

Governing Vulnerability: An Intersectional Analysis of Rohingya Refugee Protection in Indonesia

JISPO
Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan
Ilmu Politik
2026, Vol. 16, No. 1: 97-128
<https://journal.uinsgd.ac.id/index.php/jispo/index>
© The Author(s) 2026

Ria Agustina Larasati*

Universitas Bali Internasional, Bali, Indonesia

Katong Ragawi Numadi

Universitas Bali Internasional, Bali, Indonesia

Ni Putu Devi Maharani

Universitas Bali Internasional, Bali, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Rohingya refugees in Indonesia experience vulnerabilities shaped not only by displacement and statelessness but also by gender, age, family circumstances, economic dependency, disability, and exposure to violence. Although Indonesia has established an administrative framework for refugee management, limited attention has been given to how these vulnerabilities intersect within policy and implementation. This study examines how Indonesia's refugee-governance framework recognizes and responds to differentiated vulnerability from an intersectional perspective. Using a qualitative descriptive design, the study analyses official documents from Indonesian national and local authorities, international and humanitarian organizations, and relevant secondary literature. The findings show that Presidential Regulation No. 125 of 2016 provides important mechanisms for rescue, temporary accommodation, coordination, and assistance, but protection remains predominantly categorical rather than intersectional. Women, children, and other vulnerable groups receive specific recognition, yet overlapping legal, social, and economic conditions are not systematically addressed. Local implementation also varies according to institutional capacity and cooperation with international organizations. The study contributes by extending intersectional analysis to Indonesia's refugee-governance

* Corresponding author:
Ria Agustina Larasati
Universitas Bali Internasional, Bali, Indonesia
Email: riaagustina@unbi.ac.id

context and shows that more differentiated assessment is needed to identify protection needs obscured by broad administrative categories.

Keywords

Intersectionality; refugee governance; Rohingya refugees; statelessness; vulnerability

INTRODUCTION

The displacement of the Rohingya is rooted in a prolonged history of exclusion, statelessness, and mass violence in Myanmar. The 1982 Citizenship Law entrenched their effective exclusion from citizenship, while restrictions on movement, education, livelihoods, family life, and health care compounded their political and social marginalization (Mahmood et al. 2017; O'Brien and Hoffstaedter 2020). Large-scale violence and forced displacement have consequently pushed Rohingya populations across borders, particularly into Bangladesh, while recurring maritime movements through the Bay of Bengal and Andaman Sea have brought others toward Malaysia and Indonesia. Although Indonesia is not their principal destination, Aceh has become a recurrent site of disembarkation and humanitarian response because of its geographical position and the willingness of local fishers and communities, at critical moments, to assist people in distress at sea (McNevin and Missbach 2018; Adiputera and Missbach 2021). UNHCR (2025) reported that 3,854 people, primarily Rohingya, landed in Aceh and North Sumatra on at least 27 boats between 2023 and 31 December 2025. At the end of 2025, 2,596 Rohingya refugees remained in Indonesia, including 1,055 accommodated in temporary sites in Aceh and Riau. These figures position Indonesia within an ongoing regional protection crisis rather than a series of isolated emergency arrivals (Sholeh 2019).

Indonesia occupies a distinctive position within this displacement regime. It is not a party to the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees or its 1967 Protocol and has no comprehensive domestic asylum law establishing a full refugee-status determination and rights framework (Tan 2016; Krustiyati 2012). Nevertheless, refugees are not outside the scope of Indonesian law (Qothrunnada and Shidfan 2024). The Constitution

recognizes the right to seek asylum, while protection obligations, including non-refoulement, have been linked to international human rights commitments, customary international law, and domestic legal provisions (Tobing 2021; Dewansyah and Nafisah 2021). Presidential Regulation No. 125 of 2016 on the Handling of Refugees from Abroad (Perpres 125/2016) established an administrative framework covering rescue, placement, security, coordination, and cooperation with international organizations. It did not, however, create conventional pathways for local integration, formal employment, or durable domestic asylum (Sianturi and Viartasiwi 2021). Describing Indonesia simply as a “transit country” therefore obscures the prolonged character of refugee lives, as asylum seekers may remain for years awaiting resettlement or another solution (Sampson, Gifford, and Taylor 2016; Missbach 2017; Mixed Migration Centre 2021; Saputra, Zulfa, and Riyanta 2024). Indonesia’s refugee regime consequently combines humanitarian assistance, immigration control, international burden sharing, and legal ambiguity rather than constituting a comprehensive rights-based protection system (Kneebone, Missbach, and Jones 2021).

Existing scholarship has identified several consequences of this arrangement. Migration governance studies show how deterrence and anti-smuggling rationalities intersect with humanitarian discourse (McNevin, Missbach, and Mulyana 2016), while research on refugee protection highlights both alternative pathways and the constraints created by dependence on international organizations and fragmented institutional responsibilities (Prabandari and Adiputera 2019). Analyses of Perpres 125/2016 further demonstrate that refugees are frequently constructed as temporary, externally managed, or security-relevant populations rather than consistently treated as rights-bearing subjects (Sadjad 2021). Constitutional commitments to asylum therefore coexist uneasily with immigration-control practices (Dewansyah and Nafisah 2021). Decentralization creates additional problems because local governments may be expected to facilitate accommodation and services despite uncertainties surrounding mandates, funding, and institutional responsibility (Suyatna et al. 2021; Missbach and Adiputera 2021). The central problem is thus not merely the absence of

policy, but institutional fragmentation, ambiguous responsibilities, uneven implementation, and persistent tension between humanitarian protection and migration control (Akbar, Bukhari, and Hamadi 2024; Taha, Rofii, and Riyanta 2024).

Nor can refugee governance in Indonesia be understood through state institutions alone. In Aceh, responses to Rohingya arrivals involve fishing communities, local authorities, Islamic organizations, civil society, international agencies, and other humanitarian actors. McNevin and Missbach (2018) show how Acehnese practices of hospitality provide an alternative perspective on refugee protection, while Missbach and Stange (2021) demonstrate both the mobilizing potential and the limitations of Muslim solidarity in protecting Rohingya refugees across Southeast Asia. Recent research similarly identifies non-state actors as integral to Indonesia's prolonged and fragmented refugee regime (Hasan et al. 2025). In Aceh specifically, faith-based organizations contribute not only material assistance but also advocacy, community mobilization, and humanitarian narratives centred on dignity and protection (Cavin, Asmara, and Febrianto 2026). Scholarship therefore provides a substantial understanding of legal ambiguity, fragmented governance, local responsibility, humanitarianism, religious solidarity, and securitization in Indonesia's treatment of refugees.

What this literature captures less systematically is differentiation within the apparently singular category of the "Rohingya refugee" (Taha 2019). Although Rohingya share experiences of ethnoreligious persecution and statelessness, displacement does not affect everyone in the same way. Research across South and Southeast Asia shows that gender, age, family position, economic circumstances, exposure to violence, and legal status shape risks, capacities, and access to protection. Studies of Rohingya mental health demonstrate that trauma interacts with daily stressors, material deprivation, insecurity, and statelessness (Riley et al. 2017; Tay et al. 2019; Kaur et al. 2020). Research on Rohingya women locates gender-based violence within wider structures of forced displacement, dependency, and statelessness rather than treating it as an isolated harm (Priddy et al. 2022). Studies of Rohingya children likewise identify the long-term consequences of disrupted schooling, restricted educational opportunities, encampment, and uncertain futures (Shohel 2023).

At the same time, vulnerability should not be equated with passivity. Rohingya refugees negotiate constrained circumstances through livelihoods, social relations, mobility, and everyday forms of adaptation and resistance. In Malaysia, refugees pursue life projects despite restrictive legal and socioeconomic conditions (Sunam 2023), while Rohingya refugees in India strategically negotiate visibility and invisibility in hostile political and institutional environments (Mitra and Şahin-Mencütek 2024). Research in Bangladesh similarly shows that legal status, livelihood opportunities, host-community relations, and political conditions interact to shape possibilities for inclusion (Salehin and Hossain 2025). Vulnerability is therefore better understood as relational and context-dependent, produced through interactions among social position, legal status, institutional arrangements, material conditions, and political power.

This insight has important implications for Indonesia. Much of the Indonesian literature has focused on legal status, institutional responsibility, migration management, humanitarian governance, foreign policy, local reception, and border control. These studies explain why refugee protection remains incomplete, but they commonly employ “refugees,” “foreign refugees,” or “Rohingya refugees” as broad policy categories. Scholarship concerned with categorization has primarily examined how institutions represent refugees as foreign, temporary, dependent, or administratively problematic populations (Sadjad 2021; Damaledo 2021; Kneebone, Missbach, and Jones 2021). Rohingya-specific studies have meanwhile emphasized Muslim solidarity, humanitarian diplomacy, non-intervention, local hospitality, civil society, and faith-based organizations (Adiputera and Missbach 2021; Missbach and Stange 2021; Cavin, Asmara, and Febrianto 2026). What remains less developed is how Indonesia’s policy categories and protection arrangements recognize, obscure, or reproduce differences among Rohingya refugees themselves.

Addressing this problem requires moving beyond simply identifying women, children, older persons, survivors of violence, persons with disabilities, or other groups as separately “vulnerable.” UNHCR data already demonstrate substantial differentiation among Rohingya refugees in Indonesia, including unaccompanied or separated children, women at risk,

single parents, children at risk, and persons with disabilities. Humanitarian interventions also include child protection and responses to gender-based violence. The critical analytical question is therefore not whether differentiated vulnerabilities are recognized at all, but whether Indonesia's policy and institutional architecture adequately capture vulnerabilities that emerge through the interaction of multiple social and legal positions, and whether administrative classifications render some experiences more visible than others.

Intersectionality provides an appropriate framework for examining this problem. Crenshaw's foundational formulation challenged approaches that treat race, gender, and other categories as independent axes of disadvantage, demonstrating instead how interacting structures of power produce experiences that cannot be explained adequately through a single category (Crenshaw 1991; Carastathis 2014; Al-Faham, Davis, and Ernst 2019). Applied to forced migration, intersectionality shifts analysis from additive classifications toward interactions among refugee and citizenship status, gender, age, ethnicity, religion, class, disability, family status, and other socially consequential positions. Importantly, it also directs attention to institutions. Vulnerability is not merely an individual attribute; it may be intensified, mitigated, misrecognized, or rendered invisible through policy categories, rules, and institutional practices.

Recent refugee scholarship demonstrates the value of this approach. Berry and Taban (2021) show that the intersection of refugee and minority status may create protection gaps inadequately captured by either category alone. Kanal and Rottmann (2021) challenge representations of refugee women solely as victims and emphasize agency within specific structural and cultural constraints. Flamand, Raimondo, and Saroléa (2023) use intersectionality to identify asylum-seeker vulnerabilities that fall outside standardized categories, while Branco and Xerez (2024) show how intersecting positions shape trajectories of exclusion. Using intersectionality-based policy analysis, Andersson Nystedt et al. (2025) further demonstrate that policy regimes can recognize migrants and young people as vulnerable populations while still producing exclusion through interactions between migration rules and sectoral protection policies. These

studies establish a crucial distinction: recognizing separate categories of vulnerable people is not equivalent to examining how vulnerability is intersectionally and institutionally produced.

The principal research gap, therefore, is not an absence of scholarship on Rohingya vulnerability or Indonesian refugee governance. Both bodies of literature are substantial. What remains underdeveloped is their systematic connection. Indonesian governance of Rohingya refugees has rarely been examined through an intersectional policy lens that connects legal and institutional arrangements with differentiated experiences of protection, exclusion, and access. This formulation avoids the unsustainable claim that intersectionality is new to Asia or refugee studies. Instead, the novelty lies in applying an established analytical framework to a comparatively underexamined dimension of Indonesia's non-Convention and prolonged-transit refugee regime.

Accordingly, this article examines how Indonesia's framework for handling Rohingya refugees constructs and responds to vulnerability from an intersectional perspective. It asks three questions: How are vulnerability and protection needs defined and operationalized within Indonesia's policy and institutional arrangements for Rohingya refugees? To what extent do these arrangements recognize interactions between refugee status and statelessness and other relevant social positions, including gender, age, ethnicity, religion, socioeconomic circumstances, and family situation? What protection gaps become visible when Indonesia's response is examined through an intersectional lens? These questions do not assume that every identity dimension produces disadvantage in the same way; relevant intersections and their consequences must be established empirically.

The study contributes in three respects. Empirically, it moves beyond treating "the Rohingya" as a homogeneous policy population by examining differentiated conditions within a population already affected by structural exclusion. Analytically, it connects intersectionality with scholarship on Indonesia's non-Convention and prolonged-transit refugee regime, allowing vulnerability to be understood in relation to policy design, institutional fragmentation, and unequal access to protection. From a policy perspective, it identifies where categorical or emergency-oriented interventions may

overlook protection needs arising from overlapping social and legal positions. The contribution is therefore not to claim that intersectionality is new to refugee studies or that Indonesia lacks mechanisms for identifying vulnerable refugees, but to assess how effectively existing arrangements recognize differentiated vulnerabilities and where institutional blind spots remain. This framework guides the analysis that follows, from Indonesia's refugee-governance architecture to the differentiated vulnerabilities of Rohingya refugees and their implications for more inclusive protection.

METHODS

Research Design and Analytical Approach

This study employed a qualitative descriptive design to examine how vulnerability is constructed and addressed within policies and institutional arrangements concerning Rohingya refugees in Indonesia. The design was appropriate because the research questions focus on how protection needs are defined, how differentiated vulnerabilities are recognized, and what protection gaps emerge when existing arrangements are examined through an intersectional perspective. Rather than measuring prevalence or testing causal relationships, the study interpreted policy provisions, institutional responsibilities, and documented practices relevant to refugee protection.

Intersectionality served as the principal analytical framework (Hankivsky 2014). It was used to examine how refugee status and statelessness interact with socially consequential positions including gender, age, ethnicity, religion, socioeconomic circumstances, and family situation. The analysis therefore moved beyond treating women, children, older persons, or other groups as separate categories of vulnerability and considered whether policies recognize vulnerabilities arising from overlapping social and legal positions. This orientation also directed attention to how institutional classifications and rules may shape access to protection.

Indonesia was selected as the case because the study investigates the national framework governing Rohingya refugees. The principal unit of analysis was the policies, institutional arrangements, and documented practices through which Rohingya refugees are governed

and assisted. Local-government materials were included where relevant to implementation of national policy.

Data Sources and Collection

The study relied entirely on documentary data. No refugees, government officials, humanitarian workers, or other participants were recruited or interviewed; participant sampling, recruitment procedures, and interview or survey instruments were therefore not applicable.

The documentary material comprised primary and secondary sources. Primary sources included official documents produced by Indonesian central and local government institutions and materials issued by international and national organizations involved in refugee protection and assistance. These included documents from intergovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations, social-service institutions, immigration authorities, and other agencies involved in refugee management. They were used to identify formal policies, institutional mandates, categories of vulnerability, coordination arrangements, and forms of protection or assistance.

Secondary sources consisted mainly of peer-reviewed studies on Rohingya displacement, refugee governance in Indonesia, statelessness, refugee protection, vulnerability, and intersectionality. Relevant mass-media reports were also consulted when they provided information on refugee arrivals, policy implementation, or institutional responses not fully documented elsewhere. Media reports were treated as supplementary evidence rather than as equivalent to official documents or peer-reviewed scholarship.

Data collection was conducted through a focused literature and document review. Materials were selected for their relevance to the research questions, particularly those addressing legal and institutional responsibilities, humanitarian assistance, migration management, and differentiated vulnerability. Because no formal systematic-review protocol was used, the study is not presented as a systematic literature review and does not claim to provide an exhaustive archive of all relevant documents.

Data Analysis

The documentary material was analysed qualitatively in relation to the research questions and the intersectionality framework. First, the analysis identified how policies and institutional documents defined refugees, vulnerability, protection needs, institutional responsibilities, and forms of assistance. Second, it examined whether and how these documents differentiated among refugees according to relevant social and legal positions.

Third, the analysis assessed whether the policy framework recognized vulnerabilities arising from the interaction of multiple positions rather than treating each category independently. Particular attention was given to the distinction between categorical recognition, in which groups such as women or children are separately identified as vulnerable, and intersectional recognition, in which overlapping social and legal conditions are considered together. Where evidence permitted, discrepancies between formal policy provisions and documented implementation were also examined.

The analysis did not assume that every identity category automatically produced vulnerability or that all Rohingya refugees experienced policies in the same way. Interpretations were limited to relationships supported by documentary evidence. Where sources did not permit assessment of a particular intersection or protection outcome, this was treated as an evidentiary limitation rather than inferred from theory alone.

Trustworthiness and Limitations

Trustworthiness was addressed by comparing different types of documentary sources. Policy claims were checked against official documents where available, while interpretations were considered alongside peer-reviewed research and reports from organizations involved in refugee protection. This reduced dependence on a single institutional account and enabled areas of convergence, inconsistency, and omission to be identified. Analytical transparency was maintained by distinguishing between what documents explicitly stated and what was interpreted through the intersectional framework.

The study nevertheless has limitations. Reliance on documentary materials means that refugee experiences are examined indirectly through policies, institutional records, published research, and public reporting rather than through first-hand accounts from Rohingya refugees. Documentary availability may also vary across institutions and locations, while official and organizational sources may reflect particular institutional perspectives. The findings should therefore be understood as an analysis of Indonesia's refugee-policy framework and documented practices rather than a comprehensive account of all Rohingya experiences.

RESULTS

Intersectionality

The documentary analysis indicates that intersectionality is useful for distinguishing between the general vulnerability associated with refugee status and vulnerabilities that arise from the interaction of several social and legal positions. Following Crenshaw (1989, 1991), intersectionality understands disadvantage as emerging not from a single identity category but from the interaction of identities and structures of power. In the context of forced migration, this means that refugee status cannot be examined independently from gender, age, ethnicity, religion, socioeconomic circumstances, citizenship status, disability, or family position.

This distinction is relevant to the Rohingya because their vulnerability begins with a condition that already combines ethnicity, religion, and statelessness. As a Muslim ethnic minority excluded from citizenship in Myanmar, Rohingya refugees enter displacement after experiencing restrictions on movement, education, health care, livelihoods, and political participation. Their subsequent status as refugees adds another layer of legal and institutional uncertainty. The documentary evidence examined in this study further shows that these shared conditions do not affect all Rohingya refugees identically. Women, children, people with disabilities, older persons, single parents, and economically dependent refugees may encounter different risks even within the same displacement and protection system.

The analysis therefore distinguishes between categorical vulnerability and intersectional vulnerability. Categorical approaches identify groups such as women or children as vulnerable populations. An intersectional approach asks how membership in such categories interacts with other conditions. A Rohingya woman, for example, may simultaneously experience the consequences of gender inequality, statelessness, refugee status, economic dependency, and restricted access to formal employment. Similarly, an unaccompanied Rohingya child may experience vulnerabilities produced by age, separation from family, statelessness, interrupted education, refugee status, and exposure to trafficking.

This distinction provides the basis for interpreting the findings that follow. It does not imply that all Rohingya refugees experience every form of vulnerability, nor that every identity category necessarily produces disadvantage. Instead, it directs attention to the specific interactions supported by the documentary evidence and to whether Indonesian refugee-management arrangements are capable of identifying and responding to them.

The Intertwining of Identities and Vulnerabilities of Rohingya Refugees in Indonesia

The findings show that the vulnerability of Rohingya refugees in Indonesia develops across several stages of displacement. Their initial vulnerability is rooted in exclusion from citizenship and systematic discrimination in Myanmar. The 1982 Citizenship Law effectively excluded the Rohingya from citizenship, contributing to restrictions on civil and political rights, freedom of movement, education, health care, and other basic services. Episodes of violence and military operations subsequently forced large numbers to flee toward Bangladesh and other countries in South and Southeast Asia.

Indonesia, particularly Aceh, became one of the locations reached by Rohingya travelling by sea. Earlier arrivals in 2009 and 2012 were followed by larger maritime arrivals in Aceh in 2015. The source material documents the important role of Acehnese fishermen in rescuing Rohingya

at sea despite initial government reluctance to permit disembarkation (Alunaza and Juani 2017; Sari, Hidayat, and Pratisti 2018). Refugees were subsequently accommodated in temporary facilities supported by local governments, UNHCR, and IOM, while some were later relocated to Medan, Makassar, Jabodetabek, and other locations (Nst 2018; Puspita and Nofli 2024).

Statelessness remains a central structural vulnerability after arrival. Rohingya refugees do not enter Indonesia simply as displaced persons but as people already deprived of effective nationality protection. In Indonesia, their circumstances intersect with another temporary legal status. Because Indonesia is not a party to the 1951 Refugee Convention or the 1967 Protocol, refugee management is primarily governed through domestic administrative arrangements, particularly Presidential Regulation No. 125 of 2016. Refugees receive temporary protection and humanitarian assistance but do not obtain a conventional pathway to permanent settlement or unrestricted access to formal employment.

This prolonged temporariness has economic and psychological consequences. The source material links restricted employment opportunities and dependence on humanitarian assistance with financial insecurity, particularly among refugees who remain in Indonesia for years (Fauzan et al. 2022). Limited global resettlement opportunities and Australian deterrence policies have further contributed to prolonged stays (Mixed Migration Centre 2021; Saputra, Zulfa, and Riyanta 2024). Refugees who have already experienced persecution and forced migration may consequently face continuing uncertainty concerning resettlement, livelihood, family life, and future mobility. Prabowo, Akim, and Sudirman (2022) also identify limitations in access to basic necessities and health care within this prolonged transit environment.

Gender intersects with these structural conditions in specific ways. The documentary evidence identifies Rohingya women as particularly exposed to sexual and gender-based violence, exploitation, economic dependency, and limitations in reproductive health services. These vulnerabilities cannot be attributed to gender alone. Statelessness, displacement, limited employment opportunities, insecure accommodation, family

responsibilities, and dependence on assistance can intensify the risks faced by women. Women who are heads of households may experience additional economic and caregiving pressures.

Age similarly produces differentiated vulnerabilities. Rohingya children may arrive after years of exclusion from schooling in Myanmar and further educational disruption during displacement. In Indonesia, Circular Letter No. 75253/A.A4/HK/2019 provides a basis for refugee children to access education, but the documentary material identifies significant limitations. Education for refugee children should not impose costs on national or regional budgets, Indonesian citizens receive priority, and restrictions apply to formal educational certification. The resulting arrangement provides some educational access but does not place refugee children on the same footing as Indonesian students. For Rohingya children, therefore, age interacts with refugee status, statelessness, disrupted schooling, and socioeconomic dependency.

Unaccompanied children face additional risks, particularly trafficking and exploitation. The wider regional evidence on human smuggling also shows that refugees seeking onward movement to Malaysia may become vulnerable to trafficking networks. The discovery of trafficking camps and mass graves along the Thailand-Malaysia border illustrates the dangers associated with irregular movement. Economic hardship in Indonesia can reinforce these risks where refugees perceive Malaysia as offering better employment prospects or family connections. The evidence therefore shows how legal restrictions, economic insecurity, and aspirations for onward movement can combine to increase exposure to exploitation.

Disability and older age also appear in the documentary material, although the evidence is less extensive than those concerning women and children. Refugees with disabilities and elderly persons may experience difficulties accessing assistance when shelter, transportation, or logistical distribution systems are not adapted to their mobility or care needs. Their circumstances illustrate why uniform assistance does not necessarily result in equal access.

The findings also reveal that vulnerability is shaped by relationships with host communities. Aceh initially demonstrated substantial

humanitarian solidarity toward Rohingya refugees, influenced by *peumulia jamee*, or respect for guests, Muslim solidarity, and collective memories of conflict and the 2004 tsunami. Acehese fishermen's rescue of refugees in 2015 became an important example of locally grounded humanitarian action (Prabowo, Akim, and Sudirman 2022; Apsarini et al. 2024).

However, this hospitality has not remained constant. The source material documents increasing tensions surrounding refugee accommodation, allegations of misconduct involving some refugees, onward movement from shelters, competition over resources, and public uncertainty regarding the duration of refugee presence (Yunanda et al. 2024). Incidents of forced removal from shelters further demonstrate how refugees can move rapidly from being viewed as humanitarian subjects to being perceived as social or security problems. Such changes in local reception can have particularly serious consequences for women, children, and refugees who have already experienced violence and displacement.

Overall, the evidence shows that there is no single Rohingya refugee experience in Indonesia. Statelessness and refugee status create a common structural condition, but gender, age, family circumstances, economic position, disability, exposure to violence, and local social relations influence how vulnerability is experienced. These findings directly support the need to examine whether Indonesian policy responds only to broad refugee categories or also to the interaction of these conditions.

Evaluation of Indonesia's Policy towards Rohingya Refugees based on an Intersectional Perspective

The documentary evidence shows that Presidential Regulation No. 125 of 2016 represents an important institutional development in Indonesia's response to refugees. It established procedures for identification, rescue, temporary accommodation, security, assistance, and coordination among central and local government agencies and international organizations. However, its primary orientation remains administrative and operational. The regulation provides a mechanism for managing refugees but does not establish a comprehensive rights-based asylum framework or detailed procedures for identifying intersecting forms of vulnerability.

The policy framework nevertheless cannot be described as completely insensitive to vulnerability. Women and children are frequently treated as priority groups, and humanitarian organizations provide forms of protection related to gender-based violence and child protection. The more precise finding is that recognition is predominantly categorical rather than intersectional. The reviewed documents provide less evidence of systematic mechanisms for assessing how gender, age, disability, family situation, socioeconomic dependency, statelessness, and refugee status operate simultaneously.

Implementation also varies considerably across Indonesian cities. Aceh has primarily developed emergency accommodation in response to maritime arrivals, often relying on local humanitarian solidarity and cooperation with UNHCR and IOM. In 2015, local governments accommodated large numbers of Rohingya refugees in temporary facilities, while Lhokseumawe later used public facilities, including the Vocational Training Center, for accommodation. These responses demonstrate local capacity for rapid humanitarian adaptation, although they do not constitute a durable protection arrangement (Andriyani et al. 2023; Komnas HAM 2023).

Other locations demonstrate different institutional models. Makassar developed community accommodation through cooperation with IOM and has been characterized as comparatively more protection-oriented than an immigration-detention model (Missbach 2017). Medan formalized local coordination through the Task Force for Handling Refugees from Abroad under Mayoral Decree No. 465.2/30 K of 2022. Pekanbaru similarly established a refugee task force and developed plans for more centralized accommodation. Yogyakarta has also hosted refugees through community-based accommodation arrangements supported by IOM (Triceseria, Zayda, and Prabaningtyas 2015).

These examples do not all concern Rohingya refugees specifically and therefore cannot be interpreted as direct evidence of Rohingya experiences in every location. They nevertheless demonstrate that Presidential Regulation No. 125/2016 is implemented differently according to local capacity, infrastructure, cooperation with international organizations, and

social and political circumstances. Indonesia consequently has a nationally defined administrative framework but a locally variable protection environment.

Three principal protection gaps emerge from the evidence. First, the framework remains oriented toward emergency response and temporary management, while refugees may remain in Indonesia for prolonged periods. Restrictions on employment, uneven educational access, and limited durable solutions therefore become more consequential over time. Second, vulnerability is recognized more clearly through separate categories than through the interaction of multiple conditions. Third, the level and form of protection depend substantially on local capacity and external humanitarian support.

The findings therefore do not demonstrate a complete absence of refugee protection in Indonesia. Presidential Regulation No. 125/2016, local-government responses, and cooperation with UNHCR, IOM, civil society, and faith-based organizations have created important mechanisms for rescue, accommodation, assistance, and coordination. The principal limitation identified through the documentary analysis is narrower: these mechanisms do not yet show a systematic capacity to assess and respond to vulnerabilities generated through overlapping social and legal positions.

Taken together, the findings show that Indonesia's refugee-policy framework provides essential humanitarian and administrative responses but remains uneven in addressing differentiated vulnerability. Statelessness, refugee status, gender, age, economic dependency, family circumstances, disability, and local reception can combine to produce substantially different protection needs. The intersectional assessment therefore reveals not simply whether vulnerable groups are recognized, but where existing classifications and implementation arrangements may fail to capture the complexity of those needs. These empirical findings provide the basis for the discussion of how Indonesia's refugee-governance framework might be understood, and potentially strengthened, through an intersectional perspective.

DISCUSSION

The findings indicate that the principal limitation of Indonesia's response to Rohingya refugees is not the absence of protection, but the limited capacity of the existing framework to recognize how different forms of vulnerability interact. Presidential Regulation No. 125 of 2016 provides an important administrative basis for rescue, identification, temporary accommodation, coordination, and cooperation with international organizations. Yet these arrangements remain oriented primarily toward emergency management and categorical protection. This matters because Rohingya refugees do not experience vulnerability through refugee status alone. Statelessness, gender, age, family circumstances, economic dependency, disability, exposure to violence, and local reception combine in different ways, creating unequal protection needs within the same refugee population.

This finding refines rather than rejects previous scholarship on Indonesian refugee governance. Earlier studies have shown that refugee policy in Indonesia is characterized by legal ambiguity, temporary protection, migration control, and dependence on international organizations (Missbach 2017; Adiputera and Missbach 2021). The present findings support this assessment but add another dimension: policy limitations also arise from how vulnerability is classified. Existing arrangements may recognize women, children, older persons, or persons with disabilities as vulnerable groups, but such recognition is not necessarily intersectional. A woman who is also a single parent, stateless, economically dependent, and a survivor of violence may face risks not adequately captured by the category "woman" alone. Similarly, an unaccompanied child may simultaneously experience educational exclusion, trafficking risk, family separation, and legal uncertainty.

This interpretation reinforces Crenshaw's argument that disadvantage cannot always be understood through single-axis categories. In the Rohingya case, statelessness is especially significant because it precedes arrival in Indonesia and continues to shape refugee experiences after displacement. Rohingya refugees arrive after long-standing exclusion from citizenship, mobility, education, livelihoods, and other rights in Myanmar. Their temporary status in Indonesia adds another layer of uncertainty

because protection does not provide a conventional pathway to permanent integration or unrestricted employment. Statelessness and refugee status therefore intersect to produce prolonged institutional insecurity.

Gender provides a further illustration. The findings identify risks faced by Rohingya women relating to sexual and gender-based violence, exploitation, economic dependency, and restricted access to reproductive health services. These vulnerabilities do not arise from gender alone. They may be intensified by displacement, insecure legal status, restricted livelihood opportunities, family responsibilities, and dependence on humanitarian assistance. This interpretation is consistent with scholarship that cautions against treating refugee women either as a homogeneous group or solely as passive victims. An intersectional perspective allows vulnerability and agency to be considered together while remaining attentive to the structural constraints within which refugee women act.

The situation of Rohingya children leads to a similar conclusion. Their educational disadvantage is cumulative rather than singular. Many arrive after disrupted schooling or exclusion from education in Myanmar, while access in Indonesia remains constrained by temporary refugee status, funding limitations, prioritization of Indonesian citizens, and restrictions surrounding formal certification. Age-related vulnerability therefore intersects with statelessness, previous educational deprivation, socioeconomic dependency, and legal status. The important point is that formal access does not necessarily produce substantive equality. A child may be permitted to attend school while still facing institutional barriers that limit the value and continuity of that education.

Economic vulnerability likewise illustrates how multiple conditions interact. Restrictions on formal employment leave refugees dependent on humanitarian assistance or limited alternative resources (Sianturi and Viartasiwi 2021). As transit becomes prolonged, this dependency becomes more consequential. Economic insecurity may intersect with family responsibilities and aspirations for onward migration, including attempts to reach Malaysia, thereby increasing exposure to smugglers or trafficking networks. These findings confirm scholarship describing the prolonged character of refugee transit in Indonesia but extend it by

showing how temporariness interacts with economic, familial, and protection vulnerabilities. The documentary evidence does not establish causal relationships, however, and these risks cannot be assumed to affect all refugees equally.

The findings from Aceh also complicate simple narratives of either hospitality or hostility. Earlier responses were shaped by *peumulia jamee*, Muslim solidarity, and local memories of conflict and disaster. Acehese fishermen's rescue of Rohingya refugees demonstrates how local moral norms can generate humanitarian responses even when formal state arrangements are reluctant or limited. This supports previous scholarship emphasizing the importance of locally grounded solidarity in refugee reception.

At the same time, later tensions show that hospitality is conditional rather than permanent. Public acceptance can weaken amid uncertainty over the duration of refugee presence, perceived resource pressures, security concerns, allegations of misconduct, and dissatisfaction with shelter management. This qualifies any assumption that religious affinity automatically ensures sustained protection. Muslim solidarity may facilitate rescue and initial reception, but it cannot substitute for durable institutional arrangements, transparent coordination, and effective management of host-community relations. Social reception itself therefore becomes part of the conditions shaping refugee vulnerability.

Variation among Aceh, Makassar, Medan, Pekanbaru, and other cities further demonstrates that a common national framework does not produce uniform outcomes. Local governments implement Presidential Regulation No. 125 of 2016 differently according to administrative capacity, infrastructure, political circumstances, and cooperation with UNHCR, IOM, civil society, and other actors. Aceh has relied heavily on emergency responses to maritime arrivals, whereas other cities have developed community accommodation, formal task forces, or more planned institutional arrangements. This confirms earlier research describing Indonesian refugee governance as fragmented and locally mediated.

From an intersectional perspective, this local variation has an additional implication. Recognition of differentiated vulnerability depends

not only on national policy but also on whether local institutions have the capacity to operationalize protection. Formal acknowledgement of women, children, persons with disabilities, or other vulnerable groups may have limited practical significance where specialized services, facilities, trained personnel, referral mechanisms, or resources are unavailable. Local variation can therefore produce geographically uneven conditions of protection.

However, not every weakness identified in the findings can be attributed to the absence of an intersectional framework. Resource constraints, unclear institutional mandates, dependence on international funding, limited resettlement opportunities, political sensitivity surrounding refugees, and Indonesia's status outside the 1951 Refugee Convention may independently restrict policy implementation. Intersectionality should therefore not be treated as a complete solution to refugee governance. Its value lies primarily as a diagnostic framework for identifying forms of vulnerability that conventional administrative categories may obscure.

This qualification also refines the description of Indonesia's refugee response as "one-size-fits-all." The evidence does not support such a claim in its strongest form because humanitarian practice already recognizes women, children, survivors of violence, and other vulnerable groups. A more accurate conclusion is that protection remains predominantly categorical rather than intersectional. Categorical policy asks whether women, children, persons with disabilities, or older persons receive special attention. Intersectional analysis asks how several conditions operate simultaneously and whether institutions are equipped to recognize the resulting combination of needs.

This distinction has implications for information and assessment practices. Disaggregated information on gender, age, family situation, disability, health, economic circumstances, and experiences of violence can reveal combinations of vulnerability that broad classifications may conceal. A single mother who has survived violence may require a different combination of support from another woman who does not share those circumstances. Likewise, the needs of an unaccompanied child differ substantially from those of a child living with parents. The present study

supports more differentiated assessment but does not establish which specific data system or assessment procedure would be most effective.

Refugee participation raises a related issue. Policies constructed largely through administrative categories risk defining vulnerability from an institutional rather than experiential perspective. Refugees may possess knowledge of needs and risks that are not visible in official classifications. However, this study did not directly investigate Rohingya participation in policymaking and therefore cannot determine which participatory mechanisms would be feasible or effective. Participation should consequently be understood as a policy implication rather than an empirically tested solution.

The same caution applies to practical interventions. The findings justify greater attention to safe accommodation, reproductive and maternal health, psychosocial services, educational access, child protection, disability-sensitive support, and protection from trafficking because these correspond to documented vulnerabilities. They do not establish the effectiveness of particular interventions such as specific shelter models, livelihood schemes, microcredit arrangements, or regulatory amendments. Those measures would require separate implementation and evaluation research.

The study makes several contributions. Theoretically, it extends intersectionality in refugee governance by treating refugee status and statelessness as dimensions that interact with gender, age, socioeconomic circumstances, family situation, disability, and other social positions. This shifts attention from identity alone to the role of legal and institutional structures in shaping vulnerability. Empirically, the study demonstrates differentiation within a Rohingya population frequently treated as a single humanitarian category and shows how these vulnerabilities are mediated by prolonged transit and locally uneven governance. Methodologically, the documentary approach shows the value of examining formal policy alongside documented implementation in order to identify gaps between categorical recognition and differentiated protection. For policy, the analysis identifies where administrative classifications may overlook overlapping needs without assuming that intersectionality alone can resolve wider legal and institutional constraints.

These contributions must be considered within the study's limitations. Because the analysis relies on policy documents, organizational materials, published research, and public reporting, it does not directly capture how Rohingya refugees themselves interpret or prioritize their experiences. Documentary evidence is also uneven across locations and groups. Women and children are more visible in available materials than some other populations, including persons with disabilities and older refugees. The study therefore cannot determine the prevalence or relative severity of particular vulnerabilities, generalize individual experiences to all Rohingya refugees, establish causal relationships between policies and outcomes, or conclude that one locality provides universally better protection than another.

Within these boundaries, the findings support a more precise interpretation of Indonesia's refugee regime. Indonesia has developed meaningful mechanisms for rescue, temporary accommodation, humanitarian assistance, and coordination, while local governments, communities, and international organizations have adapted pragmatically to refugee arrivals. The unresolved problem is that these arrangements remain better suited to managing broad categories and immediate needs than to recognizing vulnerabilities produced through overlapping legal and social positions during prolonged displacement. Intersectionality therefore matters not because it replaces existing refugee policy, but because it reveals differences that administrative categories can obscure. For Rohingya refugees, whose displacement is already structured by statelessness and exclusion, this perspective provides a more precise understanding of both the achievements and the continuing limitations of Indonesia's protection framework.

CONCLUSION

This study shows that Indonesia's framework for handling Rohingya refugees, centred on Presidential Regulation No. 125 of 2016, provides an important administrative and humanitarian basis for rescue, temporary accommodation, coordination, and assistance, but remains limited in recognizing vulnerability as an intersectional condition. Vulnerability is

generally addressed through broad or categorical classifications rather than through systematic consideration of how refugee status and statelessness interact with gender, age, family circumstances, socioeconomic dependency, disability, and exposure to violence. The findings further show that these intersections produce differentiated protection needs. Rohingya women may face compounded risks associated with gender-based violence, economic dependence, and insecure legal status, while children may experience overlapping disadvantages related to statelessness, disrupted education, family separation, and prolonged uncertainty. Protection also varies across local contexts because implementation depends on institutional capacity, available resources, and cooperation among local governments, international organizations, and civil society. The principal contribution of this study is therefore to extend intersectional analysis to Indonesia's refugee-governance context by demonstrating that the key policy gap lies not in a complete absence of vulnerability recognition, but in the limited capacity of existing arrangements to identify and respond to vulnerabilities generated through overlapping social and legal positions.

These findings suggest that refugee protection in Indonesia would benefit from more differentiated assessment and service provision within the existing governance framework, including closer attention to gender-based violence, child protection, psychosocial needs, disability, family circumstances, educational access, and economic dependency. More systematic use of appropriately disaggregated information could also help institutions identify needs that broad categories may obscure, while meaningful refugee participation may improve understanding of protection concerns that are not readily visible in official documents. These implications should, however, be interpreted within the limits of the study. Because the analysis relies on policy documents, organizational materials, published research, and public reporting, it does not directly capture how Rohingya refugees themselves understand or prioritize their experiences, nor can it establish the prevalence of particular vulnerabilities or the effectiveness of specific interventions. Future research should therefore incorporate participatory and interview-based approaches with Rohingya refugees, compare protection practices across Indonesian localities, examine less visible groups such as older persons and persons with disabilities, and

evaluate how specific protection mechanisms operate in practice. Such work would help determine how an intersectional perspective can be translated from analytical diagnosis into more responsive and equitable refugee governance.

REFERENCES

- Adiputera, Yunizar, and Antje Missbach. 2021. "Indonesia's Foreign Policy Regarding the Forced Displacement of Rohingya Refugees: Muslim Solidarity, Humanitarianism, and Non-Interventionism." *Asia-Pacific Journal on Human Rights and the Law* 22 (1): 69–95. doi:10.1163/15718158-22010002.
- Akbar, Rashiq, Fathan Ramadavi Bukhari, and Ibrahim Ghifar Hamadi. 2024. "Krisis Pengungsi Rohingya di Aceh: Evaluasi Kebijakan Indonesia terhadap Ancaman Keamanan Non-Tradisional." *Indonesia Foreign Policy Review* 11 (1): Article 32. doi:10.5281/zenodo.14562491.
- Al-Faham, Hajer, Angelique M. Davis, and Rose Ernst. 2019. "Intersectionality: From Theory to Practice." *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 15: 247–65. doi:10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-101518-042942.
- Alunaza, Hardi, and M. Kholit Juani. 2017. "Kebijakan Pemerintah Indonesia melalui Sekuritisasi Migrasi Pengungsi Rohingya di Aceh Tahun 2012–2015." *Indonesian Perspective* 2 (1): 1–17. doi:10.14710/ip.v2i1.15535.
- Andersson Nystedt, Tanya, Tobias Herder, Anette Agardh, and Benedict OppongAsamoah. 2025. "Included and Excluded: An Intersectionality-Based Policy Analysis of Young Migrants' Vulnerability to Sexual Violence in Sweden." *International Journal for Equity in Health* 24: 86. doi:10.1186/s12939-025-02454-x.
- Andriyani, Lusi, Putri Raisa Islamy, Wachid Ridwan, and Jauchar B. 2023. "Kebijakan Pemerintah Daerah Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam terhadap Pengungsi Rohingya Tahun 2020–2022." *Jurnal Sosial-Politika* 4 (1): 20–27. doi:10.54144/jsp.v4i1.63.

- Apsarini, Aulia Aristawidya, Laila Sofwan, Muhammad Naufal Kurnia, and Salman Fitrahadi Muzakki. 2024. "Tindakan Indonesia dalam Melindungi Pengungsi Rohingya Berdasarkan Perspektif Etika Utilitarianisme." *Das Sollen: Jurnal Kajian Kontemporer Hukum dan Masyarakat* 2 (1).
- Berry, Stephanie Eleanor, and Isilay Taban. 2021. "The Right of Minority-Refugees to Preserve Their Cultural Identity: An Intersectional Analysis." *Netherlands Quarterly of Human Rights* 39 (3): 198–219. doi:10.1177/092405192111033419.
- Branco, Ana Sofia, and Romana Xerez. 2024. "Asylum Seekers' Trajectories of Exclusion: An Analysis Through the Lens of Intersectionality." *Social Inclusion* 12: Article 8428. doi:10.17645/si.8428.
- Carastathis, Anna. 2014. "The Concept of Intersectionality in Feminist Theory." *Philosophy Compass* 9(5): 304–14. doi:10.1111/phc3.12129.
- Cavin, Ishak Jacques, Alexander Hendra Dwi Asmara, and Martinus Dam Febrianto. 2026. "Promoting Hospitality and Protection: The Role of Faith-Based Organizations in the Arrival of Rohingya Refugees in Aceh, Indonesia." *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*. OnlineFirst. doi:10.1177/01171968261470173.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 1989. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics." *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 1989 (1): 139–67.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 1991. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review* 43 (6): 1241–99. doi:10.2307/1229039.
- Damaledo, Andrey. 2021. "Identity Politics and Refugee Policies in Kupang, Eastern Indonesia: A Politico-Historical Perspective." *Asian Journal of Law and Society* 8 (3): 507–20. doi:10.1017/als.2021.6.
- Dewansyah, Bilal, and Ratu Durotun Nafisah. 2021. "The Constitutional Right to Asylum and Humanitarianism in Indonesian Law: 'Foreign Refugees' and PR 125/2016." *Asian Journal of Law and Society* 8 (3): 536–57. doi:10.1017/als.2021.8.

- Fauzan, Fauzan, Helmi Helmi, Rudi Febriamansyah, and Sri Oktavia. 2022. "The Importance of Humanistic Dimension in Managing Rohingya Refugees in the Indonesian Western Province of Aceh." *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities* 30 (3): 1049–69. doi:10.47836/pjssh.30.3.07.
- Flamand, Christine, Francesca Raimondo, and Sylvie Saroléa. 2023. "Examining Asylum Seekers' 'Other Vulnerabilities': Intersectionality in Context." *European Journal of Migration and Law* 25 (4): 501–24. doi:10.1163/15718166-12340165.
- Hankivsky, Olena. 2014. *Intersectionality 101*. Vancouver: Institute for Intersectionality Research & Policy, Simon Fraser University.
- Hasan, Finahliyah, Randy W. Nandyatama, Bayu D. Kurniadi, and Ni Made Diah Apsari Dewi. 2025. "Refugee Regime in the Prolonged Transit: The Role of Non-State Actors in Indonesia's Fragmented Governance." *Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees* 40 (2): 1–17. doi:10.25071/1920-7336.41386.
- Human Rights Watch. 2017. "All of My Body Was Pain": Sexual Violence against Rohingya Women and Girls in Burma. November 16.
- Human Rights Watch. 2024. "Indonesia: Protect Newly Arrived Rohingya Refugees: Investigate, Prevent Anti-Rohingya Violence in Aceh." January 16.
- Indonesia. 2016. *Peraturan Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 125 Tahun 2016 tentang Penanganan Pengungsi dari Luar Negeri*. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2016 Nomor 368.
- Kanal, Maria, and Susan B. Rottmann. 2021. "Everyday Agency: Rethinking Refugee Women's Agency in Specific Cultural Contexts." *Frontiers in Psychology* 12: 726729. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2021.726729.
- Kaur, Kushilpal, Ahmad Hatim Sulaiman, Chee Kok Yoon, Aili Hanim Hashim, Manveen Kaur, Koh Ong Hui, Zuraida Ahmad Sabki, Benedict Francis, Sarbhan Singh, and Jesjeet Singh Gill. 2020. "Elucidating Mental Health Disorders among Rohingya Refugees: A Malaysian Perspective." *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 17 (18): 6730. doi:10.3390/ijerph17186730.

- Kneebone, Susan, Antje Missbach, and Balawyn Jones. 2021. "The False Promise of Presidential Regulation No. 125 of 2016?" *Asian Journal of Law and Society* 8 (3): 431–50. doi:10.1017/als.2021.2.
- Komisi Nasional Hak Asasi Manusia Republik Indonesia. 2023. "Pernyataan Komnas HAM Terkait Penanganan Pengungsi Rohingya di Aceh." Keterangan Pers No. 70/HM.00/XII/2023, December 28.
- Krustiyati, J. M. Atik. 2012. "Kebijakan Penanganan Pengungsi di Indonesia: Kajian dari Konvensi Pengungsi 1951 dan Protokol 1967." *Law Review* 12 (2): 171–92.
- Mahmood, Syed S., Emily Wroe, Arlan Fuller, and Jennifer Leaning. 2017. "The Rohingya People of Myanmar: Health, Human Rights, and Identity." *The Lancet* 389 (10081): 1841–50. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(16)00646-2.
- McNevin, Anne, Antje Missbach, and Deddy Mulyana. 2016. "The Rationalities of Migration Management: Control and Subversion in an Indonesia-Based Counter-Smuggling Campaign." *International Political Sociology* 10 (3): 223–40. doi:10.1093/ips/olw009.
- McNevin, Anne, and Antje Missbach. 2018. "Hospitality as a Horizon of Aspiration (or, What the International Refugee Regime Can Learn from Acehnese Fishermen)." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 31 (3): 292–313. doi:10.1093/jrs/fey014.
- Missbach, Antje. 2017. "Accommodating Asylum Seekers and Refugees in Indonesia: From Immigration Detention to Containment in 'Alternatives to Detention'." *Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees* 33 (2): 32–44. doi:10.7202/1043061ar.
- Missbach, Antje. 2019. "Asylum Seekers' and Refugees' Decision-Making in Transit in Indonesia: The Need for In-Depth and Longitudinal Research." *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 175 (4): 419–45. doi:10.1163/22134379-17504006.
- Missbach, Antje, and Yunizar Adiputera. 2021. "The Role of Local Governments in Accommodating Refugees in Indonesia: Investigating Best-Case and Worst-Case Scenarios." *Asian Journal of Law and Society* 8 (3): 490–506. doi:10.1017/als.2021.5.

- Missbach, Antje, and Gunnar Stange. 2021. "Muslim Solidarity and the Lack of Effective Protection for Rohingya Refugees in Southeast Asia." *Social Sciences* 10 (5): 166. doi:10.3390/socsci10050166.
- Mitra, Rohini, and Zeynep Şahin-Mencütek. 2024. "Bargaining (In) Visibility: Rohingya Refugees and the Politics of Visibility in India." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 37 (3): 716–33. doi:10.1093/jrs/feae049.
- Mixed Migration Centre. 2021. *A Transit Country No More: Refugees and Asylum Seekers in Indonesia*. May 27.
- Nst, E. N. Domloboy. 2018. "Peranan International Organization for Migration (IOM) dalam Menangani Permasalahan Refugees (Pengungsi) Rohingya di Indonesia." *Jurnal PIR: Power in International Relations* 2 (1): 70–81. doi:10.22303/pir.2.1.2017.70-81.
- O'Brien, Melanie, and Gerhard Hoffstaedter. 2020. "'There We Are Nothing, Here We Are Nothing!': The Enduring Effects of the Rohingya Genocide." *Social Sciences* 9 (11): 209. doi:10.3390/socsci9110209.
- Pemerintah Kota Pekanbaru. 2025. "Pemko Pekanbaru Tunggu Persetujuan IOM Relokasi Pengungsi Rohingya." January 8.
- Prabandari, Atin, and Yunizar Adiputera. 2019. "Alternative Paths to Refugee and Asylum Seeker Protection in Malaysia and Indonesia." *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal* 28 (2): 132–54. doi:10.1177/0117196819850946.
- Prabowo, Joseph Rizki, Akim Akim, and Arfin Sudirman. 2022. "Peran Tentara Nasional Indonesia dalam Menanggulangi Pengungsi dari Luar Negeri: Studi Kasus Pengungsi Rohingya di Indonesia (2015–2020)." *Aliansi: Jurnal Politik, Keamanan dan Hubungan Internasional* 1 (1). doi:10.24198/aliansi.v1i1.38863.
- Priddy, Grace, Zoe Doman, Emily Berry, and Saleh Ahmed. 2022. "Gender-Based Violence in a Complex Humanitarian Context: Unpacking the Human Sufferings among Stateless Rohingya Women." *Ethnicities* 22 (2): 215–32. doi:10.1177/14687968221078373.

- Puspita, Rona, and Nofli. 2024. "Handling of Rohingya Refugees in Indonesia as a Transit Country." *Indonesian Law Journal* 17 (1): 1–24. doi:10.33331/ilj.v17i1.150.
- Qothrunnada, Annisa Fortuna, and Muhammad Zulfa Shidfan. 2024. "Perlindungan Hukum terhadap Etnis Rohingya di Indonesia." *Jurnal ISO: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial, Politik dan Humaniora* 4 (2): 1–10. doi:10.53697/iso.v4i2.1813.
- Riley, Andrew, Andrea Varner, Peter Ventevogel, M. M. Taimur Hasan, and Courtney Welton-Mitchell. 2017. "Daily Stressors, Trauma Exposure, and Mental Health among Stateless Rohingya Refugees in Bangladesh." *Transcultural Psychiatry* 54 (3): 304–31. doi:10.1177/1363461517705571.
- Sadjad, Mahardhika Sjamsoe'oed. 2021. "What Are Refugees Represented to Be? A Frame Analysis of the Presidential Regulation No. 125 of 2016 Concerning the Treatment of Refugees 'from Abroad'." *Asian Journal of Law and Society* 8 (3): 451–66. doi:10.1017/als.2021.3.
- Salehin, Mohammad Musfequs, and Md. Aslam Hossain. 2025. "The Rohingya Dilemma: Exploring the Challenges of Local Integration in Bangladesh." *International Migration* 63 (3): e70027. doi:10.1111/imig.70027.
- Sampson, Robyn C., Sandra M. Gifford, and Savitri Taylor. 2016. "The Myth of Transit: The Making of a Life by Asylum Seekers and Refugees in Indonesia." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42 (7): 1135–52. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2015.1130611.
- Saputra, Fahrizal, Eva Achjani Zulfa, and Stanislaus Riyanta. 2024. "Indonesia as a Transit State in Handling Overseas Refugees from the Aspect of Immigration Policy." *Journal Transnational Universal Studies* 2 (5): 288–304. doi:10.58631/jtus.v2i5.104.
- Sari, Deasy Silvy, Taufik Hidayat, and Aliyuna Pratisti. 2018. "Indonesian Government Policy on Rohingya Refugees." *Andalas Journal of International Studies* 7 (1): 1–13. doi:10.25077/ajis.7.1.1-13.2018.
- Shohel, M. Mahruf C. 2023. "Lives of the Rohingya Children in Limbo: Childhood, Education, and Children's Rights in Refugee Camps in

- Bangladesh.” *Prospects* 53: 131–49. doi:10.1007/s11125-022-09631-8.
- Sholeh, Badrus. 2019. “Indonesia and ASEAN Responses on Rohingya Refugees.” In *The Palgrave Handbook of Ethnicity*, edited by Steven Ratuva, 1891–1906. Singapore: Palgrave Macmillan. doi:10.1007/978-981-13-2898-5_170.
- Sianturi, Marupa Hasudungan, and Nino Viartasiwi. 2021. “Advocating the Temporary Rights to Work for Refugees and Asylum Seekers in Transit in Indonesia.” *Indonesia Law Review* 11 (3): 249–66. doi:10.15742/ilrev.v11n3.2.
- Sunam, Ramesh. 2023. “When Bare Life Is Bearable: The Life Projects of Rohingya and Hazara Refugees Living in Malaysia.” *International Migration Review* 57 (1): 449–74. doi:10.1177/01979183221106174.
- Suyatna, I Nyoman, I Made Budi Arsika, Ni Gusti Ayu Dyah Satyawati, Rohaida Nordin, and Balawyn Jones. 2021. “Assessment of the Responsibility of Local Governments in Indonesia for the Management of Refugee Care.” *Asian Journal of Law and Society* 8 (3): 467–89. doi:10.1017/als.2021.4.
- Taha, Dina. 2019. *Intersectionality and Other Critical Approaches in Refugee Research: An Annotated Bibliography*. LERRN Working Paper 3. Ottawa: Local Engagement Refugee Research Network. doi:10.22215/glrnw/1931661.
- Taha, Ikram A., Muhammad Syaroni Rofii, and Stanislaus Riyanta. 2024. “Rohingya Refugees: A Study of Indonesian Government Policies.” *Asian Journal of Engineering, Social and Health* 3 (4): 813–21. doi:10.46799/ajesh.v3i4.298.
- Tan, Nikolas Feith. 2016. “The Status of Asylum Seekers and Refugees in Indonesia.” *International Journal of Refugee Law* 28 (3): 365–83. doi:10.1093/ijrl/eew045.
- Tay, Alvin K., Andrew Riley, Rakibul Islam, Courtney Welton-Mitchell, Bethany Duchesne, Victoria Waters, Andrea Varner, Brahim Moussa, A. N. M. Mahmudul Alam, M. A. Elshazly, Derrick Silove, and Peter Ventevogel. 2019. “The Culture, Mental Health and Psychosocial

- Wellbeing of Rohingya Refugees: A Systematic Review.” *Epidemiology and Psychiatric Sciences* 28 (5): 489–94. doi:10.1017/S2045796019000192.
- Tobing, Dio Herdiawan. 2021. “Connecting the Obligation Gap: Indonesia’s Non-Refoulement Responsibility Beyond the 1951 Refugee Convention.” *Asian Journal of Law and Society* 8 (3): 521–35. doi:10.1017/als.2021.7.
- Triceseria, A. A. I. Diah, Nurul Azizah Zayda, and Rizka Fiani Prabaningtyas. 2015. “A New Approach to Refugee’s Welfare through the Role of Community: Case Study of Refugee’s Community Centre in Sewon.” *Global South Review* 2 (1): 1–12.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. 2016. *Global Trends: Forced Displacement in 2015*. Geneva: UNHCR.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. 2021. *Left Adrift at Sea: Dangerous Journeys of Refugees across the Bay of Bengal and Andaman Sea*. August 19.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. 2025. *Rohingya Boat Arrivals, 31 December 2025*. UNHCR Indonesia.
- Yunanda, Rizki, Teuku Kemal Fasya, Dedi Fariadi, Kurniawati Kurniawati, Dini Rizki, and Faizul Aulia. 2024. “The Social Impact of the Existence of Rohingya Refugees in Aceh.” *Community: Pengawas Dinamika Sosial* 10 (1): 129–41. doi:10.35308/jcpds.v10i1.9009.