



**Doctoral School of
International Relations
and Political Science**

THESIS SUMMARY

Sodip Roy

Exploring the Links between Camp governmentality and Agentic Responses of
Rohingya Refugee in Bangladesh

PHD DISSERTATION

Supervisors:

Lehoczki Bernadett Judit, PhD

Giorgia Dona, PhD

Budapest 2025

DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND POLITICAL
SCIENCE

CORVINUS UNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST

Thesis Summary

Sodip Roy

Exploring the Links between Camp governmentality and Agentic Responses of
Rohingya Refugee in Bangladesh

DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

Supervisors:

Lehoczki Bernadett Judit, PhD

Giorgia Dona, PhD

©Sodip Roy

Contents

1. RESEARCH BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION OF THE TOPIC	4
1.1 Research objectives	6
1.2 Research questions	6
2. RESEARCH METHODS	6
3. FINDINGS OF THE RESEARCH	8
3.1 Structure and mechanism of camp governmentality	8
3.2 Power dynamics of the PRS and fragmented camp governmentality	10
3.3 Governmentality induced agency of the refugee.....	11
4. CONCLUSION.....	12
4.1 Contribution	13
4.2 Limitation	13
5. MAIN REFERENCE	13
6. LIST OF PUBLICATION: ONLY ON ROHINGYA REFUGEE.....	15

1. RESEARCH BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION OF THE TOPIC

While approximately 10 million refugees live in complete encampments globally for decades, 1.3 million of Rohingya refugee live in the 32 camps in the Cox's Bazar district of Bangladesh. They live under the humanitarian response of the Government of Bangladesh and hundreds of NGOs and IGOs. State actors and the humanitarian organizations as non-state actors maintain the camps. Refugees also participate, demonstrate, and negotiate on their issues in the camps. Some of the Rohingya camps exist since 1991, there are no major chaos and conflict in the camps. However there is an explicit power plays in these refugee camps. This power dynamic in the camps is labelled as 'governmentality'. So, there is no scope to remain 'subhuman life' or bare life forever for refugees in this complex and protracted situation. But most of the studies have overlooked power and power play-based agencies of refugees. Existing studies did not investigate anything about connection between camp governmentality and refugee agency. This thesis argues that refugee agency is an inevitable tool of camp governmentality. And a balance between these two phenomenon supports the stability and longevity of protracted refugee situation (PRS).

Refugees are special categories of people and 'undesirable' to their destination (Agier, 2011; Malkki, 1996). Refugee and refugee camps as political space attract high interest in international politics (Loescher, 1996; Haddad, 2008). They are threat to national and international order (Owens, 2009), thus state and non-state actors take the responsibility to maintain them. Although designed as temporary, humanitarian responses in refugee camps often become indefinite, particularly in the Global South. Stability of the refugee camps gets priority to ensure peace and security in the region until a durable solution for the forcibly displaced people (Jacobsen, 1999). And humanitarian regime (international refugee regime-IRR) devises many formal and informal techniques, policies, strategies to hold the refugees in the camps. The entire system produces a particular type of governmentality meaning that different actors exercise and circulate power among them. This power dynamics have been marked as 'hybrid governmentality (Wahab, 2022) 'graduated sovereignty (Ong, 2000), gusted sovereignty (Laocharoenwong, 2020) 'layered sovereignty (Turner, 2005) and so on (Hyndmann, 2000; Hanafi & Long, 2010; Ramadan, 2012; Farzana, 2016). Despite 'othering' measures operate in the everyday life of refugee camps, agency transforms among them in the time being. Refugees (re)construct new relationship, skills, capacities and ambiguities or agencies in the camps (Hyndmann, 1997; Turner, 2015; Omata,

2017; Oesch, 2017). Likewise security and international cooperation about refugee crisis are influenced by the agency of the refugee (Huysmans, Dobson & Prokhovnik 2006). Activities like raising awareness and participation in decision-making are encouraged to tackle prevalent risks in the encampment (Krause, 2021). Put differently, camp governmentality and refugee agency are two connected attributes of refugee camp governance. But the existing studies did not discover any connection between these two aspects of camp operation. In this hindsight, it is attempted here to understand the mechanism of stability and existence of PRS. Saying differently, refugee agency turns into an integral tool of camp operation in the multiplicity of power relations of the refugee camps. This investigation refers to the Rohingya refugee camps in Bangladesh. Since the beginning of these camps in 1991, humanitarian government has been capable of maintaining a peaceful situation, most importantly it remains stable even after the largest influx in 2017. I mark this gap as problem, thus require an academic attention to understand the stability and longevity of refugee camps like Rohingya camps in Bangladesh.

Rohingya camps is a PRS consisting of both new and three decades old refugeehood. It comprises of the most homogenous forcibly displaced people in a single set-up ever. Almost every relevant IGOs and INGOs have been engaged in this world's largest refugee responses so far. Neither the state actors nor the IRR could bring forth any solution to this protracted situation. Regional peace and security are directly linked with a refugee crisis while their transnational mobility can hamper the global security as well. Resultantly, (peaceful)encampment remains the main strategy keeping the stability of regional order in South and Southeast Asia. So, I find the Rohingya refugee camps in Bangladesh as one of the significant cases of research in the discipline of IR.

Camp governmentality and refugee' agency requires an in-depth and long-time fieldwork that is oftentimes more challenging for a researcher from a different culture and land. In that sense, as a national from the same country and having research experience on Rohingya refugee offered me a vantage point to examine the case. Besides, it is not always necessarily required to select cases from far away in field research, a field can be somewhere closer to his/her home too (Lamont, 2022). From positionality perspective, I realized for minimum gap between 'emic and etic' accounts of Rohingya camps. Rohingya refugee in the camps in Bangladesh offered a better lens to investigate how and what factors have driven the refugees for agentic responses to lead life in humanitarian emergencies and complex governmentality. Moreover, it helps to unfold how the state and non-state actors respond and affect their interaction with refugees. In addition, the

growing academic significance of the Rohingya refugee crisis also has influenced me to select this case in Bangladesh.

1.1 Research objectives

In this hindsight this research set the following research objectives. This study aimed to (1) broaden the understanding of camp governmentality by discovering refugee as an integral part of fragmented camp governmentality; (2) unfold refugee agency as a ‘proxy tool’ for refugee to survive in particular camp governmentality; (3) draw the importance of link between camp governmentality and refugee agency in IRR towards the stability and longevity of PRS; (4) widen the scope of application of ethnography in studying phenomena of IR.

1.2 Research questions

During setting the research objectives, it is prevalent that existing studies did not connect the two important phenomenon of long-term refugee camps. Thus this research deals with the overarching question of ‘what is the connection between camp governmentality and agentic responses of Rohingya refugee in Bangladesh’? With a view to better comprehension of burgeoning issues of refugee crisis, this research breaks down this questions into several sub-questions. They are: how does governmentality (formal and informal) operate in the Rohingya refugee camps? how does the Rohingya refugees’ agency interact with the camp governmentality?, how do the state and non-state actors perceive refugees’ agencies in the camp governmentality?

2. RESEARCH METHODS

My main assumption and claim is that there is a strong connection between camp governmentality and refugee agency in the camps. Existing studies put sovereignty-territory in the centre. Many scholars have labelled this power dynamics as ‘layered sovereignty’ graduated sovereignty, gusted sovereignty, territorial governmentality and so on. But they have failed to grasp a comprehensive lens of camp governmentality. Thus I take on the Michel Foucault’s Governmentality theory, and Ethnographic methodology to investigate the issue. A general concept of agency has been considered in connecting the two phenomenon too. Governmentality is the exercise of power (Casasampera, 2021). Theory of Governmentality by Michel Foucault entails different forms of power such as sovereign power, bio-power/bio-politics, disciplinary power/liberal tactics, microphysics of power along with multifaceted policies, techniques, mechanisms. Foucault emphasizes power and every mechanism of population management or

control. In the later stage, he includes microphysics of power in his interpretation of power and population management. He defines microphysics of power that individual's body as well as every source of power wherever it is installed and applied (Foucault, 1980). For Foucault, 'power is everywhere; not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere' (1978, p, 93). He extended his interpretation that the exercise and circulation of power necessarily bring forth changes and resistance among the subject, or create subjectivity or agency. Other than changes or resistance, different activities, practices, tactics, capability and wellbeing efforts are major manifestation of agency too.

This selection of methodology is also theory driven. Besides to discern the refugee camps governmentality better I employed bottom-up directions to connect it with the agentic responses of refugees. In this regard, I found ethnography as an effective mechanism for discovering the camp governmentality from the bottom or the ground. The governmentality of Michel Foucault differs from many state-centric approaches (Lippert, 1999). It equips the researcher to avoid state-centrism in empirical evidence. While Everyday IR has been at the forefront of investigation, ethnography comes up a tested mechanism to focus on such sites (everyday life) for international inquiry (Lamont, 2022; Lie, 2013). Generally, in the Constructivist perspective of IR, predominantly in Critical scholarship every human being matters whether located remotely or in the internationally influential hub. Although refugees belong to the bottom of a nation-state or society, they are hyper-visible nationally and internationally. In this regard, Bulley's (2014) review is mentionable that ethnography can illustrate well the very nature and meaning of camp spaces, agency, and uncontrollability of the refugee community.

In this contextual and theoretical hindsight, I adopted an ethnographic approach to investigate the power dynamics and emergence of refugee agency in the Rohingya camps. The fieldwork was conducted in the Rohingya camps for six months from August 2022 to January 2023. During the six-month fieldwork the first month was spent mapping different attributes of the total 31 refugee camps. Following an inclusive criterion, finally, six camps—five from *Ukhiya* and one from the *Teknaf* area—were in the sample for in-depth fieldwork. The methods of data collection followed in-depth interview, observation, hang out and field notes. Necessarily my research consider all the three types of actors of the camps. The research participants are diverse categories of state actors (e.g. Camp in Charge, Armed Police Battalion member), non-state actors or humanitarian

organizations (e.g. different categories of NGOs, and UN organizations) and most importantly the other participant is refugee. I interviewed and observed refugees from different categories, location, and their positions in the camps. And the total number of participants turned out to 57 including 36 refugees, 10 state actors, 11 humanitarian actors. This qualitative data analysis follows the seven steps suggested by JW Creswell (2009). NVivo software was used in sorting, coding and developing themes and matrices from the data. Broadly the findings have been presented in thematic analysis.

Table: Distribution of Research Participants

Type of Actors	Category of participants	Sub-category of participants	Number of respondents	Comments
Refugee	Refugee	Ordinary	36	Selected six refugee camps
	Refugee	Working refugee /community leader		
State actor	Camp in Charge	Camp authority	05	
	Police member	Security	05	
Non-state actor	NGO staff	Service providers	11	
Non-state actor	IGO staff	Coordinator		
Total Respondents			57	

3. FINDINGS OF THE RESEARCH

The findings follows the research questions and have been compiled into three building blocks: structure and mechanism, power dynamics, camp governmentality and refugee agency.

3.1 Structure and mechanism of camp governmentality

Governmentality of the Rohingya PRS encompasses the following structure and mechanism-

- Controlling the refugees through a spatial set up.

The camps space looks completely different from the host community settings because of its special physical texture and elements. Every elements of the camps provides a phenomenon of exceptionality and controlling of the dwellers. The entire area of the Rohingya Camps is fenced by barbwire with frequent watchtowers throughout the boundary. After setting up the watch tower over the barbwire fence, the camps are easily visible for security purpose like a ‘panopticon’. The mechanism is more subjective than the structure of camps. The entry and exit points are controlled by the Armed Police Battalion (APBN). There is not much patrolling inside the camp during the day, but the localization of police station has been ensured across the camps. Entrance in the camp

is, however, easy, and exit is difficult for the Rohingya people. They must show the proper reasons and documents in favor of their mobility. Refugees must apply for exit passes before mobility.

- A slow and complex bureaucracy

Other than the physical and spatial apparatus, mainly the non-refugee actors of the camps develop a slow and complex bureaucracy to manage the population that result in an ultimate control of the refugees. Refugees do not receive feedback for their requests or demands in a timely manner from irrespective of state or non-refugee actors. Any case from refugee requires investigation and verification to proceed, which are lengthy bureaucratic interventions. Without some exception refugees do not get their documentation on time. They face a lot of sufferings about birth registration and marriage permission. They wait a long time during data card upgradation, data correction, camp transfer, cancellation of data card and so on. Other than humanitarian aid, refugees remain highly passive because of these bureaucratic mechanism.

- Legal vacuum

Legal vacuum is an effective strategy to operate and exercise of power by the state and non-state actors. However the government of Bangladesh hosts refugees since 1978, Bangladesh neither formulate refugee policy nor accede the UNHCR Refugee Convention. Thus the state actors gain the control over these vulnerable population in a legal vacuum. Rohingya refugees have no legal coverage of their human rights. They can access to some legal processes only through different NGOs in case of severe torture or violence in the camps. None of the Bangladeshi law and international covenant are applied to them regard to their protection. On the other hand, there are dilemmas for non-state actors in maintaining humanitarian principle and Bangladeshi legal framework.

- Humanitarian aid as source of power

Humanitarian aid works as a strong tool of exercising disciplinary power in the camps however, refugees challenge many attributes of this power in the camps. Empirical evidence showed that refugees in PRS cannot be controlled only through food and ration. Thus the non-refugee actors applies many more strategies in managing the refugee population. However both refugees and the humanitarian organizations acknowledge the power of the aids. While humanitarian aid is the main source of power for non-state actors, refugee also know that they have no alternative to survive otherwise in the camps. For example, if any refugee is bare of food ration for any reasons, he/she has to starve in the camp.

- Formal and informal community leadership

Volunteers and informal community leaders are the two important tools to exercise power over refugee by the non-refugee actors. While police and CiC or state actors use *majhi* (community leaders) to manage the refugee, non-state actors recruit volunteers and elected community leaders for a similar purpose. Besides, serving in distribution and other service posts, they collect the everyday whereabouts of the refugee blocks. These are kind of informal and community technique of surveillance of the population. Here my findings confirm that ‘other’ or ‘non-national’ status of the refugee is the main driver of such camp structure and mechanism while the power and agency of the refugee transform the governmentality to a great extent.

3.2 Power dynamics of the PRS and fragmented camp governmentality

Empirical evidence of the camps reveal that the different dimensions of power are exercised and circulated among the actors of the humanitarian government. They exercise power disproportionately among each other. It is more asymmetric during the interaction between state actors and refugees.

- State actors: Sovereign power and disciplinary power

State actors exercise almost every form of power over other actors of refugee camps. Most of the power produces from the sovereignty of the state. State actors enjoy monopoly in exercising sovereign power over other actors and power. Sovereign power comes up with heavy disciplinary power of the state actors too. Power of the state actors is highly noticeable in humanitarian government. It exercises power in designing the camps, demarcating them, surveillance, segregating refugees from host community, erecting barbwire fence etc.

- Non-state actors: Bio-power and disciplinary power

Non-state actors gain their power from IRR and the host government. They hardly can exercise and share sovereign power. Rather they exercise bio-power, disciplinary power, pastoral power over refugees. Humanitarian organizations do the major part of surveillance through their network among the refugees, they control and make the refugee silent through their (limited)services, food ration etc. Dependency on aid determines the bio-power of the NGOs. They maintain and support the bureaucratic wall in camp administration. Nevertheless, they authorize and empower the refugees to a great extent.

- Refugee: Microphysics of power as compromise, cooperation and resistance

As per theorization of power of Michel Foucault, body itself is a source of power. The huge number of vulnerable refugee or refugee bodies generate power and circulate them among the actors of the camps. Refugees exercise microphysics of power. My findings resolved that non-refugee actors have the scope to exercise this power too but it is minimal to their other forms of power. On the other hand, refugee as vulnerable and marginalized in refugee labelling, they exercise this form of power at their best capacity. Refugees show up their power in the following manner

- demand for their human rights such as education, accommodation and health service in the camps.
- negotiate about their repatriation
- bargain about relocation to a remote island.
- transgress the law and sovereignty everyday
- cooperate and support the humanitarian government
- resist and boycott decision
- transform lives (Rohingya women)

3.3 Governmentality induced agency of the refugee

Advantages of the governmentality lens of Michel Foucault is that it helps to view power as omnipresent that can be exercised even by the vulnerable everywhere and anytime. It is prevalent that power and agency conflate and overlap sometime in case of refugee because their power cannot be estimated in particular dimension. But their actions have clear intentions for change and wellbeing. And the overall power plays of the camps confirms the refugees as people with agency that depends on the circulation of power among the actors in the camps. Participation in camp activities, community development, intention for wellbeing, challenging the state sovereignty every day, frequent demonstration and supporting the camp security are some of the major dimension of agency in camp structure. My investigation unveils some clear cut notion of agentic responses induced by governmentality techniques in the Rohingya camps. Some of them are as follows-

Camp Governmentality	⇔ Agentic Responses of Rohingya Refugee
Spatial Technology/techniques (Barbwire fence, check posts, limited entry-exit points)	Trespassing, damaging the fence
	Telling lie, mobility in disguise/pretend as Bangladeshi, bribing the police, taking alternative routes
Extra bureaucracy	Unauthorized marriage, forging documents, uninformed camp transfer

Recruitment of Rohingya volunteers	Better services, power balance, community ownership
Informal community leaders	Not accepted warmly or silently boycott of the <i>majhi</i>
Crisis of livelihood opportunity	Do volunteering for community, not just for money
	Operating small shops inside the shelter
	Working in the host community (illegal), drug peddling (illegal)
Security patrolling by Rohingya	Prevent criminal activities and other violence, killing
Lack of quality education	Community schools, private education,
	Private tuition, home learning, online education
Restrictions on transport	Make new entry-exit points, put pressure on NGOs for ambulance, run some illegal vehicles
Restrictions on extension of shelter	Redesign the rooms, extend shelter quietly,

- Stability and longevity of the PRS

It is the refugee who works at the ground level of humanitarian activities of the camp. They keep the aid line active and accessible to other refugees. COVID-19 issue has been discussed in the thesis as a vivid example of growing agencies of refugee. Refugees are essential part of the camp governmentality or the power dynamics of the camp. It works back and forth among the actors incessantly. Refugees are empowered somehow by non-refugee actors with a view to smooth camp operation. They are provided training on livelihood, awareness, hygiene and so on. Nowadays non-state actors design many refugee-led project considering extended situation of their exile. Refugee can share, participate, and bargain many issue with non-refugee actors. This power dynamics generates agency among the refugee and create a balance among the actors of the humanitarian response. A sense of belonging grows up among them with wider participation in camp activities in the long run. Refugees obtained many techniques and disposition in the power dynamics of camp. Importantly, refugee exercise and circulate power in a well-noticed environment of multiple actors of the camps. And this link between governmentality and refugee agency normalize the temporariness, thus ensure the long-term stability of the camps.

4. CONCLUSION

This research forges a connection between camp governmentality and refugee agency that challenges ‘bare life’ fallacy of refugeehood at least a bit. The emergence of agency is obvious in the juncture of power. I conclude that refugee agency is developed both by three actors as a

governmentality techniques of refugee camps where refugee portray their agencies as ‘proxy tool’ for their well-being in protracted exile. Therefore, governmentality and refugee agency work as a binary to the stability and existence of PRS, particularly in the Rohingya camps.

4.1 Contribution

Findings of this study contribute to the discipline of IR and Refugee Studies in several capacities

- define the power dynamics in the camp as ‘fragmented governmentality’
- find refugee as an integral part of camp governmentality
- broaden the refugee agency based on power plays rather than just activities or practices
- find refugee agency as a proxy tool for the survival and wellbeing of refugee
- discover new insight towards stability and longevity of PRS regard to camp governmentality and refugee agency
- enrich the methods of IR demonstrating ethnography as an effective mechanism in studying complex phenomenon of the discipline.

4.2 Limitation

However some challenges were in mind, I comprehend two limitations on this research. Firstly, a multi-site study could offer better insight and reliability than this single case-based research. Secondly, ethnography could be at least a calendar year long for more validity of the contribution. In that case, it is easy to grasp dynamics of power and agency in different seasons of a year. Based on this empirical evidence, some studies on relationship between everyday agency and political agency as well as security and refugee agency can be very much prominent in IR and Political Science.

5. MAIN REFERENCE

Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford University Press.

Alloush, M., Taylor, J. E., Gupta, A., Valdes, R. I. R., & Gonzalez-Estrada, E. (2017). Economic life in refugee camps. *World Development*, 95, 334-347.

Bochmann, A. (2018) The power of local micro structures in the context of refugee camps. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 32(1): 63-85.

Bulley, D. (2014) Inside the tent: Community and government in refugee camps. *Security Dialogue*, 45(1): 63-80.

- Easton-Calabria, E., & Omata, N. (2018). Panacea for the refugee crisis? Rethinking the promotion of 'self-reliance' for refugees. *Third World Quarterly*, 39(8), 1458-1474.
- Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Vintage Books, New York, 1995, Trans. by Alan Sheridan Smith.
- Foucault, M. (1980). Two lectures. In C. Gordon (ed) *Power/knowledge: selected interviews and other writings 1972–1977*. New York: Pantheon, pp. 78– 108.
- Hanafi, S., & Long, T. (2010). Governance, governmentalities, and the state of exception in the Palestinian refugee camps of Lebanon. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 23(2), 134-159.
- Hyndman, J. (2000). *Managing displacement: Refugees and the politics of humanitarianism* (Vol. 16). U of Minnesota Press.
- Laocharoenwong, J. (2020). *Re-imagining the refugee camp: Sovereignty and time-space formation along the Thailand-Burma borderland*. Doctoral Thesis. University of Amsterdam.
- Lippert, R. (1999) Governing refugees: The relevance of governmentality to understanding the international refugee regime. *Alternatives*, 24(3): 295-328.
- McConnachie, K. (2014) *Governing refugees: Justice, order and legal pluralism*. Routledge.
- Oesch, L. (2017). The refugee camp as a space of multiple ambiguities and subjectivities. *Political Geography*, 60, 110-120.
- Omata, N. (2017). Unwelcome participation, undesirable agency? Paradoxes of de-politicisation in a refugee camp. *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 36(3), 108-131.
- Ramadan, A. (2012) Spatialising the refugee camp. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 38(1): 65-77.
- Turner, S. (2005). Suspended Spaces: contesting sovereignties in a refugee camp. In T. Blom Hansen, & F. Stepputat (Eds.), *Sovereign Bodies: Citizens, Migrants and States in the Post-Colonial World* (pp. 312-332). Princeton University Press.
- Turner, S. (2015) What is a refugee camp? Explorations of the limits and effects of the camp. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 29(2): 139-148.
- Uddin, N. (2020) *The Rohingya: An Ethnography of 'subhuman' Life*. Oxford University Press.
- Wahab, S. A. (2022). Hybrid governmentality in practice: Territoriality and biopolitics in the Rohingya refugee camps in Bangladesh. *Political Geography*, 94, 102568.

Walters, W. (2017) The microphysics of power redux. In *Foucault and the Modern International: Silences and Legacies for the Study of World Politics* (pp. 57-75). New York: Palgrave Macmillan US.

6. LIST OF PUBLICATION: ONLY ON ROHINGYA REFUGEE

Journal Articles:

- Roy, S. (2022). Human Trafficking of Rohingya people: A review on Protection Space for Refugee Victims. *Modern Sri Lanka Studies*, 13(1). University of Peradeniya, Sri Lanka.
- Roy, S., & Barua, H. (2021). Humanitarian Action: A De Facto Durable Solution of Refugee Crisis? *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Review*, 6(2). University of Ruhuna, Sri Lanka.
https://www.hss.ruh.ac.lk/JSSHR/Articles/Vol6Iss2/Paper_3/Vol6Iss2P3.pdf
DOI: <http://doi.org/10.4038/jsshr.v6i2.83>
- Roy, S. (2021). The stateless Rohingya refugee: A critical analysis of nation-states of Myanmar and Bangladesh. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 42(3), 668-673. Kasetsart University, Thailand. <http://kjss.kasetsart.org/>.
<https://doi.org/10.34044/j.kjss.2021.42.3.31>
- Roy, S. (2021). Labeling of statuses and its effects on human rights of the Rohingya people in Bangladesh: Rhetoric and Reality. *Annual Online volume of the Doctoral School of International Relations and Political Science*, Corvinus University of Budapest, Hungary. DOI 10.14267/978-963-503-886-2
- Roy, S. (2020). Statelessness of Myanmar's Rohingya ethnic population: assessing the role of the international community. *Social Science Review*, 37(1), 277-294. Faculty of Social Science, University of Dhaka, Bangladesh.
- Roy, S., & Behera, S. K. (2025). Host community college education: Perceptions of teachers and students of Rohingya influx in Cox's Bazar in Bangladesh. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in Education*, 14(3), 149-172. Arkansas State University, USA.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32674/ef6hzy42>

Book Review:

- Roy, S. (2024). *The Rohingya: An Ethnography of ‘Subhuman’ Life*. By Nasir Uddin, Oxford University Press, 2020, 268 pp. *Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees*, 40(1), 1-3. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25071/1920-7336.41427>

Book (chapters):

- S. Roy (forthcoming-2025). Bare lives or people with agencies: A focus on the emerging agencies of Rohingya refugee in Bangladesh, In Sajaudeen Chapparban (ed.) *The Global Refugee Camps and International Refugee Regime: Understanding the Rohingya Experiences* by Routledge.