

Sociology & Cultural Research Review (JSCRR)

Available Online: <https://scrr.edu.com.pk>

Print ISSN: [3007-3103](#) Online ISSN: [3007-3111](#)

Platform & Workflow by: [Open Journal Systems](#)

**NAVIGATING THE SOUTH CHINA SEA DISPUTE: ASSESSING
THE ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL LAW AND REGIONAL
COOPERATION IN CONFLICT RESOLUTION**

Abdul Waheed

Department of History and politics, The University of Haripur

Waheed756@gmail.com

Ejaz Khan

Ph.D Scholar Department of Political Science and International Relations

Hazara University Mansehra,

kejaz88@yahoo.com

Muhammad Salis

Subject Specialist Pakistan Studies in Elementary & Secondary Education

Department KPK Pakistan

Muhammadsalisawan@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The South China Sea (SCS) dispute represents a complex geopolitical crisis involving regional security, international law, and great power dynamics. This study examines the applicability of international law, particularly United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), in addressing Southeast Asia's territorial disputes and resource competition. It also analyzes the impact of the Permanent Court of Arbitration's (PCA) ruling, which invalidated China's expansive claims, and highlights ASEAN's conflict management efforts, emphasizing dialogue and cooperation despite internal challenges. Using qualitative research methodology, including document analysis of legal texts, ASEAN communiqués, and international rulings, this study underscores that resolving the SCS dispute requires a blend of multilateral diplomacy and a rules-based legal framework.

Keywords: *South China Sea, UNCLOS, ASEAN, Territorial Disputes*

Introduction

The South China Sea dispute can be regarded as one of the more intricate and complex issues on the current global political scene. Encompassing around 3.5 million square kilometers, the SCS constitutes a significant global maritime trade route, on which millions of people rely. The South China Sea is an oceanic expanse rich in natural resources, including oil, gas, biodiversity, and

minerals. The ongoing conflict in the region has been further aggravated by competing territorial claims. Countries such as China, Vietnam, the Philippines, Malaysia, Brunei, and Taiwan have laid overlapping claims to its waters and features. This competition has intensified tensions and complicated efforts toward resolution. Thus, it raises pertinent security concerns as well as debate on the role of international law in the dispute's resolution. The SCS is more than just a geographic significant region, but it is likewise an area where major power rivalries and competitions are going on, especially between the US and China.

According Safriyani et al. (2021) the US has a long-standing historical presence within the region and advocates for the rights to sail and overfly, while China is increasingly militarizing and constructing artificial islands to assert its claims. These circumstances make it all the more complicated for geopolitical rivalry to resolve the respective issues in the contested area between South and East China seas and present a huge threat to peace in the region. International laws, most especially UNCLOS, have established an essential legal ground for maritime disputes, which aims to strike a balance between the rights of coastal states and the interests of the international community.

This observation of ongoing situation in South China sea really concluded the extensive claims of China based on the nine-dash line and highlighted the limitations of international legal institutions in enforcing compliance from major countries (Ven et al., 2021). According to international lawyers, this trend has been obvious in terms of diminishing returns from the use of international legal mechanisms to compel powerful political actors to act within the norms. The absence of strong enforcement mechanisms under UNCLOS means that future international maritime law has even less chance of regulating maritime issues and relieving tensions across the region. As a regional organization, ASEAN has sought to promote interaction among its members and relations in the region based on the rule of law rather than power. However, differing national interests among member states as well as the influence of external forces have affected the effectiveness of ASEAN's diplomatic efforts (Hatmanto, 2021). Yet one of the issues that several states will grapple with in the end is how the effects of the territorial maritime disputes in the SCS will affect the implementation of UNCLOS. And, at last, one cannot overlook the fact that China continues to

be disregarded in the Permanent Court of Arbitration ruling of 2016 favorable to the Philippines.

Currently, discussions on Code of Conduct negotiations in the SCS highlight the difficulty of ASEAN's task of bringing its members together around a common dispute resolution strategy. Promoting peace and stability in this geopolitically delicate area depends heavily on discussions around the Code of Conduct (CoC) negotiations in the South China Sea (SCS). Building on the 2002 Declaration on the Conduct of Parties (DOC), ASEAN and China have attempted to make the CoC a legally enforceable framework to handle conflicts and stop them from getting worse (Thayer, 2018). Disagreements over the CoC's legal force, geographical reach, and enforcement procedures are among the main obstacles, which have hindered development (Batongbacal, 2020). Building confidence, resolving power imbalances, and striking a balance between claimant nations' interests are all necessary for a successful CoC discussion in order to guarantee fair results (Emmers, 2019). Investigating every option, including institutional, diplomatic, and cooperative approaches, is necessary to increase ASEAN's efficacy in resolving South Asian (SA) problems. To improve its ability to resolve disputes and uphold regional standards, ASEAN must fortify its institutional structures, especially the ASEAN Political-Security Community (APSC) (Acharya, 2021). By prioritizing preventative diplomacy and putting in place strong early-warning systems, ASEAN may be able to resolve such conflicts before they become more serious (Caballero-Anthony, 2018). This article addresses a research question: (1) How effective is UNCLOS in providing a legal framework for managing conflicts in the SCS, particularly in light of China's rejection of international arbitration decisions? Given these issues, this research aims to complement the existing literature on international law, regional security, and specific contexts of conflict resolution in one of the most geopolitically sensitive oceans.

A thorough legal framework for marine governance is offered by the UNCLOS, which is especially pertinent to conflicts like the SCS. In this regard, UNCLOS Article 121, which deals with island regime, is crucial. It states that only naturally occurring land features that can support economic activity or human settlement on their own can create continental shelves or exclusive economic zones (EEZs); other land features are restricted to a territorial sea of 12 nautical miles. Determining maritime rights for features

claimed in the SCS, such the Spratly Islands, depends on this clause. Furthermore, the significance of fair solutions is emphasized by Articles 74 and 83, which serve as guidelines for the delineation of continental shelves and EEZs between nations with overlapping claims. As underlined in the 2016 arbitral decision between the Philippines and China under Annex VII of UNCLOS, these clauses stress the necessity for governments to settle disagreements through discussion or arbitration (PCA, 2016). UNCLOS promotes equality and transparency in resolving the intricacies of the SCS conflict by utilizing such measures. To promote stability and cooperation in the region, it is important to explore possible avenues to improve ASEAN's effectiveness in addressing the SA conflicts. Another important focus of this research is the role of ASEAN as a mediator of disputes in the SCS. Therefore, it is significant for policymakers and scholars to ascertain all the dynamics. The research seeks to delve into the intricacies of the SCS and to analyze the position of law, particularly international law, with respect to the law of the sea as found in the UNCLOS, and to present the potential of regional bodies like ASEAN.

Theoretical framework

This research paper on the SCS dispute has an appropriate and relevant theoretical framework based on international law, regional security theory and the practice of multilateral diplomacy. This framework attempts to explain the legal, political and cooperative factors responsible for the conflicts in SCS. The framework consists of three components: the provisions of international law contained in UNCLOS, regional security theories and the role of ASEAN in diplomacy.

1. International Law and UNCLOS

The Convention on the Law of the Sea sets out the basic guidelines for conflicts at sea, including those present in the SCS. For example, UNCLOS sets out the legal rights and obligations of states towards the sea, thereby attempting to curb the excesses of both a coastal state and the rest of the world (Shinno & Mizoguchi, 2021). The Convention establishes various maritime areas such as territorial waters, exclusive economic zones and the continental shelf, and establishes a framework for resolving disputes over maritime and resource claims areas. Nevertheless, the SCS proves difficult for the implementation of UNCLOS, particularly because China asserts historical rights that go beyond the provisions of the Convention. Although China's claim is grounded in history, it is

not given much weight by international law, which, from China's point of view, devalues its ancestry and fuels animosity. China believes that its claim should be modified to take into account historical rights because it predates UNCLOS, which was agreed to in 1982 and went into effect in 1994 after the 60th state ratified it. The Chinese have resorted to persistent diplomatic effort to either amend international law or get a unique exemption to it, where China's ancestral rights would be acknowledged by everyone, in order to assert such claims in a circumstance where the complexity of international law may not support them (Buszynski, 2012).

The 2016 Permanent Court of Arbitration decision rejecting China's claims based on the nine-dash line highlights the limitations of international legal processes in ensuring major powers' compliance (Lennerfors et al., 2015). This ridicule is a concerning dilemma for the future of international law within the settings of maritime disputes and for the possible escalation of regional conflict.

Regional Security Theories

The second component has regional security theories that seek to explicate the interactions of power and cooperation within the SCS. Balance-of-power theory, according to it, holds that all states are usually conceiving ways in which to balance their power so that none of the states becomes excessively powerful (Ilott et al., 2012). This is the case in South Sudan, for instance, smaller claimant states like Vietnam and the Philippines are turning to foreign powers like the US to counterbalance China's growing military presence and assertiveness.

Additionally, it has been mentioned that cooperative security theories seek to address regional rifts through communication and multilateral approaches and do not assume a state always needs to be confrontational to achieve security, since states can be amicable toward one another (Redish, 2014). Accordingly, ASEAN's attempts to forge a rules-based order and facilitate dialogue between member states are consistent with this approach. However, somehow, the efficacy of the organization's diplomacy has been disenchanted by rival national interests and the hindering influence of great powers with a significant diminishing of possibilities of regional cooperation (Patra & Braunstein, 2012).

2. ASEAN as a Diplomatic Actor

This is one of the main theoretical issues on which the arbitration by ASEAN about the SCS issue has concentrated. As a regional

organization, ASEAN is seeking to promote discussion and exchange among its member states, emphasizing a collective security approach (Larsen et al., 2017). A good example of an ongoing process of Code of Conduct for the SCS states as well as the attempt by ASEAN to develop means of conflict resolution and cooperation among the states involved. Nevertheless, the efficacy of ASEAN has mainly been put to test by varying priorities and interests of its member-states along with influences from outside powers like the US and China (Grant & Osanloo, 2014). On the other hand, the approach of consensus decision-making may end up resulting in gridlock on tough issues and impede timely responses to the fast-changing dynamics in the SCS. It is crucial to understand the possibility of more significant ASEAN engagement in the peaceful resolution of conflicts.

Effectiveness of International Law in the South China Sea

The SCS conflict creates a very serious threat to the enforcement of international law in general and UNCLOS in particular. Maritime law, especially UNCLOS, holds claims and rights-finding mechanisms for coastal states and in addition to global interests. However, it is quite tough to enforce international law in the SCS, especially when China makes repeated assertive foreign claims that often rely on historical arguments contradicting the core of UNCLOS. During the Allied peace treaty negotiations with Japan in August 1951, Chinese Premier Zhou Enlai made a declaration that serves as the current foundation for China's territorial claims. Zhou asserted China's sovereignty over the Paracel and Spratly Islands in the statement. When China claimed its rights to territorial waters during the Jinmen dispute in September 1958, it reiterated its claim to these islands. China first connected the assertion of marine rights, in this case rights to territorial waters, with its claims to territorial sovereignty in the 1958 proclamation. China's sovereignty claim has been described in official government declarations using much the same wording since the middle of the 1970s (FRAVEL, 2011).

The Permanent Court of Arbitration Ruling

From July 2016, PCA had a decree on the course of proceedings initiated by the Philippines to conduct its maritime claims regarding the SCS against China. The Chamber ruled that China's claim over the SCS based on the so-called nine-dash line was inconsistent with UNCLOS provisions and that China had interfered with the Philippines' claims within its EEZ (Hwon, 2023). This decision was important not only because of its legal

implications, but also because it could serve as a future benchmark for other maritime issues. On the other hand, China's absolute rejection of the decision has raised doubts about the applicability of international law when pressed by the interests of powerful states. The fact that China is not respecting the PCA's decision highlights a fundamental flaw in international law and its enforcement mechanism. UNCLS provides a framework for the settlement of disputes at the sea or ocean level, subject to the compliance of states with its terms.

SCS refers to the militaristic Beijing behavior and the persistent construction of artificial islands, not to mention the pessimistic view cast on these situations and the legitimacy of such behavior in international law context. Thus, the ruling by PCA in favor of Philippines constitutes considerable legal advancement, but this has not brought any physical changes in the ground and the inherent difficulty in the exercise of international legal standards against a state determined to violate them.

1. Legality of China's Militarization

The increasingly pronounced militarization of the SCS has posed further legal challenges to China's claims of abundance and security in the region. Construction of military installations on artificial islands was denounced as contravention of principles of international law in particular UNCLOS, which forbids fortification or conversion of facilities for military usage that are not islands (Hwon, 2023). Hwon's study asserts that China's actions are not only violations of the rule of law but also threaten the stability and security of the region itself. The international community is thus caught in a moral dilemma on how to address apparent regional hegemony by China without tangling up itself in international law matters. The complications surrounding the legality of China's claims are compounded by its assertion of historical rights over the SCS, a notion that is ill-defined in international law. Not only was such a claim blandly rejected by the other claimants, but it has also raised questions concerning the applicability of UNCLOS in addressing historical claims that predate the Convention (Singh, 2015). Comparison of the past claims to current legal framework of UNCLOS, which seeks to ensure clarity and stability in maritime governance.

2. Geopolitical Dynamics and International Law

Furthermore, the functioning of an international law interactive form within the SCS is also the interplay of the other geopolitical factors. A bigger complexity is added to this involvement of the US

and other external states. This has been China's contention mostly when calling for respect of the freedom of navigation principle in the SCS and conducting various freedom of navigation operations (FONOPs) that have put China's expansive claims to the navigation in check. Although these actions reinforce international law, they also seem to escalate tensions and further escalate a more confrontational posture by China.

Furthermore, the lack of a reliable multilateral framework to address the deteriorating maritime security situation in the Asia-Pacific region exacerbates the problems of international law (Lee, 2021). The absence of a cohesive approach among the players in the region further undermines the effectiveness of diplomatic efforts toward conflict resolution and galvanizes the impression that power politics intervenes above legal norms. Lee's argument calls for a new focus on multilateralism as a way of overcoming security challenges associated with the SCS issues.

ASEAN's Role in Conflict Resolution

The central portion of the SCS is identified by many territorial disputes and geopolitical conflicts. Consequently, interactions by member countries increased and have created a challenge for ASEAN on how to manage and resolve these tensions. As a large regional organization, ASEAN has its own brand of conflict management. It laid down certain principles of non-interference, reaching consensus before a decision is made and peaceful negotiation as the methods for resolving disputes.

1. ASEAN's Mechanisms for Conflict Resolution

ASEAN is putting up mechanisms for conflict resolution in the SCS, attached to the 1992 ASEAN declaration on the SCS as an important document. This declaration called for peaceful resolution of disputes and promoted cooperation between member countries (Singh, 2017). In 2002, ASEAN and China agreed on the SCS, "Declaration on the Conduct of Parties" (DOC), to reaffirm and promote the need for discussions and measures to build confidence (Singh, 2017). ASEAN's commitment to creating a conducive environment for conflict resolution is indeed illustrated by this framework, notwithstanding the territorial disputes involved. Strategy to resolve conflicts by such an organization is, however, found to be very much reliant on informal diplomacy and moral pressure; both such methods come under the heading of the ASEAN way. The method has principles of consensus and respect among member states, thus enabling better responsiveness and flexibility towards regional issues (Emmers, 2014). While such

an approach has made possible different levels of communications and cooperation, it has inevitably drawn criticism for being unable to take up more contentious issues, especially those related to the SCS disputes.

2. Challenges Faced by ASEAN

Here are some problems regarding the SCS that have been attempted to be tackled by ASEAN. One prime challenge is the varied interests and positions that the ASEAN members hold. Some countries such as Vietnam and the Philippines have been more aggressive in challenging China's territorial claims, while countries such as Cambodia and Laos appear to be more pro-Chinese (Castro, 2021). Such disintegration within ASEAN affects the organization's ability to pursue a common front and also complicates the resolution of potential conflicts. Furthermore, in addition to great power rivalry, particularly between the US and China, ASEAN's role in the SCS has also become more complex. Such evidently measures taken by the US against the freedom of navigation exercise for use against China's broad claims have also been countered by China in attendant economic and political operations aimed at subjugating the ASEAN countries (Castro, 2021). Thus, this geopolitical competition further complicates the situation for ASEAN as it tries to manage the powers in the region without losing meaning and relevancy as a conflict resolution body.

3. ASEAN's Influence on Regional Stability

Despite the various challenges encountered, ASEAN's contribution towards the strengthening and maintenance of the regional stability is not something to be ignored. The proclivity of the organization towards dialogue and cooperation has also managed to achieve some level of calm in the region that has discouraged transformation of any conflict into outright war. As ASEAN has initiated a number of the initiatives, including the establishment of the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) and the ASEAN Defense Ministers' Meeting Plus (ADMM-Plus), forums for discussion already exist between member countries, with outsiders as partners, and founded trust among them. In addition, ASEAN's attempts to engage China in the SCS dialogue appear to have been quite successful, particularly as regards the setting up of hotlines and other measures in crisis management (Putra, 2015). These initiatives underscore ASEAN's ability to promote cooperation and create an enabling environment for building trust between warring nations, even as challenges persist.

4. Prospects for ASEAN's Role Looking ahead

ASEAN's ability to assume the necessary peacekeeping position in the contested maritime region depends on its effectiveness in adapting to the changing geopolitical environment along with resolving the internal rivalries among its states. It will be important to increase the effectiveness of the organization by introducing proposals for improved conflict resolution for the purpose of regional peacekeeping (Aprilla, 2021). This could lead to greater cohesion among member states, inspire a shared belief in the importance of a rules-based order, and strengthen ASEAN's cooperation with external powers.

5. Regional and Global Implications

The dispute over the SCS raises regional and international issues that go beyond the direct dispute over space and resources between Southeast Asian nations. The current situation in this region, which is crucial for Southeast Asian countries, is a concern not only for these countries, but also for the entire geopolitics, global trade and the implementation of international law. **Regional Implications for Southeast Asia**

The political and security dynamics in Southeast Asia are heavily influenced by the SCS conflict. There are several nations in the region, all of which have territorial disputes, such as China, Vietnam, the Philippines, Malaysia and Brunei, which have overlapping claims to maritime areas. Adding to the dispute are militarization and naval confrontations that threaten to devastate the region with wars. China's growing assertiveness in the SCS has motivated the smaller claimants to seek security alliances with external powers, particularly the US, which has significantly expanded its military presence in the region through freedom of navigation operations (Anand & Forbes, 2021). As a regional organization, ASEAN must overcome the issues surrounding the SCS dispute and ensure that member states remain united and loyal to each other. It is the different interests of ASEAN members that make joint action difficult and weaken the organization's ability to defend itself against external forces (Putra, 2015). The current discussions around a code of conduct in the SCS demonstrate ASEAN's efforts to create mechanisms to resolve conflicts and improve relations between member states. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of such measures is often

undermined by external power and internal conflict within ASEAN (Emmers, 2014).

1. Influence of External Powers

The involvement of external powers, particularly the US and China, is fundamental in the context of the SCS conflict. The US has expanded its influence in the region and promoted the protection of freedom of navigation and international laws, particularly UNCLOS (Pradityo, 2022). Some of the ASEAN countries see this position as a necessary willingness to respond to China's growing influence. In any case, the US stance has also created tensions of a different kind, primarily because China sees them as a direct threat to its sovereignty and territorial integrity (Jose & Prasetyo, 2021). China's approach to the SCS includes not only assertive territorial claims but also diplomatic engagements that include countries in the ASEAN region. Through economic ties and investment, China is trying to strengthen its influence in the region while weakening ASEAN's efforts to find a common solution to the dispute (Emmers, 2014). This tactic of diversifying control serves to further complicate the possibilities for regional cooperation and exacerbates the problems ASEAN has in balancing the interests of its external powers.

2. Global Ramifications of the Conflict

The impact of the SCS conflict is not only limited to the region, but also affects global trade and international standards. The SCS is a strategic sea route for shipping, through whose waters approximately a third of all global maritime trade passes (Haosheng & Liu, 2023). Here, the disruptions caused by shipping restrictions in an area can have serious economic impacts, particularly with regard to global supply channels and the resulting dispersions across economies. The geopolitical climate surrounding the SCS makes it impossible not to be openly concerned about the security of maritime trade corridors and fears for the international order. Furthermore, the SCS conflict poses obstacles to the application of international law and respect for the rules-based international order. There is reason to doubt the superiority of binding dispute resolution mechanisms such as the PCA, since by rejecting the PCA decision, China is region militarized. As a result, doubts have been expressed about the confidence that UNCLOS can have in dealing with maritime issues related to differences between countries (Imam & Panennungi, 2021). The international system's weakness in enforcing legal compliance could encourage other states to

disregard international standards, which in turn would pave the way for a more chaotic and disorderly global society.

Conclusion

The SCS conflict is highly complicated in that it relates strongly with issues on regional security, international law and global power politics. Within the context of the SCS dispute, this study sought to comprehend the issues surrounding the dispute including the application of international law in particular UNCLOS and ASEAN engagement in conflict management. The results highlight the intricate ties between legal frameworks and regional interaction and geopolitics, emphasizing the importance of a multi-pronged strategy to solve recurrent problems related to this critical maritime space. International law has significantly diluted its applicability within SCS because of the active intervention of China, which has entirely chosen to ignore the PCA's ruling that invalidated its claim on the Southern Sea on the basis of a nine-dash line. This refusal puts forward critical questions on the manner of practical application of international legal norms and also on the prospects of UNCLOS in regulating future maritime controversies.

The failure of numerous international legal regimes has enabled some powerful states to disregard legal determinations that may threaten the entire rules-based system of global maritime governance. By these principles and mechanisms, dialogue and cooperation have always remained primary as ASEAN's approach to addressing disputes related to the SCS. The enhanced performance of this organization has been significantly affected by conflicting national interests among member states as well as interference from other countries, especially the US and China. As an example of ASEAN's contribution to stability in the region, the ongoing discussions on the Code of Conduct bring to the fore SCS internal rivalries along with external factors which exacerbate the unity of the member states. The territorial dispute in the SCS, and all other complexity, is more than just a land-and-resource dispute; it is a threat to the security of the region, and trade worldwide. Generally, the SCS is an important maritime route for international shipping, and there is bound to be a significant impact on economic activity when such a place is disrupted. The political atmosphere clearly averts the likelihood of globalization without the softening of rival attitudes and rethink on the present multilateral security approaches.

References

- Anand, A. and Forbes, L. R. (2021). Calming the waters of the south China sea: solving territorial disputes over artificial islands. *Journal of Student Research*, 10(3). <https://doi.org/10.47611/jsrhs.v10i3.1797>
- Aprilla, W. (2021). Indonesia's efforts in resolving south China sea conflict. *International Journal on Social Science, Economics and Art*, 11(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.35335/ijosea.v10i1.1>
- Castro, R. C. D. (2021). Under the shadow of the giants: the ASEAN in search of a common strategy in a fluid and perilous indo-pacific region. *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics*, 7(2), 282-301. <https://doi.org/10.1177/205789112111014598>
- Darwis, D. and Wambrauw, M. S. F. (2023). Indonesia's foreign policy in the indo-pacific region in the 2023 ASEAN chair. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 06(11). <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v6-i11-23>
- Emmers, R. (2014). Asean's search for neutrality in the south china sea. *Asian Journal of Peacebuilding*, 2(1), 61-77. <https://doi.org/10.18588/201405.000019>
- Grant, C. and Osanloo, A. F. (2014). Understanding, selecting, and integrating a theoretical framework in dissertation research: creating the blueprint for your "house". *Administrative Issues Journal Education Practice and Research*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.5929/2014.4.2.9>
- Hatmanto, E. D. (2021). A comparison between an indonesian and an english journal published in indonesia. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Sustainable Innovation Track Humanities Education and Social Sciences (ICSIHESSE)*. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211227.006>
- Hwon, L. (2023). The legality of militarization of the south China sea and its legal implications. *KMI International Journal of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries*. <https://doi.org/10.54007/ijmaf.2023.e2>
- Ilott, I., Gerrish, K., Booth, A., & Field, B. (2012). Testing the consolidated framework for implementation research on health care innovations from south yorkshire. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, 19(5), 915-924. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2753.2012.01876.x>
- Imam, M. H. and Panennungi, M. A. (2021). Conflict in the south China sea and exports to china within the asean-china free trade agreement framework. *Proceedings of the Asia-Pacific Research in*

- Social Sciences and Humanities Universitas Indonesia Conference (APRISH 2019). <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210531.066>
- Jose, H. S. and Prasetyo, S. A. (2021). A strategic view of minilateralism: Indonesia, quad, asean, south Korea, Japan, and impediment to asean centrality? *Journal Ilmiah Kajian Keimigrasian*, 4(2), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.52617/jikk.v5i2.268>
- Larsen, D. P., Wesevich, A., Lichtenfeld, J., Artino, A. R., Brydges, R., & Varpio, L. (2017). Tying knots: an activity theory analysis of student learning goals in clinical education. *Medical Education*, 51(7), 687-698. <https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.13295>
- Lee, J. (2021). China's maritime ambition, security dilemma and lack of multilateral framework. *Journal of Asian Security and International Affairs*, 8(2), 195-217. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23477970211017729>
- Lennerfors, T. T., Fors, P., & Rooijen, J. v. (2015). Ict and environmental sustainability in a changing society. *Information Technology & People*, 28(4), 758-774. <https://doi.org/10.1108/itp-09-2014-0219>
- Patra, M. K. and Braunstein, S. L. (2013). An algebraic framework for information theory: classical information. *IMA Journal of Mathematical Control and Information*, 30(2), 205-238. <https://doi.org/10.1093/imamci/dns016>
- Pradityo, R. (2022). ASEAN comprehensive security in managing covid-19 pandemic in Myanmar. *Jupiis: Journal Pendidikan Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial*, 14(2), 27. <https://doi.org/10.24114/jupiis.v14i2.37320>
- Putra, B. A. (2015). China's assertiveness in the south China sea: have ASEAN endeavors in establishing regional order truly failed? *Journal of Politics and Law*, 8(4), 178. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jpl.v8n4p178>
- Redish, E. F. (2014). Oersted lecture 2013: how should we think about how our students think? *American Journal of Physics*, 82(6), 537-551. <https://doi.org/10.1119/1.4874260>
- Safriyani, R., Rakhmawati, R., & Sadieda, L. U. (2021). What to accommodate to develop students' academic writing? need analysis for a research-based textbook development. *IJET (Indonesian Journal of English Teaching)*, 10(1), 86-98. <https://doi.org/10.15642/ijet2.2021.10.1.86-98>
- Shinno, Y. and Mizoguchi, T. (2021). Theoretical approaches to teachers' lesson designs involving the adaptation of mathematics textbooks: two cases from kyozai kenkyuu in Japan. *ZDM –*

Mathematics Education, 53(6), 1387-1402.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11858-021-01269-8>

Singh, L. B. (2017). ASEAN's initiatives in the south China sea dispute: quest for peace and stability in the indo-pacific region. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 22(1), 26-47.
<https://doi.org/10.22452/jati.vol22no1.3>

Singh, L. B. (2017). ASEAN's initiatives in the south China sea dispute: quest for peace and stability in the indo-pacific region. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 22(1), 26-47.
<https://doi.org/10.22452/jati.vol22no1.3>

Ven, P. v. d., Leferink, S., & Pemberton, A. (2021). The key characteristics and role of peer support in the aftermath of victimization: a scoping review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 24(2), 899-912. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380211043826>.

SCREEN