Marginality and Migration: Children Trapped in a Cycle of Economic, Educational and psycho-Social Marginality in Bulilima and Mangwe Districts of Zimbabwe

Winniefridah Matsa

Abstract

International migration and marginality are among the immense challenges of humankind worldwide. Many studies have focused on the marginality of migrants in destination countries. This study, however, focuses on the marginality of children left behind by parents due to labour migration. The objectives of the study are to determine forms of marginality, and economic, educational and psycho-social experiences of marginalisation of children left behind by migrating parents. It also explores strategies to mitigate the effects of marginality on left-behind children. Theories of marginality and social exclusion make up the theoretical framework for this study. The study design is a qualitative phenomenological inquiry probing on lived experiences and challenges of marginalised migrant children in Bulilima and Mangwe districts of South-West Zimbabwe. The sample comprised a total of 94 participants, 18 class teachers, 40 caregivers and 36 left-behind migrant children. The instruments were in-depth interviews for class teachers and caregivers as well focus group discussions for left-behind migrant children. The results revealed that children left behind experienced different forms of marginalisation ranging from economic, structural, cultural, educational and psycho-social marginalisation. Ecological marginality, migration and poverty intertwine to tap migrant children in a cycle of educational and psychological marginalisation. The study recommends synchronised intervention strategies by government policymakers, non-governmental organisations, educationists and community member engagement to mitigate the effects of marginality among left-behind children.

Keywords: *Marginality, marginalisation, social exclusion, psycho-social experiences, systematic marginalisation.*

Introduction

The relationship between international migration and families left behind has become an important question worldwide (Démurger, 2015, 1). According to Aflatoun International, Credit Suisse and Plan International (2014), there are linkages between

Acting Director Quality Assurance and Professional Development (QAPD) and a Senior Lecturer at the Midlands State University Gender Institute. Email: matsaw@staff.msu.ac.zw / winniematsa@gmail.com Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Winniefridah Matsa, Acting Director Quality Assurance and Professional Development (QAPD) and a Senior Lecturer at the Midlands State University, Gender Institute, email: matsaw@staff.msu.ac.zw / winniematsa@gmail.com

migration, poverty and marginality. Marginality was reported among 50 states in the United States of America as one of the immense challenges facing these nations (Elsheikh et al., 2016). Marginality can be an indicator of the existence of discrimination, oppression and marginalisation in representation, participation in governance, and income inequality. The rates of incarceration of suspected criminals as well as immigration asylum policies in most destination countries may reflect cultural bias or social prejudice against other groups in society. Marginality results in poverty that forces the marginalised groups to migrate in search of better economic opportunities. Gatzweiler et al. (2011) posit that all forms of poverty can be explained through the concept of marginality.

According to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO, 2010), marginalisation is a process whereby something or someone is pushed to the edge of a group and accorded lesser importance as a result of social distance or remote and harsh physical environments. It can also be a social phenomenon where a minority subgroup is excluded and their needs or desires are ignored. Marginalisation is a process of putting individuals or groups outside mainstream society to form an acute and persistent disadvantage rooted in underlying social inequalities. Marginality is being positioned or the state of being on the fringes of borders (Pelc, 2006). Von Braun and Gatzweiler (2014) echo that marginality is being discriminated against, excluded or have no right to access social services. Marginality is a status or characteristic of being on the margins economically, socially, politically or even ecologically. This position of marginality prevents people from opportunities, freedom of choice, and development of personal capacities. Jenson (2000, 2) concurs that marginality includes a lack of capacity to gain full respect in society to the extent that one becomes an "invisible minority" whose identity as a full citizen is questionable. According to Gatzweiler et al. (2011), marginality is an involuntary position and a condition of an individual or group at the margins of social, political, economic, ecological and biophysical systems, restraining them from freedom of choice.

Leimgruber's (2004) definition of marginality has four forms of marginality, namely: geometrics, ecological, economic and social. Geometrics can be defined as groups or individuals who are on the periphery of a larger area, which can be a state, continent or territory. With ecological marginality, the natural environment limits the potential for survival by excluding individuals or groups from the benefits of the environment. Economic marginality is a lack of access to production as well as a lack of access to resources and infrastructure to the extent of being on the periphery economically. Social marginalisation has to do with the exclusion of minorities premised on language, religion, ethnicity and education, among others.

Leimgruber (2004) further categorised the types of marginalisation into three broad categories: (i) systematic; (ii) economic; and (iii) leverage. Systematic marginalisation is produced by hegemonic powers within political and economic systems that generate inequalities through the distribution of social, political and economic benefits that exclude others. Collateral marginalisation is a by-product of living among the marginalised, where

the states of being marginal reproduce themselves. Leverage means there is intentional pressure of demand of labour force in the developed nations, thereby influencing migration from countries of the global South to the North through unequal remuneration.

Black et al. (2006) reveal that international migration may be a cause, symbol or consequence of global inequalities. It may be rooted in income and wealth inequalities between sending and destination countries. Most migrants come from the poorest sections of societies of the global South, flocking to the rich Northern parts of the global markets.

Yeoh and Lam (2006) posit that there is a causal or symbiosis relationship between international migration and marginality. Marginality can be a push factor for international migration, and migration itself can lead to a marginalisation of migrants in their destination countries. This marginalisation cascades to children who migrate with parents or those left behind. Studies by Yeoh and Lam (2006) reveal that left-behind children are economically, emotionally, socially and psychologically marginalised. The children are immobile yet vulnerable to marginalisation.

Fan and Zhao (2010) also point out that labour migration has an emotional cost because of family separation and loss of comfort in family life. Both migrants and their children in China showed signs of unhappiness resulting from perceived uncertainty about the future and frustration over living a marginalised life with anxiety and depression. Gassmann et al. (2013) report that psychological theories in the field of migration suggest a link between migration and the well-being of children left behind. Disruption of attachment with parents leads to emotional disturbances such as depression, sadness, anger and distress. UNICEF (2014) also echoes that the effects of international migration are largely felt in the areas of health and education. Botezat (2018) found that the absence of parents due to migration had profound physical and mental health problems as well as emotional and psychological stress in Asia, Eastern Europe and South America. In some communities, this was viewed as a national tragedy. Financially and materially, children may be better off yet deprived of primary care at home resulting in harmful effects on children's overall well-being. Botezat and Pfeiffer (2014) confirmed health problems and psychological stress in Romania. Children left behind experienced depression, anxiety, emotional and behaviour problems.

The Vietnamese case study by the International Organisation for Migration (IOM, 2009) revealed that left-behind children were vulnerable, lonely, discriminated and lacked family protection. In China, both children and parents suffered from anxiety. Migration changed the lives of all family members. Children had symptoms of depression and anxiety because of separation from parents. Some took to smoking, drinking alcohol or suicide, while others abandoned their homes. Some parents, after realising that migrating leaving children behind was costly, decided to return (Liang et al., 2017).

Ge and Durst (2019) discovered that in the Northern Shaanxi province of China,

children experienced separation, discrimination and marginalisation in school and the community. The rural area's geographical, economic and social positioning was marginalised. The people in that province were disadvantaged due to a lack of resources, and poverty forced parents to migrate in search of means to improve the economic status of the family. However, children remained to experience loneliness, discrimination and marginalisation.

Studies by Cappelloni (2011) in Mexico and by Baker et al. (2009) in the Caribbean revealed that the separation of children from parents cause parental and emotional marginalisation. The indicators of marginalisation were unhappiness, rape, sexual abuse, lack of physical health and neglect. Tufis (2007) discovered that children in Romania were marginalised in terms of education. Kufakurinani et al. (2014) also discovered that in Zimbabwe, migrant children did not have good relations with caregivers, other children, teachers and the whole community.

The paper focuses on marginalised children left behind by migrating parents and seeks to determine the forms of marginalisation and economic, educational as well as psycho-social marginality being experienced by left-behind children in the Bulilima and Mangwe districts of Zimbabwe. It also proffers strategies to mitigate marginality and the negative effects of parental absence due to labour migration.

Theoretical Framework

The paper is premised on theories of marginality and social exclusion. According to Zhizhko (2016), the theory of marginality analyses not only the economic and social conditions of marginal people but also their psychological state. The paper uses marginality as a tool to explain lived experiences and personal feelings about academic and psychological stress related to being marginalised.

Marginalisation relates to exclusion and extends to all aspects of the life of the marginalised, including educational, economic and social benefits. Marginalisation is the most dangerous form of oppression, where the whole category of people is excluded from useful participation in social life. The people's potential is subjected to severe material deprivation. Social exclusion refers to the dynamic process of being shut fully or partially from any of the social, political, economic and cultural systems, which determine the social integration of a person in society (Jenson 2000, 10). It includes denial of civil, political, and social rights and citizenship as well as the unequal distribution of power and wealth, among others. Marginalisation, like social exclusion, is a process of reproducing excluded groups or individuals living on the periphery of society.

The above state and position of the migrant affect the status and experiences of their children; those who migrate with parents as well as those children who are left behind. The children left behind are at loss on whether to identify with their migrant parents or with caregivers. Extended family caregivers do not wholly accept them as

their children, yet parents cannot migrate with them to destination countries because of immigration policies and economic reasons. Their separation from parents and partial adoption by extended family members places them in a state of marginality and "limbo" (Park, 1928) (not belonging to anyone).

Literature Review
Background to the study area and the forms of marginality experienced by communities in Bulilima and Mangwe

According to Zimbabwe National Statistics Agency, UNICEF-Zimbabwe and World Bank (2015), Zimbabwe Poverty Atlas reveals that the two districts, Bulilima and Mangwe, are situated in the second poorest province of Matabeleland South and experience geophysical and economic marginality. The Poverty Index for Bulilima and Mangwe in Matabeleland South is at 73-84%. Zimbabwe National Statistics Agency, UNICEF-Zimbabwe and World Bank (2015) describe the area as worse in food security and nutrition, infrastructure utilities, social services and beneficiation. According to Hill (1999), 75% of communal lands in Bulilima and Mangwe are ecologically marginalised and uninhabitable. The above becomes the source of marginalisation for the people of Bulilima and Mangwe forcing able-bodied people to migrate to neighbouring countries in search of employment opportunities. Poverty and migrant policies in both origin and destination countries force them to leave their families, especially children, behind. It is these children who experience different forms of marginalisation, worsened by the absence of parents due to migration.

The Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement (2017) (in Zimbabwe) highlights that the province of Matabeleland South, where Bulilima and Mangwe are situated, is in drought-stricken natural ecological regions four and five. The regions are too dry for successful crop production without irrigation. Region four receives 450-600 mm per year and region five less than 500 mm per year as the rainfall is erratic, inadequate and unreliable. The soils are poor and crop yields decrease from regions two to four and five. During years of drought, communal farmers can hardly be fed. The majority depends on this unreliable rainfall where dry land cultivation is a risky venture. The order of good harvest is one in four years. CESVI Cooperation and Development (2003) concurs that regions four and five of Zimbabwe have been historically disadvantaged and marginalised due to the combined effects of ecological, colonial and political factors.

According to Asian Research Institute, Zimbabwe is a third world country that experiences economic marginalisation, which gives rise to uneven development. Uneven development then causes labour migration from rural to urban or developing to developed nations in search of employment. The global economy marginalises those on the periphery of the capitalist economy, making them incapable of self-generated growth and development, hence global marginalisation (Phillip, 2010). Globalisation causes uneven development and it is a form of marginalisation and control of economically weaker nations by the economically powerful. Marginalisation, in whatever form,

cannot be detached from the hegemonic economic and political systems (Phillip, 2010). According to Cole (2017), globalisation is an ongoing process that involves interconnected changes in the economic, cultural, social and political spheres of society. It involves ever-increasing integration of isolated places, cultures, norms, values, behaviours and ways of life where other people's norms and values are peripheral. Politically, it is a development of forms of government that operate on a world scale. Economically, it is an expansion of capital around the world, integrating all other economies. The process marginalises other people's values, norms, economies and political governments.

Bond et al. (2014) postulates that marginality in Africa was driven by the factors of pre-colonial society, depth of colonial interference, post-colonial interaction, and new colonial leadership with its external actors. The policies of leadership in different historical periods determined the conditions of life for millions of people. Colonialism was rooted in racial exclusion, exploitation, and control of others. In post-independent Africa, most states have been authoritarian and unable to redistribute economic benefits universally; instead, governments retain greater portions for themselves.

Hill (1999) traces marginalisation in Zimbabwe to the 1890 British occupation when indigenous people were alienated from productive lands with the arrival of British colonial settlers. The indigenous people were pushed to unproductive marginal lands that later became the fringes of development. The 1950s to the 1970s saw increased alienation of the blacks when the colonial settlers demarcated state farms and forest land through the Land Apportionment Act 1931 and Land Husbandry Act 1951. After the 1980 liberation and independence era, the government was unable to redistribute and control resource use. The unequal development and marginalisation of Matabeleland South are ecological, colonial and political.

Phillip (2010) argues that the structure and pattern of the first and second economies (developed and developing) is a cause of marginalisation. The economy of the first world informs wider expectations and aspirations of the third world. The second economy is a consequence of the accumulation in the first economy, while the second economy is characterised by underdevelopment, little gross domestic product (GDP) and a large population of the poor living in rural areas. The two economies are structurally disconnected, forcing people in the second economy to migrate to the first. This is one reason why migrants flock from Zimbabwe (second economy) to South Africa (first economy). Zhizhko (2016) points out that the relationship between poverty, marginality, exclusion and inequality cannot be refuted. Poverty and the lack of economic development opportunities lead to a widespread lack of employment opportunities. This has given rise to labour migration from South-West Zimbabwe to neighbouring countries in search of employment. International migration increases in the context of the above marginalisation and further deepens it.

Although migration has benefits, sometimes it marginalises education. School going children drop out of school to migrate. Educated parents and young men and

women migrate leaving behind children with less educated caregivers who offer little or no support in schooling. According to Aflatoun International, Credit Suisse and Plan International (2014), in rural agro economies, 75% of children are left with grandparents with less physical, financial and educational means. Children experience economic, educational and psychological marginalisation. They are lonely, depressed and have a lower quality of life than other children. Aflatoun International, Credit Suisse and Plan International (2014) reported that in China, although 70% of children talked to their parents over the phone every week, they still missed their parents. Children felt it was hard to be joyous in life and were doubtful of their parents' love. Wei (2011) discovered that in Jamaica, migrant children performed poorly compared to children of non-migrant parents because of low concentration levels.

Exploring economic, educational and psycho-social experiences of marginalisation

Labour migration is conventionally viewed as economically benefitting family members who are left behind through remittances. For example, the social cost of migration, the physical absence of parents, and the loss of time of household production and care by the migrant might outweigh gains from remittances (Démurger, 2015).

Migration has resulted in increased child labour (formal and informal) in the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) within and outside family settings. The top countries for child labour are Senegal, Sierra Leone and Côte d'Ivoire. Children working on family farms make up 90% of the workforce in Burkina Faso, 87% in Mali, and 81% in Liberia (ILO, 2010, 32). This is because migrants have family support disrupted by the migration of breadwinners. In Senegal, Mali and Niger, children combined work with schooling. Working children were found to be rarely attending school. Demands of work on children's time and energy forced children to marginalise schooling. There was also evidence of higher repetition of grades arising from poor performance and irregular attendance.

The International Labour Organisation (ILO, 2010, 36) discovered that 'out of school' children also constituted a higher percentage, with 56% of these children aged 7-14 years in Mali, Burkina Faso and Niger. In Senegal, Guinea Bissau and Guinea, one-third of children aged 10-14 years were 'out of school'. In Mexico, migration was found to be discouraging educational advancement. In Ecuador, children aspire to follow their parents. Education accounted for 18% of total remittances, where enrolment rates were close to 100% for children younger than 11 years, but rapidly drops to 85% for urban remittance receivers and 60% for those who do not receive remittances (Bucheli et al., 2018). In Sri Lanka, in the eastern province of Gampaha, Colombo Kurunegala, migrant children experienced direct socio-psychological marginalisation. Disruption of families, diversion from education and pressure of domestic work for children made children experience psychological problems and risks of abuse (Jayasuriya & Opeskin, 2015). UNICEF (2015) also echoes that Sri Lankan children are disadvantaged, stigmatised and marginalised. They are marginalised by national policies in origin, transit and destination

countries that do not respect the provisions of the convention on the rights of the child (CRC). Some parents begin a new life and abandon old families and children. The International Labour Law provides for Convention Number 143, requiring each member state to take all necessary measures to facilitate the re-unification of families of migrant workers. However, the ratification of the clause by member states has been weak. Of the 54 states that are part of the convention, only 13 have signed the ratification. Article 17 makes provision for the migrant worker who has been employed in another country for at least a year to visit his/her country of origin without loss of rights or being visited by his/her family anytime. It also provides for the right of the child to maintain direct and regular contact with both parents, but this has also been restricted to those with migrant documents. International agreements and conventions lack concrete steps for affirmation (UNICEF, 2015).

In a study by Botezat (2018), it was revealed that there is no consensus on the findings of the relationship between migration and the education of left-behind children. The findings are country-specific and depend on the family environment and children's ages. Remittances benefitted secondary rather than primary school-going children in Eastern Europe, Asia and South America. The migration of parents was a national tragedy because of the scarcity of caregivers. Household work was at the expense of study time and meant the "absence of parents". Children suffered emotional and psychological distress, causing harm to their well-being of children.

Breigenzer (2014) reported that 23% of students dropped out of school at grade 9, the end of compulsory education, owing to poverty and labour migration in rural China. Children resented parents and felt unloved, were disobedient and did not show respect, thereby deviating from Confucian education. They viewed parents as "homecoming strangers" (Breigenzer, 2014, 29). Parents' filial role in caring for the elderly was taken up by left-behind children. The educational environment at home was not supportive. This was also echoed by Save the Children (2014) who noted that in Moldova, the home environment lacked an education supportive culture because the educational levels of caregivers and migrating parents were very low. Some children stayed with senior citizens, who marginalised education. As a result, they lacked motivation for education, missed classes, dropped out of school or had their academic performance deteriorating. In Moldova, the cash remittances were sometimes insignificant to the extent that children became burdens to caregivers. Interviewed caregivers concurred that the children of migrants were not economically sustained. They lacked affection from caregivers and material support from parents; hence, they were economically, educationally and socially marginalised (Save the children, 2014).

In El Salvador, enrolment among youth aged 10-17 years correlated positively with monthly per capita income, where 1980-1983 enjoyed the largest improvement in school attainment. About 40% of parents with remittances had their children completing primary education. Enrolments reached the equivalent of universal primary education targets, i.e., 80% of rural and 90% of urban populations. In Tajikistan, 94% of migrant

children attended school, 63% completed secondary education, 17% completed tertiary education, and 16% received a basic education. However, increased enrolments were marred by the lack of supervision and the burden of work. Youth aged 7-11 years and 12-17 years did not attend school consistently (Edwards & Ureta, 2003).

Baker et al. (2009) discovered that in the Caribbean, children were found to be having feelings of abandonment, low self-esteem, anger and material obsession. They were also full of despair, mistrust and unable to concentrate at school. Children spent their entire lives struggling with feelings of rejection and loss. Broken promises of re-union with parents resulted in emotional instability. Although parents sent remittances, 15% of the income in the Caribbean was not spent on school fees. Left-behind children's fees, as a result, were paid late. Mexicans also invested very little in education because of migration to the United States of America (Save the Children, 2014). In Ghana, remittances were also not spent on education. Children devoted more time to family duties and worked for themselves in income-generating projects because they had lost touch with migrant parents (Owusu, 2011).

In Zimbabwe, migrant children experienced mood swings, sadness and emptiness, coldness, detachment and irritability towards caregivers, teachers and their parents (Philippa, 2011). They viewed themselves as "self-guardians" because of a lack of parental advice and care. Their defence mechanisms included isolation, silence, denial, and redirection to substitute activities such as watching television and chatting on cell phones. Relationships between international migration and families left behind have become an important question. Access to education should be monitored and safety nets instituted. There should be policies to address the situation of vulnerable children and to remove barriers in law and practice to link public service providers with migration. Currently, no strategies are focusing on migrant children as a separate category of the vulnerable; hence this study seeks to proffer some strategies to mitigate the economic, educational and psychological impact of marginalisation on children left behind.

Methodology

The design is a qualitative case study of Bulilima and Mangwe to unearth hidden experiences that can only be obtained from a natural setting and the participants affected by the phenomenon of marginality. Both the setting and the participants—migrant children at secondary school, caregivers and teachers—were marginalised. Caregivers and class teachers were purposively selected because of their in-depth knowledge of the experiences of migrant children due to their daily interaction with these children. Other teachers and learners were randomly selected. Migrant children and class teachers were purposively sampled. The aim was to hear their migrant children's "voices, hearts and minds", what they say, feel and think of their marginalisation.

Stratified sampling was used to select three different types of schools, composed of six schools: two mission/government boarding, two low-cost and two rural day

schools. The selection of caregivers was done through chain sampling. The sample had a total of 94 participants, comprising 18 class teachers, 40 caregivers and 36 left-behind migrant children. The instruments used were in-depth interviews with class teachers and caregivers, and focus group discussions for left-behind migrant children. Focus group discussions were conducted with migrant children exclusively. In-depth interviews were held with class teachers and caregivers to unveil experiences of marginality at home and school.

Findings and Discussion
Forms of marginality in Bulilima and Mangwe

Results of the study revealed that the two districts, Bulilima and Mangwe, lie in marginal border areas of South-West Zimbabwe. The two districts do not have any vibrant economic resources or activities, hence showing high rates of migration from Zimbabwe to Botswana and South Africa. This confirms the two districts' marginality in terms of the economic and spatial distribution of settlements, which is in line with findings of Zimbabwe National Statistics Agency, UNICEF-Zimbabwe and World Bank (2015) that the two districts lie in the poorest province of Matabeleland South with a high Poverty Index characterised by a lack of social services and food security.

Caregivers highlighted that their important economic activities were pastoralism and cultivation and that the agro-based economy was rain-fed in a dry region of Matabeleland South. The recurrent droughts and the collapse of the industrial economy have forced able-bodied men and women to migrate to other countries. The Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement (2017) confirms that Matabeleland South province of Zimbabwe is in natural ecological regions four and five, with low rainfall, recurrent droughts, poor soils and low productivity. The area is thus ecologically marginalised. According to the caregivers, marginalisation in Bulilima and Mangwe dates back to the period before colonialism. They said the arrival of Mzilikazi and the Ndebele pushed them to the marginal areas of Western Zimbabwe, which is dry and unproductive. Ndebele hegemony was imposed on them. There is also socio-cultural marginalisation that manifests in the education system through the language of instruction and the dominant culture. Teachers and caregivers stated that although the schools are for the Kalanga people and have Kalanga names, the dominant language and culture in schools is Ndebele. The language of instruction is Ndebele, yet the local language is Kalanga. The Kalanga people are alienated from their own language and culture through education. Most of the teachers are trained in English and Ndebele as languages of instruction. Caregivers, teachers and learners concurred that the language predominantly spoken in schools and public community gatherings with outsiders is Ndebele. In political gatherings, the language used is Shona and the interpretations are done in Ndebele, which is also not their ethnic language. The vernacular language examined at ordinary level and advanced level certificates is Ndebele. All other subjects except Ndebele are examined in English. The cycle of marginalisation is reproduced and extends to many aspects of the life of the marginalised (Zhizhko, 2016).

Exploring economic, educational and psycho-social experiences of marginality in Bulilima and Mangwe

Of the 54 teachers who participated in the study, 49 (90.7%) had at least 10 years of experience and most were diploma holders. The most experienced and degree-qualified teachers were reported to have migrated because of poverty and the economic situation. The few remnants of experienced degree holders and certificated teachers were in administration. These remnants remained behind because they were in positions of authority or approached retirement age. The migration of educated teachers affects the quality of education for learners in this marginal rural area, as confirmed by the UNDP (2010), who stated that most Zimbabweans found in the streets of Johannesburg were well-educated, having completed secondary education or obtained diplomas/degrees, which also confirms the brain drain theory of Tevera and Crush (2003).

Both teachers and caregivers confirmed a high staff turnover because of poor transportation and other services. Teachers were unwilling to be deployed to this area, which was evidenced by the number of transfers and swaps. Some were affected by the culture of migration and left for greener pastures. The level of education of caregivers in both districts was low, with only some of them being on Ordinary Level. The few educated community members were confirmed to have migrated to urban areas or other countries. Education itself has been marginalised and learners were left with caregivers having a marginal education. Some migrant parents sent remittances to learners, but remittances cannot educate children (Zirima & Nyanga, 2012). Learners themselves were reported to be marginalising education, with some dropping out of school to migrate and others migrating immediately after obtaining Ordinary Level and Advanced Level as offered by the Zimbabwe School Examinations Council (ZIMSEC), never to return to collect their certificates. In both the questionnaire and focus group discussions, the majority of learners were favourable to migration, viewing it as the only option out of poverty, not only for their parents but also for themselves.

Migrant parents do not fully assimilate in South Africa, and migrant policies in both the sending and the destination countries make it difficult for their children to be absorbed in South Africa and Botswana's education systems. Children, like their parents, are trapped in a cycle of marginalisation. Some parents sent their children back to Zimbabwe to first pursue their education. Learners who were made to return to Zimbabwe, however, admitted that some of their parents were living in poverty in South Africa, citing imikhukhu (poor shelters), violence, low paying jobs, lack of skills and education, and expensive schools. This serves as evidence that their parents are on the margins of the South African economy.

Back home, teachers and caregivers reported that only a few migrants were able to pay fees and provide schooling materials and other basic needs for their families. In 2016, because of the fall of the South African Rand, many learners were dropping out of school. Assisting organisations either did not target migrant children as they

assumed that all migrants were sending remittances, or they ignored children citing that their parents were enjoying luxurious lives in South Africa. Humanitarian organisations excluded migrant children from benefitting as part of the poor and vulnerable.

Teachers confirmed that some migrant children, especially those left in child-headed households or living with elderly grandparents, were among the poorest. Migrant children dropped out of school because of fees, tattered uniforms and malnutrition. Teachers, caregivers and community members were not sympathetic to migrants' children, citing negligence by their parents. Non-governmental organisations, development agencies and government social welfare schemes also treated migrant children's problems as peripheral, excluding them from educational assistance, scholarships and grants. Although teachers admitted that most of their fees were from migrant parents and that the status of some children of migrants was far better than that of non-migrants, not all migrants were remitting sufficiently for their families, thereby confirming findings by Save the Children (2014) that not all children of migrants were economically sustained.

The secondary schools were far apart as a result of economic, political and regional marginalisation. Some parents negotiated with relatives for the accommodation of learners, especially for secondary education. As a result of poverty, very few migrant parents can afford boarding or low-cost boarding. Those who tried did so during Ordinary Level and Advanced Level examination years. The poor stayed with relatives in homes adjacent to schools. Some rented incomplete houses in business centres near the schools. These environments are not conducive to learning. Some incomplete houses have no electricity or water supply. The business centres have noisy beer hall gardens, bottle stores, nightclubs and grocery shops. The toilets are common facilities shared by the neighbourhood.

Learners felt that they were marginalised even by teachers. Treatment of migrants and non-migrant children differed. Non-migrant parents' requests for delayed payments of fees were accepted while migrant children were denied that privilege. Migrant children were not allowed in classes without complete school uniforms and other learning materials. Non-migrant children's disciplinary cases were attended to and resolved urgently compared to those of migrant children. Caregivers sometimes refused to stand in for absent migrant parents during disciplinary hearings. Non-migrant parents' children were listened to and school administrators sympathised with non-migrant children. This view was confirmed by caregivers although disputed by teachers.

However, teachers confirmed that migrant children were marginalised by both their parents and caregivers at home. Some lived with uncaring relatives, alone, or with employed caregivers, who all neglected them. As a result, migrant children had psychological or social behavioural problems. Some relatives felt it burdensome to be guardians of migrant children. Some migrant children reported that relatives hated them and were jealous of their parents, but they pretended to be helpful to benefit from remittances sent by migrant parents. Migrant children felt discriminated against by

caregivers. One aunt from Mangwe had this comment:

Bayasisunduzela abantwababo [meaning migrant parents deny and push the responsibility of their children to them].

In fact, caregivers expressed that being a guardian to migrant children was burdensome and the caregivers did not do it out of choice. Migrant children were aware of this "see-saw" game between their parents and caregivers. They were "floating" children as described by Ling (2011).

Both teachers and caregivers were reported by learners as not being concerned with migrant children's education. With parents being far, they mentioned that they journeyed schooling alone. Caregivers did not bother to attend important days of the school calendar, citing that it was not their duty; the value of education to caregivers is peripheral. Three boys who were in the Upper six in Mangwe had not been visited or consulted by anyone since they were three years old. Two of them in Bulilima had this to say:

Learner 1: *My parents have never attended any consultation, speech and prize giving or sports days.*
Learner 2: *It is painful, our success or problems are unknown. We are not recognised or praised for the good things we do at school.*

When it comes to behaviour moulding, no one took responsibility. Migrant parents left everything to teachers and caregivers, who felt it was not their duty to mould migrant children. Teachers neglected their responsibility to caregivers and absent parents. Children admitted that parents rarely talked to them, especially on issues concerning schooling save for fees and educational material provisions. Caregivers were illiterate and expected learners to do everything with teachers at school. On the other hand, teachers gave assignments and exercises to be done as homework. Migrant children did not have educational support or assistance at home. Teachers confirmed that migrant children did not have stable characters, appearing happy sometimes, at times stressed, tense, intolerant and hostile to teachers and caregivers. Some were too mature for their age while others never matured. Others were ill-socialised, stubborn, stressed and full of pride. Lack of parental guidance, control, discipline, care and love led to socio-psychological problems that manifested in mood swings, low concentration, isolation and stress, resulting in psychological and educational marginalisation. Failure to receive a quality education is equivalent to exclusion. In terms of moral and educational guidance, learners belong to no one in the trialogue of caregivers, teachers and migrant biological parents, hence "marginal".

Existing strategies for mitigating economic, educational and socio-psychological effects of marginality

The existing coping strategies do not mitigate marginalisation. In fact, some of these strategies marginalised migrant children further. Most learners lived a marginal life, trapped in a cycle of marginality. There are no proactive strategies, and the reactive ones do not target migrant children, but vulnerable children in general. Migrant children are not viewed as vulnerable children, especially by non-governmental organisations, social welfare and community schemes. Some migrant children turned to illicit behaviours such as drug abuse, cheating, copying homework from others, absenteeism, and bribing security guards for entry without paying fees. This further marginalised them and caused them to be labelled as 'a bunch of children with ill behaviour'.

Teachers cited guidance and counselling as one of the strategies they use to help migrant children cope with educational and psychological challenges. However, the guidance and counselling by teachers do not target migrant children only; it also focuses on orphans, infected and affected learners. Chaplains are only present in boarding schools and low-cost boarding schools, and most of their topics do not cover issues of migrant children. Matrons and superintendents concentrate on issues relating to school rules. Police officers invited to educate learners on how to deal with the challenges they encountered as children in schools focus on crime, violence and abuse in general. Teachers furthermore reported that the Basic Education Assistance Module (BEAM), Plan international, World Vision, and Higher Life (Capernaum) focus on orphans, double orphans, infected and affected children, those who are physically and mentally challenged, and those with imprisoned or ill parents, leaving out children with absent parents. Realising the gap, this paper suggests strategies that are transformative, proactive and focused on migrant children.

Conclusion

The people in general and migrant children in Bulilima and Mangwe experience diverse forms of marginality, including ecological, regional, socio-political, educational and socio-psychological marginalisation. They suffer from geometric marginalisation because their region lies on the periphery of Zimbabwean territory, the fringes of the state. They are also ecologically marginalised because their natural environment limits their potential to benefit from it because of its scarce rainfall, poor soils and lack of productivity. These people and migrant children also experience systematic marginalisation because the hegemonic political and economic powers created an unequal distribution of resources resulting in the exclusion of the region. Migrants and their children live among the marginalised and, as such, experience collateral marginalisation (Leimgruber, 2004).

Economic marginalisation manifests in poverty, unemployment, the lack of skills and education, and a high rate of migration for employment in neighbouring countries. Educational marginality manifests in low levels of literacy, in the culture of migration of

the educated, and in those dropping out of school to migrate. This migration has left learners with teachers and caregivers with low qualifications and experience. In terms of education, migrant children are marginalised. They are therefore trapped in a state of their parents' marginality.

Socio-psychological marginality manifests in isolation, mood swings, neglect, hurt, low concentration levels and stress. This has a ripple effect on these children's characters, education and environment. They are trapped in a trialogue of marginality and neglect. Learners are 'invisible' and not recognised as a separate category by social welfare, government, community schemes and non-governmental organisations. This invisibility and exclusion is evidence of marginality; it cascades to migrant children being marginal in school, at home, in policy-making, and consequently, in life. Fostering with caregivers is not complete, guidance by teachers is not comprehensive, and moulding by parents is absent, making these children marginal even socially and academically. International migration is intertwined with poverty, ecology, and educational, economic, social, emotional and psychological marginalisation, which traps migrant children in a cycle of marginality.

Recommendations

The study recommends:

i)	Globalisation and regional integration into the economic and political programmes of the government to guard against the exclusion of the people of Matabeleland South from development endeavours in their country.

ii)	Deconstruction of geo-political, economic and national socio-cultural structures that construct poverty for certain regions and certain groups of people.

iii)	Mainstreaming migration into the national development agenda to maximise benefits and minimise negative effects for children and adolescents left behind by migrating parents (UNICEF, 2015).

iv)	Policy, legal and psycho-social support systems bolstered to help families and left-behind children to cope with the detrimental effect of migration.

v)	Government welfare schemes, BEAM, non-governmental organisations, Legal Assistance Centre (LAC), and Church Alliance for Orphans (CAFO) should not focus on orphans, HIV and AIDs infected or affected only but also address all situations of vulnerable children.

vi)	Removal of barriers in law and practice that take into consideration migrant policies, economic situations and children's rights.

vii)	A working link between public service providers and immigration offices in origin, transit and destination countries.

viii)	Awareness campaigns for professionals in health and education on specific problems, especially marginal children left behind by marginal parents.

ix)	Setting up centres to train health officers, teachers in schools and chaplains to handle traumatised children and to recognise traits associated with the psychological effects of parental migration.

x)   Appointment of a focal point person in each community to link schools with caregivers, teachers, health personnel and social welfare officers.

xi)   Awareness campaigns at community level to sensitise members about the vulnerability and marginality of migrant children.

xii)   Teacher and chaplain programmes that take into account socio-psychological and educational challenges of marginalised migrant children.

xiii)   Studies for the provision of statistical and qualitative data to create a database for migrant children and the challenges they encounter.

References

Aflatoun International, Credit Suisse, & Plan International. (2014). Financial education and life skills for girls in China: Overcoming marginalisation and barriers to education. Global Education Initiative. Retrieved from https://plan-uk.org/file/financial-education-and-life-skills-for-girls-in-chinapdf/download?token=_n1u92kG.

Baker, C., Elings-Pele, V., & Reis, M. (2009). The impact of migration on children in the Caribbean. Corpus ID: 11466910. Retrieved from http://www.unicef.org.

Black, R., Natali, C., & Skinner, J. (2006). Migration and inequality. World Bank.

Bond, P., Gachanga, T., Coker, B., Deo, T. K., Mawere, R., & Abbas, K. (2014). Marginalisation in Africa. London: Zed Books.

Botezat, A. (2018). Parental migration and the children left behind. Retrieved from https://bold.expert/parental-migration-and-the-children-left-behind/.

Botezat, A., & Pfeiffer, F. (2014). The impact of parents migration on the well-being of children left behind—Initial evidence from Romania. IZA Discussion Paper No. 8225. Retrieved from https://econpapers.repec.org/scripts/redir.pf?u=https%3A%2F%2Fdocs.iza.org%2Fdp8225.pdf;h=repec:iza:izadps:dp8225.

Breigenzer, A. (2014). The effects of labour migration on the traditional Chinese family structure and the role of children. [Honour's Thesis, Washington University].

Bucheli, J.R., Bohara, A. K., & Fontenla, M. (2018). Mixed effects of remittances on child education. IZA Journal of Development and Migration, 8(10), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40176-017-0118-y.

Cappelloni, C. (2011). Going beyond material well-being: Looking at the hidden costs of migration on children left behind. PRAXIS, The Fletcher Journal of Human Security, XXVII, 24–37.

CESVI Cooperation and Development. (2003). Sustainable development and natural resource management in Southern Zimbabwe. No. AID 5063. A project funded by Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/7785726/Sustainable_development_and_natural_resources_management_in_Southern_Zimbabwe.

Cole, N. L. (2017). The definition of globalisation in Sociology. Sociological Forum, 7(3), 425–446.

Démurger, S. (2015). Migration and families left behind. IZA World of Labour, 144. https://doi.org/10.15185/izawol.144.

Edwards, A C., & Ureta, M. (2003). International migration, remittances, and schooling:

Evidence from El Salvador. Journal of Development Economics, 72(2), 429–461.

Elsheikh, E., Menendian, S., & Gambhir, S. (2016). 2016 Inclusiveness Index: Measuring Inclusion and Marginality. Report. Haas Institute (UC Berkeley).

Fan, L., & Zhao, W. (2010). Research of life satisfaction among rural left-behind children. Education, 2, 42–44.

Gassmann, F., Siegel, M., Vanore, M., & Waidler, J. (2013). The impact of migration on children left behind in Moldova. Merit working papers 2013. United Nations university.

Gatzweiler, F., Baumüller, H., Husmann, C., & Von Braun, J. (2011). Marginality: Addressing the root causes of extreme poverty. Zentrum Für Entwicklungsforschung (ZEF) Center for Development Research University of Bonn, Working Paper Series, 77.

Ge, L., & Durst, D. (2019). A hermeneutic phenomenological inquiry: Probing challenges and prospects of left-behind children education in the Northern Shaanxi Province, China. Journal of Studies in Social Sciences, 18(2), 68–106.

Hill, R. (1999). Colonialism and inequality in Zimbabwe. IUCN-ROSA: Harare.

International Labour Organisation (ILO). (2010). The twin challenges of child labour and education: Marginalisation in the ECOWAS region. UNICEF.

International Organisation for Migration (IOM) (2009). Gender and labour migration in Asia. Geneva: IOM.

Jayasuriya, R., & Opeskin, B. (2015). The migration of women domestic workers from Sri Lanka: Protecting the rights of children left behind. Cornell International Law Journal, 48, 579.

Jenson, J. (2000). Backgrounder: Thinking about marginalisation: What, who and why? Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks.

Kufakurinani, U., Pasura, D., & McGregor, J. (2014). Transnational parenting and the emergence of 'diaspora orphans' in Zimbabwe. African Diaspora, 7(1), 114–138.

Leimgruber, W. (2004). Between global and local: Marginality and marginal regions in the context of globalization and deregulation. Ashgate.

Liang, Y., Wang, L., & Rui, G. (2017). Depression among left-behind children in China. Journal of Health Psychology, 22(14), 1897–1905.

Ling, M. (2011). Discipline the new citizens in-between: Migrant workers' children and local NGOs in urban China. In Association of Asian Studies Annual Conference (p. 31), Honolulu.

Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement. (2017). Rainfall characteristics in the five natural regions. Retrieved from http://www.moa.gov.zw.

Owusu, B. (2011). Coping daily with parental migration: Perspectives of children left behind. [Master's Thesis, Norwegian University of Science and Technology].

Park, R. E. (1928). Human migration and the marginal man. American Journal of Sociology, 33(6), 881–893.

Pelc, S. (2006). Marginality and marginalisation. Retrieved from https://enlightenfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Marginality-and-Marginalisation.pdf .

Philippa, D. M. (2011). Zimbabwe adolescents' experience of their parents' absence due

to Diaspora. [Master's Thesis, University of South Africa].

Phillip, K. (2010). Inequality and economic marginalisation: How the structure of the economy impacts on opportunities on the margins. Law, Democracy & Development, 14(1), 1–28.

Save the Children. (2014). Left-behind, left-out: The impact on children and families of mothers migrating for work abroad. Child Rights Resource Centre.

Tevera, D. S., & Crush, J. (2003).The new brain drain from Zimbabwe. SAMP Migration Policy Series No. 29. Cape Town: IDASA.

Tufis, A. (2007). The effects of absence of migrant parents on their children's school performance. Soros foundation. Retrieved from http://www.childmigration.net.

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) (2014). 25th Anniversary of the Convention on the Rights of the Child. UNICEF.

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). (2015). Migration, mainstreaming education and health. Development agenda report. UNICEF.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2010). Comprehensive economic recovery in Zimbabwe: A country profile. ZIMSTAT and IOM.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO). (2010). Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2010: Reaching the marginalised. Working group on call for EFA. UNESCO-EFO.

Von Braun, J., & Gatzweiler, F. W. (2014). Marginality: An overview and implications to policy. In J. Von Braun, & F.W. Gatzweiler (Eds.), Marginality. Dordrecht: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7061-4_1.

Wei, L. G. (2011). Left-behind children in rural China: Research based on the use of qualitative methods in inner Mongolia. New York: University of New York.

Yeoh, B. S. A., & Lam, T. (2006). The cost of immobility: Children left behind and children who migrate with parents. Asia Research Institute: National University of Singapore.

Zhizhko, E. A. (2016). Socio-economically marginalised (migrant farmworkers) in Mexico: Theoretical approaches to the study. EcoForum, 5(1), 86–101.

Zimbabwe National Statistics Agency, UNICEF-Zimbabwe, & World Bank. (2015). Small area poverty estimation: Statistics for poverty eradication. Harare: UNICEF and World Bank.

Zirima, H., & Nyanga, T. (2012). The cost of immobility. Brain drain and educational outcomes of children in Zimbabwe. Wudpecker Journal of Educational Research, 1(3), 39–44.