnel, and household respondents who graciously donated their time.

References

1. United Nations General Assembly. Situation of human rights of Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar: report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. 2025. Available from: https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/4092194/files/A_HRC_60_20-EN.pdf.
2. Inter-Sector Coordination Group (ISCG). Bangladesh: Rohingya Refugee Response - Flash Appeal for 150,000 New Arrivals (June - December 2025). 2025. Available from: https://reliefweb.int/report/bangladesh/bangladesh-rohingya-refugee-response-flash-appeal-150000-new-arrivals-june-december-2025.
3. United Nations Human Rights Council. Situation of human rights of Rohingya Muslims and other minorities in Myanmar. 2025. Available from: https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/4084836.
4. Médecins Sans Frontières. The illusion of choice: Rohingya voices echo from the camps. 2025. Available from: https://reliefweb.int/report/bangladesh/illusion-choice-rohingya-voices-echo-camps.
5. Inter-Sector Coordination Group (ISCG). Bangladesh: Rohingya Humanitarian Crisis Joint Response Plan January 2025 - December 2026. 2025. Available from: https://reliefweb.int/report/bangladesh/bangladesh-rohingya-humanitarian-crisis-joint-response-plan-january-2025-december-2026.
6. World Food Programme (WFP). Impact of Cuts - Bangladesh: Outcome of 2023 pilot study: Impact of funding shortfalls on beneficiaries. 2024. Available from: https://reliefweb.int/report/bangladesh/impact-cuts-bangladesh-outcome-2023-pilot-study-impact-funding-shortfalls-beneficiaries-august-2024.
7. The World Bank, World Food Programme (WFP). Impact of Food Ration Cuts on the Displaced Rohingya Population in Cox's Bazar. 2024. Available from: https://reliefweb.int/report/bangladesh/bangladesh-impact-food-ration-cuts-displaced-rohingya-population-coxs-bazar-may-2024.
8. Inter-Sector Coordination Group (ISCG). Rohingya Refugee Response Urgent priorities: Addressing the Most Pressing Needs of the Joint Response Plan. 2025. Available from:

https://reliefweb.int/report/bangladesh/bangladesh-rohingya-refugee-response-urgent-priorities-addressing-most-pressing-needs-joint-response-plan-june-december-2025.

9. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), International Organization for Migration (IOM), Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO). Bangladesh: Joint Multi Sector Needs Assessment: Cox's Bazar, Rohingya Refugee Response – 2023, Refugees. 2023. Available from: https://microdata.unhcr.org/index.php/catalog/1128.
10. REACH. Bangladesh J-MSNA - MSNI Methodological Overview. 2023 [cited 2025 Apr 4]. Available from: https://repository.impact-initiatives.org/document/impact/474ac9e5/BGD2301_2023-J-MSNA_-MSNI-Methodological-overview_Jan-2024.pdf.
11. REACH. Research Terms of Reference: Joint Multi-Sector Needs Assessment MSNA 2023, Bangladesh. 2023 [cited 2025 Apr 4]. Available from: https://reliefweb.int/report/bangladesh/research-terms-reference-joint-multi-sector-needs-assessment-msna-2023-bgd2301-bangladesh-august-2023-v-1.
12. United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA). Joint and Intersectoral Analysis Framework (JIAF) 2 Technical Manual. 2024. Available from: https://reliefweb.int/report/world/joint-and-intersectoral-analysis-framework-jiaf-2-technical-manual-july-2024.
13. Global Education Cluster. Calculating Education Cluster People in Need (PiN). 2024. Available from: https://www.educationcluster.net/calculating-people-need.
14. Inter-Sector Coordination Group (ISCG). Joint Multi-Sector Needs Assessment (J-MSNA): Bangladesh Rohingya Refugees - December 2021. 2022. Available from: https://reliefweb.int/report/bangladesh/joint-multi-sector-needs-assessment-j-msna-bangladesh-rohingya-refugees-december-2021.
15. World Food Programme (WFP). Bangladesh: Refugee Influx Emergency Vulnerability Assessment (REVA-8) Report, June 2025. 2025. Available from: https://reliefweb.int/report/bangladesh/bangladesh-refugee-influx-emergency-vulnerability-assessment-reva-8-report-june-2025.
16. Inter-Sector Coordination Group (ISCG). Joint Multi-Sector Needs Assessments (J-MSNA) Factsheet - Refugee Camp-level findings - December. 2023. Available from: https://reliefweb.int/report/bangladesh/bangladesh-joint-multi-sector-needs-assessment-j-msna-camp-level-findings-december-2023.
17. StataCorp. Survey Data Reference Manual. 2025. Available from: https://www.stata.com/bookstore/survey-data-reference-manual/.
18. The Washington Group on Disability Statistics. The Washington Group Short Set on Functioning (WG-SS). 2022 [cited 2025 Apr 4]. Available from: https://www.washingtongroup-disability.com/question-sets/wg-short-set-on-functioning-wg-ss/.
19. Wilson HJ. Drivers and determinants of extreme humanitarian needs among Rohingya refugee households: Evidence from UNHCR's multi-sectoral needs analysis. PLOS ONE. 2025;20(12):e0331727. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0331727.
20. REACH. Assessment of the Education Sector response to the Rohingya crisis - Rohingya refugee response. 2021. Available from: https://reliefweb.int/report/bangladesh/bangladesh-assessment-education-sector-response-rohingya-crisis-rohingya-refugee.
21. Cox's Bazar Education Sector. Joint Education Needs Assessment: Rohingya Refugee in Cox's Bazar - June 2018. 2018. Available from: https://reliefweb.int/report/bangladesh/joint-education-needs-assessment-rohingya-refugee-cox-s-bazar-june-2018.
22. Inter-Sector Coordination Group (ISCG). Bangladesh: Rohingya Humanitarian Crisis Joint Response Plan 2025-26 funding update as of 31 October 2025. 2025. Available from: https://reliefweb.int/report/bangladesh/bangladesh-rohingya-humanitarian-crisis-joint-response-plan-2025-26-funding-update-31-october-2025.
23. United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). Global Humanitarian Overview 2026: Rohingya Joint Response Plan (JRP). 2026 [cited 2026 Jan 8]. Available from:

https://humanitarianaction.info/document/global-humanitarian-overview-2026/article/rohingya-joint-response-plan-jrp-1.

24. United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). Humanitarian Action for Children 2026 - Bangladesh. 2026. Available from: http://reliefweb.int/report/bangladesh/humanitarian-action-children-2026-bangladesh.

Supporting Information

S1 Document. STROBE checklist for cross-sectional studies.