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Foreword from the Ministry of Women’s
Empowerment and Child Protection

Assalamu’alaikum Wr. Wb. Greetings to all of us,

The criminal act of trafficking in persons is an act that seriously harms human values and human rights. Networks of traffickers operate in very veiled and covert ways as well as with rough and overt means of kidnapping or using violence. Women and children are particularly vulnerable to becoming victims of trafficking.

Rampant cases of trafficking in persons have encouraged the formulation of various policies, programs and activities in efforts to eradicate the criminal act of trafficking in persons in Indonesia. In addition, studies have been conducted to determine the causes of the increasing numbers of trafficking victims. Various factors suspected to lead to human trafficking include poverty, low education, lack of information, divorce and social problems. Therefore, awareness, care and cooperation of all parties are needed in order to eliminate human trafficking in Indonesia.

The handling of the criminal act of trafficking in persons commenced in 2002, with the enactment of Presidential Regulation No. 88/2002 on the National Action Plan for Eradication of the Criminal Act of Trafficking in Persons 2002-2007, followed by the National Action Plan for Eradication of the Criminal Act of Trafficking in Persons and Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children 2009-2014, and finally the National Action Plan for the Prevention and Handling of the Criminal Act of Trafficking in Persons 2015-2019. In addition, as part of the effort of prevention and handling of the criminal act of trafficking in persons, the Task Force on Prevention and Handling of the Criminal Act of Trafficking in Persons was established as mandated by Article 58 (paragraph 3) of the Law on the Eradication of The Criminal act of Trafficking in Persons (Number 21, Year 2007). The establishment of the Task Force on the Prevention and Handling of the Criminal Act of Trafficking in Persons was also reinforced through Presidential Regulation No. 69/2008, which established the Coordinating Minister for Human Development and Culture as the Chair and the Minister of Women’s Empowerment and Child Protection as the Daily Chair of the Task Force.

Every witness and/or victim of trafficking is entitled to health rehabilitation services, social rehabilitation, legal aid, repatriation and social reintegration. Social reintegration and empowerment of trafficking victims are very important in preventing victims from falling back into the same situations that led to trafficking in the first place. This publication, Moving On. Family and Community Reintegration Among Indonesian Trafficking Victims, provides an overview of the experiences of the victims, survivors and families of trafficking victims who are living their lives after the traumatic events that have affected them. This publication is expected to give encouragement and understanding to increase efforts to prevent the criminal act of trafficking in persons and to support victims of human trafficking.

We greatly appreciate the role of NEXUS Institute in conducting research on human trafficking in Indonesia. We also thank and express our highest appreciation to the authors and contributors, especially to Rebecca Surtees for her work and careful attention to issues
related to the criminal act of trafficking in persons. Ms. Surtees has devoted her energy and thoughts to the writing of this publication. Hopefully *Moving On. Family and Community Reintegration Among Indonesian Trafficking Victims* can advance our common mission in realizing the protection of Indonesian women's rights, in particular victims of the criminal act of trafficking in persons.

Wassalamu’alaikum Wr. Wb
Jakarta, July 2017
Deputi Bidang Perlindungan Hak Perempuan

Vennetia R. Danes
Foreword from the Ministry of Social Affairs

First of all, we are grateful to God the Glorified and Exalted for the blessing and grace for the result of this research. The research entitled Moving On. Family and Community Reintegration Among Indonesian Trafficking Victims has been successfully published by the NEXUS institute. We hope that this report will become a reference for inputs into program development in conducting reintegration for victims of trafficking in Indonesia. We acknowledge and appreciate NEXUS Institute for the many research reports and in-depth studies that it has conducted on the issue of human trafficking in Indonesia.

The report Moving On. Family and Community Reintegration Among Indonesian Trafficking Victims will hopefully provide guidance and be a resource for stakeholders, the national government, regional governments and the society at large in providing social reintegration assistance to victims of human trafficking.

With the publication of the report Moving On. Family and Community Reintegration Among Indonesian Trafficking Victims, we hope that service providers can provide the optimal level of reintegration assistance and with full commitment to trafficking victims in their work. We trust that all stakeholders involved in the reintegration of victims of trafficking will actively participate such that trafficking victims can be successfully reintegrated according to regulations, procedures and established standards.

Thus, our hope, may God always bless all of us. Amen

Dr. Sonny W. Manalu, MM
Director of Social Rehabilitation for Socially Disadvantaged and Victims of Trafficking, Ministry of Social Affairs
Jakarta, February 2017
Preface

Moving On. Family and Community Reintegration Among Indonesian Trafficking Victims

is the final installment in our three-part research series that pioneers the use of longitudinal methods in the field of human trafficking research. With this series NEXUS has sought to introduce a broader and deeper perspective over time than is common for current research in this field. This research has involved more than 100 trafficked individuals – both men and women, including a number who were trafficked as children – as well as many family members and community members. Nearly 150 other key officials at all levels of government and civil society were also interviewed over three years. With this sweeping effort, the NEXUS Institute has begun to explore and weave together the broader contours of the lives of individuals and their families before and after trafficking.

The broader perspective of this research includes examining vulnerabilities, needs, life challenges and family and community dynamics in the lives of these individuals before they were trafficked. It explores how problems and challenges that existed before trafficking were accentuated by the experience of trafficking. And it presents how rescue, escape and returning home rarely, if ever, made those issues disappear and the complexity of family and community life after trafficking. There is great value in incorporating the fuller picture of these individuals’ lives in the context of listening and learning to more comprehensively and effectively support their recovery and reintegration. The perspectives shared in this report, taken together, provide one of the most comprehensive and complexly interwoven pictures to date of what “home” can mean for the prospects of success or failure of recovery after trafficking.

For many years, officials around the world have condemned human trafficking, dedicated themselves to ending it and proclaimed their respective government’s commitment to supporting the recovery of victims of trafficking by assisting and protecting and, ultimately, “reintegrating” those who have survived being trapped in modern slavery.

There has been some important progress – especially in the adoption of international and national anti-trafficking frameworks. In reality, however, implementation continues to lag and meaningful reintegration of trafficked victims has likely been the most overlooked area of engagement by governments around the world. Many countries do not differentiate in any meaningful way between the concepts of “return” and “reintegration”. As a result, “reintegration” typically means only that survivors return to their home communities. In most countries, the possibility of access to true long-term reintegration support is virtually
nonexistent. For most victims in many countries, there would be no reintegration if not for the loving and compassionate support of their families and communities.

This study explores the complex dynamics of the environment into which victims of trafficking return. It presents our research focusing on family and community members and describes the circumstances to which victims come back after their escape or rescue. Despite many daunting challenges upon return, it was often the support within families and communities that gave rise to resilience and this was an essential foundation for recovery and reintegration success.

But families are an uncertain and varying source of support. Certainly a well-considered policy supporting reintegration must incorporate the strengths of family and community support. However, the assumption that victims’ families and communities will be able or willing to provide for all of the long-term assistance needs that arise in long-term recovery and reintegration is not a sound model for ensuring a nation’s policy and humanitarian objectives toward victims of human trafficking.

There are many lessons to be learned here that have implications for understanding what help and support trafficking victims and their families may need. The picture formed by the many individuals interviewed for this research series provides compelling reasons to further study strategies for understanding and working with families and local communities to support their roles as providers of critical, although not exclusive, safety nets for victims. We hope that researchers will continue to expand this examination to other contexts and communities.

From our inception, our vision of our work at the NEXUS Institute has focused on contributing to the body of independent in-depth research and analysis on human trafficking for the purpose of supporting the development and implementation of more effective laws, policies and practices to combat human trafficking and to support victims of trafficking to recover and rebuild their lives. I believe that this work is true to this vision. I hope that you find this research is helpful to your understanding of human trafficking and that it will inspire committed innovative and impactful approaches to combat this pernicious crime and human rights violation and support those who have survived.

This field research was undertaken by NEXUS within the framework of a multi-year research project supported by the United States Department of State’s Office to Monitor and Combat
Trafficking in Persons. I wish to thank everyone in that office and others at the United States Department of State who have supported this work.

I thank those who participated in this research in communities in Indonesia. We appreciate the courage that is required. This study would not have been possible without the willingness of so many survivors, family and community members and others to contribute to this work.

I also thank NEXUS’ research team. The dedication of NEXUS’ lead researcher Rebecca Surtees to expanding understanding about human trafficking and providing insights about the path to recovery for over twenty years – often on issues of first impression and at the cutting edge of knowledge about human trafficking – is remarkable and inspiring to those of us who work in this field to further discover and apply more effective and humane responses to the human toll of trafficking in persons. Any government looking to improve their programs of care and support for victims of trafficking in meaningful ways would be well-served to start by reviewing the knowledge, evidence and findings that can be found in the dozens of research reports that she has authored. Our entire research team – Thaufiek Zulbahary, Suarni Daeng Caya, Laura S. Johnson and Pattarin Wimolpitayarat – bring significant expertise and purpose to their work. This work has involved sacrifices by all of them and I can only say that I am immensely grateful that they have agreed to dedicate their talents to this work.

Victims who have survived trafficking are often remarkably strong, resourceful and resilient. Nevertheless, while some are able to rebuild their lives and thrive, many remain in a continuous process of partial success and setback. This series of research studies tells the stories of both. For all, there is a need for our greater understanding and collective commitment to support their challenging journey to move on through more nuanced, tailored and sustained assistance and care.

As always, I invite those who care about human trafficking and related issues and are interested in being part of seeking solutions to follow our work at www.NEXUSInstitute.net and @NEXUSInstitute. I also encourage you to look at NEXUS’ photo essay associated with this research at https://medium.com/@NEXUSInstitute

Stephen Charles Warnath
Founder, President & CEO
The NEXUS Institute
1440 G Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20005
www.NEXUSInstitute.net
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### Acronyms and abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDR</td>
<td>Indonesian Rupiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>non-governmental organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Rukun Tetangga (harmonious neighborhood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMK</td>
<td>Sekolah Menengah Kejuruan (secondary vocational education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>Trafficking in Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD</td>
<td>United States Dollar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

A trafficking victim’s escape or exit from exploitation is a significant moment. It signals safety, freedom and a way back to one’s life, family and community after months and even years of exploitation and abuse. But “moving on” from trafficking is not uncomplicated. Rather, it is, commonly, a complex, taxing and complicated process that involves significant challenges and setbacks along the way. This paper explores the different levels at which reintegration takes place – individual, family and community – and the (often different, sometimes contradictory) actions and reactions within families and communities over the course of recovery and reintegration. It also outlines some of the tensions, issues and challenges faced within family and community settings during reintegration, issues that are often multi-layered, mutually reinforcing and coterminous.

Tensions and issues within the family center around financial problems (no remittances and the burden of debt); being stressed and distressed following trafficking; feelings of shame and being blame; and damaged or destroyed personal relationships. Community tensions are tied to failed migration and not returning with money; criticism of victims’ “ambition”; victims’ stressed or “problematic” behavior once home; discrimination because of “unacceptable” behaviors (e.g. prostitution, pregnancy); and jealousy about victims being assisted. The study also identifies sites of resilience and support within the family and community, which support, bolster and galvanize reintegration success.

This paper is part of a research series of papers produced in the context of the NEXUS Institute’s longitudinal research project Protecting the Unassisted and Underserved. Evidence-Based Research on Assistance and Reintegration, Indonesia, which aims to enhance the evidence base about successful reintegration of trafficked persons in Indonesia.
2. Research methodology

2.1 Methodology and data sources
This longitudinal research, conducted with 108 Indonesian trafficking victims, has five data sources as outlined below:

1. **Repeat interviews with trafficked persons** in Jakarta, West Java, Central Java, East Java and South Sulawesi. First round interviews were conducted with 108 victims (49 males, 59 females); second round interviews were conducted with 66 respondents (24 males, 42 females) approximately six to nine months after the first interview.

2. **Informal communication with 30 trafficked persons** between formal interviews - speaking by telephone, exchanging text messages and/or meeting informally during fieldwork. Informal communication was often on-going with these 33 respondents.

3. **Interviews with 34 family members of trafficking victims** (including spouses, parents, siblings, children, grandparents, aunts/uncles, nieces/nephews and in-laws) and **31 friends/neighbors of trafficked persons**, to discuss how they experienced and coped with the trafficked individual’s absence while trafficked, his/her return home and experiences and challenges during his/her process of recovery and reintegration.

4. **Participant observation in the family and community environment**, with the research team generally spending two of four weeks each month conducting community-based fieldwork. Interactions included informal conversations and discussions with individuals or groups, direct observation and participation in community events.

5. **Interviews with 144 key informants/stakeholders at the national, district, sub-district and village level** between October 2013 and April 2016, including representatives of the Indonesian government (32), national and international NGOs (97), international organizations (5), donors/embassies (4) and academics/researchers (6). Twenty-five (25) informants were interviewed more than once. Key informants included administrators, policy-makers, law enforcement, medical personnel, social workers, lawyers and paralegals, village chiefs, teachers/principals, trade unionists and migrant worker activists.

2.2 Research sample. About the respondents

*Sex and age.* Of 108 trafficking victims, 49 were male and 59 were female. Respondents were almost exclusively adults when interviewed, although two respondents were 17 years old. Twelve individuals were trafficked as children, but were adults when interviewed. Respondents ranged in age from 13 to 49 when trafficked. Age varied according to the form of exploitation. Women trafficked for sexual exploitation were generally much younger than victims of labor trafficking.
Table #1. Age of respondents when trafficked, disaggregated by sex and form of trafficking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males (n=49)</th>
<th>Females (n=59)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trafficked for fishing</td>
<td>Trafficked for other forms of labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+ years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education. Most respondents (n=65) had some level of elementary school (24 males, 31 females); 17 respondents attended junior high (7 males, 10 females); 20 respondents attended senior high school (13 males, 7 females) and five respondents attended vocational school.

Table #2. Education level of respondents, disaggregated by sex and form of trafficking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Males (n=49)</th>
<th>Females (n=59)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trafficked for fishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafficked for other forms of labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafficked for domestic work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafficked for sexual exploitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some elementary school (grade 1-6)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior high school (grade 7-9)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior high school (grade 10-12)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational school</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not answer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family situation. Most respondents (61 out of 108) were married when trafficked and had one or two children, although some had more. Thirty-one respondents were unmarried when trafficked and had no children, 14 were divorced or separated and two were widowed. However, trafficked persons’ family situations changed after return from trafficking and over the course of the research project. Some had since married and had children (or more children); other marriages and families had dissolved. Some trafficked persons’ marital status was in a state of flux during the project.

Table #3. Family situation of respondents at time of trafficking, disaggregated by sex and form of trafficking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status (at time of trafficking)</th>
<th>Men trafficked for fishing</th>
<th>Women trafficked for domestic work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Married 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Unmarried 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Divorced 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Widowed 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children (at time of trafficking)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Marital status (at time of trafficking)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status (at time of trafficking)</th>
<th>Men trafficked for other forms of labor</th>
<th>Women trafficked for sexual exploitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Widowed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Number of children (at time of trafficking)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children (at time of trafficking)</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Area of origin and integration.** Respondents originated from Jakarta (n=6), South Sulawesi (n=3), Central Java (n=15), East Java (n=1), Lampung (n=2) and seven districts in West Java (n=81), including Bandung (n=9), Bogor (n=5), Cianjur (n=11), Cirebon (n=11), Indramayu (n=16), Karawang (n=20) and Sukabumi (n=9). Most returned to live in their areas of origin after trafficking, although some were staying temporarily in Jakarta, permanently integrating in Jakarta and moving to new villages/communities in the province or district. Most respondents (102 of 108) were Sundanese (n=58) or Javanese (n=44).

**Table #4. Reintegrating in home community; integrating in new community**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reintegrating in home community</th>
<th># of respondents</th>
<th>Integrating in a new community</th>
<th># of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Java</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>West Java</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakarta</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jakarta</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Java</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sulawesi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Java</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampung</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Map #1. Districts and provinces of origin for 108 respondents**
**Forms of trafficking.** Victims were trafficked for sexual exploitation (n=20) as well as for different forms of forced labor (n=88), including construction (n=3), domestic work (n=39), fishing (n=32), factory work (n=4), work on plantations (n=8) and work in a cleaning service (n=2). Some suffered multiple forms of exploitation – most commonly women trafficked for labor were also sexually abused or exploited.

**Table #5. Forms of trafficking exploitation, disaggregated by sex**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms of trafficking</th>
<th>Male (n=49)</th>
<th>Female (n=59)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Domestic work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantation work</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sexual exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other labor sector</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Country of exploitation.** Respondents were trafficked within Indonesia (n=19) as well as abroad (n=86). Three individuals were first trafficked within Indonesia and then abroad. Those trafficked abroad were exploited in 17 destination countries including in the Middle East (n=28) – Bahrain, Jordan, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, UAE – and in Asia (n=35) – Brunei, Malaysia, Singapore, South Korea, Taiwan (Province of China). Most men trafficked for fishing (n=23) were trafficked in less common destinations such as Ghana, Mauritius, South Africa, Trinidad and Tobago and Uruguay. Some victims were exploited in more than one destination.

**Table #6. Countries of exploitation, disaggregated by sex & form of trafficking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of exploitation</th>
<th>Men trafficked for fishing (n=32)</th>
<th>Women trafficked for domestic work (n=39)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bahrain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brunei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan (Province of China)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Oman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United Arab Emirates (UAE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of exploitation</th>
<th>Men trafficked for other forms of labor (n=17)</th>
<th>Women trafficked for sexual exploitation (n=20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Malaysia &amp; Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan (Province of China)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.3 Data analysis**

All interviews and field-notes were cleaned, coded and entered into the qualitative data analysis software NVivo 10. Data was analyzed according to principles of thematic analysis and the research team worked collaboratively in the identification of critical themes and issues. Analysis was contemporaneous with data collection, allowing the team to follow up on issues and themes that arose during on-going fieldwork over time.
2.4 Ethical issues & considerations
Conducting research in communities was undertaken with the utmost care. We selected villages where we had relationships with authorities or civil society and worked together with them to identify possible respondents. Potential respondents were only approached if it was safe and ethical to do so. Respondents were first approached by an interlocutor (NGO staff, community leader, migrant worker activist, another migrant worker), who explained the study and also provided a written description of the study. They were then given time to decide whether to participate in the research. Respondents were, under no circumstances, persuaded or pressured to participate. Interviews were conducted in a location chosen by the respondent. Each interview began with a detailed process of informed consent, only after which the interview took place. Upon completion of each interview, the researcher gave respondents a written referral sheet with information about assistance options and also spent time explaining possible assistance options and how to access them. Compensation per se was not provided, to avoid pressuring respondents in ways that compromised informed consent. Instead we reimbursed costs associated with the respondent’s involvement in the project – e.g. transportation costs and meals – and a small “gift” was given to each respondent to acknowledge and appreciate his/her important contribution to the project. Respondents were not immediately asked to participate in repeat interviews, but given time to reflect and decide about their subsequent participation. Researchers contacted respondents after several months to gauge their willingness to be re-interviewed and, if they agreed, the process detailed above was repeated. All interviews were strictly confidential; interview transcripts were shared only within the research team and secured according to NEXUS’ internal data protection policies. This research was conducted in partnership with the Ministry of Social Affairs and the Ministry of Women’s Empowerment and Child Protection in Indonesia. It was overseen by a research reference group.
3. Supporting successful reintegration

3.1 What is reintegration?
Reintegration is the process of recovery and economic and social inclusion following a trafficking experience. Successful reintegration is often comprised of different components including living in a safe and secure environment, access to a reasonable standard of living, mental and physical well-being, opportunities for personal, social and economic development, and access to social and emotional support. There are specific considerations, which may, cumulatively, indicate that a trafficked person has successfully reintegrated. These center around different aspects of an individual’s life and well-being as well as the broader family and social environment and may include: having a safe, satisfactory and affordable place to live; physical well-being; mental well-being; legal status; access to justice; safety and security; economic well-being; educational and training opportunities; healthy social environment and interpersonal relationships; and well-being of victims’ families and dependents. Trafficked persons may reintegrate into different settings, depending upon individual needs, interests and opportunities, including in their home communities or a new community. Reintegration also takes place at different levels – at an individual level; within the trafficked person’s family environment; within the wider community; and also within the overarching formal society.

Diagram #1. Successful reintegration

3.2 What is reintegration assistance?
Comprehensive reintegration assistance includes the following services: housing or accommodation, medical assistance, psychological support and counseling, education and life skills, economic opportunities, legal and administrative support, legal support during legal proceedings, family mediation and counseling, case management and assistance to family members, if needed. Trafficking victims may require a single service (e.g. transportation, emergency medical care, job placement) or multiple services (e.g. a combination of housing, medical assistance, psychological care, legal support, education and vocational training). Services may be trafficking-specific – e.g. offered by anti-trafficking organizations and institutions – or they may be more general – e.g. offered by agencies/institutions working with vulnerable persons, returned migrants, community development, child protection.
Meaningful reintegration is a complex and costly undertaking, often requiring a full and diverse set of services for victims (and sometimes their families), who themselves have widely differing short- and long-term physical, psychological, social and economic needs. Once the immediate needs of trafficked persons have been met (e.g. emergency health needs, immediate protection and so on), many victims require assistance to reintegrate into their families and communities (e.g. vocational training, economic support, long-term access to healthcare, counseling, education, family mediation and so on). Because reintegration can take years to achieve, programs should provide a range of services and long-term case management.

Indonesian trafficking victims are exploited for different purposes (for sexual exploitation and different forms of forced labor) and their distinct experiences of exploitation inform the types and amount of services they may require, the time needed to recover and so on. Some trafficked persons need many, even all, of the services listed above at some stage of their reintegration after trafficking. Others require one or two services and are able to draw on their personal, family and community resources to support their reintegration. Not all trafficked persons will require reintegration services. And some trafficked persons will not want or need the services that are offered or available. Many trafficked persons reintegrate without any formal assistance, drawing on their personal, family and community resources. What services are required (if any) depend on the specific situation and needs of each trafficking victim.
4. About family and community in Indonesia
Supporting reintegration after a trafficking experience requires an understanding not only of what has happened to individual victims, but also the wider family and community dynamics. This, in turn, necessitates a finely grained understanding of family and community in Indonesia, including the various constellations to which Indonesian trafficking victims return and live as they move on with their lives. It is also helpful to situate where and why fault lines in family and community relations may emerge in life after trafficking and over the course of reintegration.

Roles and relationships within the family
Family is the central organizing structure of both Sundanese and Javanese societies. The nuclear family is the most important kin group in both cultures. Family members owe each other attention, care and various other mandatory obligations; neglecting familial obligations is a serious social infraction. Parents are at the center of the nuclear family and filial responsibility is critical to both Javanese and Sundanese. Children owe deference, obedience and respect to their parents. In daily life, not only are children expected to pay deference and respect to their parents, but also to provide support and assistance, as needed. Mothers and fathers also have obligations vis-à-vis their children, whom they have to rear and protect. In Sundanese and Javanese cultures, the wife/mother is the center of the household and family. She controls the family finances, makes major decisions about household and family, is tasked with all aspects of child-rearing and deals with problems ranging from economic difficulties to more general family crises. A child’s relationship with the mother is typically closer from birth and, over the course of life, mothers remain the primary caregivers and are primarily responsible for child-rearing and family life. A child’s relationship with his/her father becomes more formal as the child ages. A Javanese and Sundanese father should receive “respect” from his children, which also implies a certain distance. This also implies the obligation on the part of the father to provide economically for his children. A mother and father’s responsibility to support and raise their child(ren) is
central to decision-making around migration, with children being a contributor, if not catalyst.

**Gender roles and marital dynamics**

Among both Sundanese and Javanese, the marital relationship is generally one of relative equality. While conjugal relations are not based on the wife’s inferior status, men do occupy a relatively “higher” position in the marriage dyad. The husband/father is the head of the family and household head and the breadwinner. The woman is first and foremost responsible for the care of her family. While marriage is desirable in both Sundanese and Javanese cultures, separation and divorce are not uncommon in West Java. Remarriage is also commonplace.

Both women and men play important roles in the economic sphere – in both formal and informal income-earning activities or employment – and contribute to the household/family economy. Men are considered the primary breadwinner and head of the household and they are expected to support their family members. Male migration has been an aspect of income earning over the past decades, with men migrating for work within the country as well as for work in neighboring countries in Asia and further afield (e.g. for plantation work, construction, factory work, commercial fishing). Much male migration has been informal – for work in nearby Malaysia – although some sectors like fishing and factory work, and more distant destination countries, involve formal migration channels. Women’s economic role is also accepted and encouraged. Women often have multiple tasks – i.e. taking care of the household and engaging in economic activities.

Women’s working role was further entrenched in the 1970s by state policies that encouraged women to join the wage-earning formal labor market and in the 1980s and 1990s, when the state began to promote transnational formal female labor migration.

**Residence patterns and household composition**

Residence patterns are largely governed by choice. That being said, “choice” is also linked with necessity and many couples live with the wife’s parents before becoming economically and residentially independent. Javanese and Sundanese household composition is flexible and may include older members of the family (parents or parents-in-law), unmarried siblings or recently divorced relatives. There may also be fostering of another family member’s children. This wider family framework offers potential for support as it extends the number of people one might rely for emotional (and financial support). But it may equally increase a victim’s burden when he/she is responsible for caring for these extended kin.
Expectations within the extended family
Both Javanese and Sundanese follow a system of bilateral kinship. Social identity is derived from both parents; ancestors of both families are recognized as kin. There is some choice in relating to different kin and trafficked persons can potentially draw on both maternal and paternal family members for support and assistance.

There are two defined kin groups in Javanese culture – close relatives (first cousins) and distant relatives (second and third cousins). However, mandatory obligations towards relatives beyond the nuclear family are limited. The nature and intensity of relationships with close and distant relatives is fluid, practical and contextual. Close relatives living far apart may have little contact; distant relatives living close by may have intense relationships. Flexible family relations mean that some kin (close or distant) may provide support in times of crisis. Some victims turned to relatives for emotional and/or financial support in times of difficulty.

Social roles, obligations and expectations
Within Javanese society, the individual serves as a harmonious part of the family or group. The essence of being Javanese is to be civilized, to knows one’s manners and place in the world. Social interactions should be characterized by rukun (harmonious unity). Conflict should be avoided. While less hierarchical, Sundanese culture is similar in the desire for social harmony. Mutual cooperation (or gotong royong) is also a prominent characteristic in Sundanese and Javanese community life.

The “neighborhood” (kampung) is an important social grouping in both urban and rural settings in West Java. Membership in the kampung involves participation in mutual aid networks, self-identification with the local community and being identified by neighbors as being of rather than in the kampung. The kampung also offers an administration structure.
Social relationships within the community are not always homogeneous, compact and harmonious. Most *kampung* consist of a disparate collection of families and neighbors who may have competing interests. Social relations and support are also influenced by class dynamics and other social hierarchies. Moreover, while community (whether rural or urban) is still of great importance in daily life, the nature of community has changed and evolved over the past decades – triggered first by the economic and political transition following the fall of the Suharto regime in 1998 and since then by social and economic changes more widely, including decentralization, political reform, urbanization and globalization and global and local patterns of consumerism.

The trafficked persons interviewed for this study reintegrated in different community settings. Many went home to their home communities after trafficking, while others opted to integrate in new settings – in Jakarta, in other towns or in the home communities of their spouses. In all cases the primary community in which they functioned during reintegration was the neighborhood (*kampung*) and the social relationships and dynamics of the community impacted not only the immediate family environment, but also the individual trafficking victim’s overall experience of reintegration.
5. Coming home. Experiences of family reintegration

Recovery and reintegration after trafficking involve not only individual trafficking victims, but also their family members and the family environment to which they return. Trafficked persons must recover and come to terms not only with the exploitation they have suffered, commonly involving multiple layers of violence, violation and hardship, but also the reactions and responses of their family members. Equally, trafficking victims’ family members, who themselves have been directly and negatively affected by the victim’s exploitation, must come to terms with all that their loved one has suffered, and also navigate, manage and ideally support the victim’s return and reintegration, which is often fraught on many levels.

Family often provides important forms of support after trafficking – emotional, social, physical and economic – which contribute to an individual’s reintegration success. At the same time, the family environment also commonly involves vulnerabilities (and even destructiveness) that may work against recovery and reintegration. A victim’s marital and family status have important implications for the viability and likelihood of reintegration and, in many cases, may account for at least some (if not many) of the “ups” and “downs” that he/she experiences in his/her post-trafficking life.

About family life
The family environment of respondents was diverse and highly complex, even, at times, contradictory. Indonesian trafficking victims returned and reintegrated into many different family and household constellations. In addition, some trafficked persons faced different reactions and responses from different people within the family. Reactions of family members – both supportive and unsupportive – were also often quite fluid, sometimes changing over time and in response to different events and situations.
The majority of respondents (61 of 108) were married and had a family of their own prior to trafficking. Most married respondents had one or two children, although some had more. Most returned to their nuclear families after their trafficking – to live with their spouses, children and also, at times, extended family members, most commonly parents and parents-in-law. Women trafficked for domestic work were more likely to be married when trafficked than women trafficked for sexual exploitation, aligning with the younger age of women and girls trafficked for sexual exploitation. The majority of trafficked men (29 of 49) were married when trafficked. However, men trafficked for fishing were less likely to be married when compared with men trafficked for other forms of labor (on plantations, in factories, for cleaning services). Remarriage is relatively commonplace in Sundanese culture. A number of respondents were married on multiple occasions, including remarriage after divorce and remarriage after widowhood. Of the 61 individuals who were married when trafficked, six (all women trafficked for domestic work) were remarriages, having been divorced from their first husbands. Over the course of reintegration, 14 respondents remarried. Being married in many ways offered a supportive framework for reintegration, not least because it theoretically afforded victims support (financial and emotional) after trafficking, which, in turn, offered some time and space to recover and move on from exploitation. That being said, this assumes a safe and supportive family setting (with one’s nuclear and/or extended family), which was not always the case. And married victims also had to consider and manage the needs and reactions of their family members, which also created additional pressure.

Thirty-one (of 108) respondents were unmarried when trafficked and had no children (19 males and twelve females). Most unmarried females were trafficked for sexual exploitation; most unmarried males were trafficked for fishing. Most returned to live with their parents during reintegration. Fourteen respondents (of 108) were divorced or separated when trafficked – 13 women (trafficked for domestic work and sexual exploitation) and one man. Being separated or divorced is generally without significant social stigma, although a number of (primarily female) respondents did speak about being looked down upon within families and communities as a consequence of their divorced status. An additional issue was the financial and emotional burden of separation/divorce (and single parenthood). Two respondents, both women trafficked for domestic work, were widows when trafficked. Widowhood involved many of the same vulnerabilities and pressures as divorce or separation, as widows largely bore their burdens alone including on-going grief over the loss of their spouse.

In some cases, marital status was more intricate and respondents lived in families with multiple marriages and complex family settings. In Indonesia, not all second marriages involve the dissolution of the first. Polygyny (a husband marrying more than one wife), while not common or socially normative, is nonetheless legal in Indonesia and was a feature in a number of victims’ lives. Polygyny may introduce additional layers of complexities to the process of family reintegration. In addition, infidelity in marriages was not uncommon, with eight women explaining that their husbands had been unfaithful while they were trafficked or after their return, and one man explaining that he planned to leave his wife because she had been unfaithful after his return from trafficking. It is likely that there were more instances of infidelity that did not come up in interviews due to the sensitive nature of this topic.

**Changes in family life over time**

Respondents’ marital status and family composition were quite fluid and changed over the course of their lives – before migration, while trafficked and during reintegration. This was particularly the case for women. While 26 of the 39 women trafficked for domestic work were married when trafficked, this changed at later stages of their lives. Of five women who were divorced with children when trafficked for domestic work, four subsequently remarried.
within a year of returning to Indonesia. Two (of three) women who were unmarried when trafficked for domestic work married between one and three years after returning to Indonesia. Women trafficked for sexual exploitation also experienced fluidity in marital status over time. Of 20 women trafficked for sexual exploitation, six were married when trafficked. Two (of nine) women who were unmarried when trafficked then married, either while they were trafficked or after exit from trafficking. Pregnancy led to marriage for at least three women trafficked for sexual exploitation. Two (of five) women who were divorced with children when trafficked remarried over the course of reintegation. That being said, some women’s situations remained the same over the course of their life after trafficking.

Trafficked men also experienced changes in marital status over time, although with less variation than women. Of 29 men who were married when trafficked, 26 remained married after trafficking. However, two (of 29) divorced or separated from their wives after returning home. And, in handful of other cases, men reported marital discord and problems that had the potential to lead to divorce. In some cases, it seemed possible that these marriages would not survive the pressure of trafficking and post-trafficking reintegation. Of the 19 men who were unmarried when trafficked, ten were still unmarried at the time of being interviewed. Eight men who were single when trafficked subsequently married over the course of their reintegation. However, not all marriages lasted.

**Family environment and living arrangements after trafficking**

In the majority of situations (65 of 108), trafficking victims returned to the same family environment as when they migrated/were trafficked. Married respondents often returned to live in a nuclear family setting – with a spouse and children. Many married respondents, though, lived in more extended family settings, with parents or parents-in-law also in the same household. In some cases, their parents or parents-in-law lived with them. But, more commonly, victims lived in the homes of their parents or parents-in-law, which typically involved different (and often more complicated) living arrangements.
Table #7. Living situation of respondents at time of trafficking and during reintegration, disaggregated by sex and form of trafficking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Returned to and remained in the same living situation as before trafficking</th>
<th>Men trafficked for different forms of labor (n=30)</th>
<th>Women trafficked for sexual exploitation (n=10)</th>
<th>Women trafficked for domestic work (n=25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear family setting</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nuclear family setting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With parent(s)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>With parent(s)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With parent(s)-in-law</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>With parent(s)-in-law</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (with siblings; with grandparents)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other (with grandparents)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those who were unmarried commonly lived with their parents after return or, less commonly, on their own. Some unmarried victims lived with their extended family members, including siblings, aunts and uncles and grandparents. Some trafficked persons were single parents, due to divorce or widowhood, and lived with their children and with extended family or in-laws (usually parents or parents-in-law). Some trafficked persons were widowed or divorced and lived alone after trafficking. Some lived with small children whom they were raising alone. Others had adult children who either lived with them (sometimes along with their spouses and children) or lived elsewhere and the respondent lived alone. Some respondents did not return to live with their families at all.

Even when respondents returned to the same family environments where they had been living before trafficking, the family environment itself often changed over time, such as with an elderly parent moving in, getting married and having a spouse move in, having additional children, a spouse leaving/migrating for work, caring for extended family and so on. These different arrangements directly informed and influenced life after trafficking and reintegration patterns and outcomes. Family composition and residential patterns often changed at various stages of reintegration, not least in response to changes in victims’ marital status.

There is a wide range of family members who may be involved, to varying degrees, in the reintegration process, including at different stages, and the family environment is often a complex terrain with different layers of support and tensions. Even within any one family setting, different family members manifested various (and often contradictory) actions and reactions, attitudes and behaviors, especially over time and in response to external factors. Some family members were supportive and helpful; others were critical and unsupportive. All of these factors and variations differentially influenced reintegration outcomes for victims and their wider families – sometimes positively, sometimes negatively.

5.1 Supportive family environment
Family was, for almost all victims, the primary source of support after trafficking. Returning to family was most victims’ preferred choice. But it was also a function of necessity – i.e. the general lack of services and support, including the limited reach of services and support at a local, community level.

Many respondents found that family generally was a safe, supportive and protective environment. They came from happy and healthy family settings before being trafficked and returned also to a generally positive family environment. Coming home was, in these cases, an emotional but happy time. Both trafficked persons and their family members described feelings of relief, joy and gratitude. In addition to emotional support, victims were also often able to rely on family for more tangible support and assistance, including a place to live, food
and money, help in caring for their children and dependents and so on. Even relationships that were (or might have been) damaged during trafficking could, in some situations, be repaired.

“[My daughter] said she was so grateful when she saw me arrive home. [She cried] a lot”. *(Woman trafficked for domestic work)*

“They are good to me. They knew that I got home without bringing any money. They gave me cigarette and coffee, even though I did not ask for them. My parents are the same. They would give me money”. *(Man trafficked for fishing)*

“[My husband] said, “Maybe our destiny does not change, we work together, here. Even if it is not much, we could be together””. *(Woman trafficked for domestic work)*

“My husband is the type of person who let things go. He thinks that since it is in the past, the most important thing is that I was safe. He did not want to prolong the problem, he thought it wastes time...After what happened he asked me to just stay home. I did not have to work. He told me he is the one who will work”. *(Woman trafficked for sexual exploitation)*

“My mother just felt grateful because there are others who didn’t come back. There are many of them who can’t go back home and suffer violence there (while abroad). Even though I didn’t get paid she just thought that I can come home and that’s what’s important”. *(Woman trafficked for domestic work)*

“Thank God, there’s no problem [with my wife] ... She worries more about what to eat the next day when we’re short on cash. Sometimes she borrows money if I hadn’t gotten any job. [My wife and parents-in-law], we stick together whether there was something to eat or there wasn’t. No, they never [get angry]. [...] Yes, my children cared about me, never gave me any trouble”. *(Man trafficked for labor)*

### 5.2 Tensions, strains and challenges in the family setting

Even in positive family settings, reintegration was not uncomplicated and initial feelings of relief and happiness often gave way in the face of different stresses and pressures that emerged over time. Trafficked persons and their families experienced strain and tensions on different levels and in relation to various factors. In more complex families, trafficking victims often returned home to profoundly unsupportive settings. Tensions and problems that preceded trafficking (and may have contributed to the decision to migrate) were unresolved and trafficking introduced an additional layer of tension. Tensions were created by: financial problems in the family; conflict between victim and family; shame and blame; and damaged or destroyed relationships.

#### 5.2.1 Financial problems in the family. The cost of migration to victims and their families

**No remittances and the burden of debt**

The most outwardly visible source of tension within families after trafficking victims returned home was related to financial and economic problems because they had not remitted money while trafficked nor come home with money. A small number of trafficking victims were able to remit or return home with some money, which eased at least the immediacy of financial issues. But any amount was far less than was promised to and expected by their families, either because victims had been paid a different amount than agreed in a contract or because they had their salaries largely withheld.
Debt also caused or contributed to tension within families. Some victims (or their family members) were in debt prior to migration and they migrated to repay this debt. Further, most trafficking victims incurred debt as part of their migration or to pay for transportation home. Some respondents owed money to family members who looked after children left behind. Some trafficking victims went into debt after trafficking, borrowing money when they were unable to work, due to injuries or illness induced by trafficking or lack of work in the community.

Trafficking victims’ feelings and reactions to financial pressures

Trafficked persons expressed their dismay, frustration and disappointment at returning home without any money, often having worsened the family’s financial situation. Some trafficking victims were divorced, separated or widowed, which meant that they had even less of a support system after their failed migration. For many divorced female respondents, ex-husbands had not supported their children during their absence or after return. Many victims described frustration and disappointment at how failed migration undermined their relationships with their children. Not being able to earn and remit money to one’s family because of having been trafficked meant “failing” in that parental/spousal role.

Actions and reactions of family members

Failure to remit or return with money was a source of stress for family members who were left behind. Although grateful and happy about the return of their loved ones, there was often an overlay of concern and tension related to victims having come home with no money. Some trafficked persons described a great deal of pressure from family members due to having returned home without money, which influenced relations over time. Where debt was involved, this added an additional layer of stress. Not all family members behaved in the same way. Trafficked persons often faced both supportive and unsupportive family members in the face of these economic problems. Family reactions were not only about the trafficking victim failing in terms of the economic situation as a result of trafficking, but also
about the family member's own inability to assist when a trafficked family member returned home.

Financial concerns were not always a primary source of tension, even in dire economic situations. In some cases, trafficked persons were supported and encouraged in by family members, whether parents, siblings, spouses, children or aunts and uncles. Some trafficking victims received financial help from different family members, which was of critical importance in their ability to move on from trafficking.

5.2.2 Stressed and distressed. Tensions and conflict between victims and family

Sources of stress and distress borne of trafficking exploitation

Indonesian trafficking victims, regardless of forms of exploitation, returned home in difficult circumstances. They were mentally and physically unwell as a consequence of what they endured, including poor living conditions, inadequate food and water, dangerous and hazardous working conditions, prolific violence and abuse and/or lack of medical care.
Living conditions for most trafficked persons were inadequate and substandard while trafficked. Trafficking victims lived in unhygienic and deplorable conditions for months and even years. Living quarters were often attached to the workplace, limiting options for free movement and contact with others. Victims generally received poor quality and insufficient food and, in some cases, limited access to drinking water. Without exception, trafficking victims (both male and female) were overworked, often inhumanely so. Indonesian trafficking victims were not provided with materials or equipment needed for their work, including appropriate work clothes and protective equipment. Violence and abuse were commonplace for the vast majority of trafficking victims. This included physical, psychological and sexual violence, inflicted on male and female victims. Many trafficking victims suffered multiple forms of violence over the course of their exploitation, sometimes at the hands of more than one person. Violence and abuse often resulted in injuries or illness. Many victims were psychologically impacted, even traumatized, by trafficking – becoming stressed, anxious and depressed. Trafficking severely and negatively impacted the well-being of returned trafficking victims, both immediately and also in the longer-term.

Actions, reactions and behaviors of trafficking victims

"I used to be frightened when I woke up late...as if I was still there [abroad]... Until now it is still [like this] ... I am frightened as if I am still there if I wake up late". (Woman trafficked for domestic work)

"[My mental condition] was in a bad shape. I was sick for a long time. That was why I didn’t do any work. That was my lowest point. [...] I was unstable and shaken. I thought a lot about the costs and the unfortunate event when I was there. I had never experienced something like that before... I didn’t know what to feel actually. I didn’t know where to look for help". (Man trafficked for labor)

Sources of stress and distress among victims’ family members

There were multiple sources of stress for the families of trafficking victims. Many family members struggled to come to terms with the knowledge of all that their loved ones had suffered while exploited. Another source of stress was victims’ sometimes unstable or stressed behaviors during reintegration. And because family members often did not know the full story of what had happened while the individual was trafficked, it was often difficult for them to make sense of victims’ behaviors, especially when behaviors continued for long periods after return. Family members were also affected by what the victim’s absence meant in their lives, including economic problems.

Sources of stress and distress from trafficking exploitation

- poor living conditions
- inadequate food and water
- dangerous and hazardous working conditions
- violence and abuse
- lack of medical care
and lack of contact for long periods. In some cases, victims whose initial relations were fraught with stress and distress reported improvements over time.

5.2.3 Feeling ashamed and being blamed. Responsibility and culpability between victims and families

Victims’ feelings of shame, guilt and responsibility

 Trafficked persons commonly expressed feelings of shame and guilt at return and over the course of reintegration. Some were ashamed at having failed at migration, coming home empty-handed or even in further debt. Victims – both men and women – were ashamed for being unable to support and care for family members, especially children. Victims were also ashamed to have failed in their filial responsibilities – to help parents and to care for them as they age. Feelings of shame and guilt were also, at times, a function of what their families – especially spouses and children – had suffered while victims were away and commonly out of communication. Shame played a role in some victims’ decisions not to reveal the full nature or extent of their trafficking experiences to family members. Some felt ashamed of their migration “failure”, which they worried would lower them in the eyes of those they loved. Some trafficking victims also feared that they would be looked down upon and blamed for things that happened while trafficked – having been raped, beaten, humiliated and seemingly unable to look after themselves. Blame sometimes played out in the reverse, including trafficking victims being upset with family members – for example, when family was involved in the victim’s trafficking. Some trafficked persons expressed frustration with family who did not hold up their end of the migration agreement – to care for the children left behind or to spend remittances in a responsible way.

Being blamed. Accusations and recrimination from family members

 Many trafficked persons were blamed by their family members, in part or to degrees, for different reasons. One source of blame was for not having succeeded at migration, leading to reproach and accusations from different family members, including parents, spouses, children and siblings. Some blame was because of the burden that failed migration (i.e. trafficking) placed on family members. Other sources of blame included spouses and children who felt abandoned or neglected during the trafficking victim’s absence. Parents, particularly mothers, were blamed and rejected by their children who experienced their absence as abandonment and neglect. In some cases, family members were upset with the trafficking victims for being gone during challenging times for the family, such as during illness or death. Women trafficked for sexual exploitation faced blame
for their involvement (albeit forced) in prostitution. Some men trafficked for labor were accused of having frivolously spent their money abroad.

However, blame was not inevitable and a number of returning trafficking victims described their families’ fatalistic acceptance of their bad experiences and a general lack of blame. Even when victims suffered blame in their families at the outset, these situations were not irreparable. Negative reactions from family members often changed over time. Initial recriminations often gave way to some level of acceptance, at least within different segments of the family and to degrees.

5.2.4 Relationships were damaged or destroyed. Managing fissures and fractures

Causes of fissures and fractures
Indonesian trafficking victims were away from home and family for long periods of time – from a few months to several years – often with little or no contact with their family members. In some cases, victims continued to suffer separation from their family members even after they had escaped from or exited trafficking – e.g. during detention abroad. Opportunities for contact in these situations were also very limited (often only a call prior to their return home and sometimes not even that). Some victims also had limited contact and communication with family members after they had returned home either because they needed to work away from their families (in another city, province or country) or because they were pursuing a case against their traffickers and staying in the place where the legal case was being handled. Trafficking separations, compounded by lack of communication and contact, led to fissures and fractures in family relationships. Many family relationships were disrupted and even destroyed as a result of trafficking separation and distances. Problems in the family environment before trafficking also meant that some “reunions” were especially difficult and more prone toward family fractures.

Diagram #3. Period of time trafficked among victims of trafficking

Disrupted parent/child relations
One of the main “casualties” of trafficking in many victims’ lives was in their relationships with their children. Trafficking prevented them from being a part of the early lives of their
children; some victims returned home to children who barely knew them. Some children had also developed negative feelings towards a trafficked parent as a consequence of what they were told by others during his or her absence.

Parental absence affects children’s well-being and, in many cases, disrupts their support network. This is especially the case for trafficked mothers as mothers are typically the main sources of emotional support for Indonesian children.

“... [the youngest boy] said like this to me, ‘Why you do not take care of me, mother?’ How can [he say] I did not take care of him? He knew that I left him for working abroad. I left him so that he can eat and continue go to school. Until one day my eldest son came to me to discuss about that. [...] My son told me, ‘We did not need your money, we needed your attention’.

(Woman trafficked for domestic work)

Marriages were damaged and destroyed
Tensions and problems emerged in many marriages during a victims’ absence. In some instances, these were “minor” and predictable tensions related to financial issues, being ashamed and blamed and being stressed and distressed. However, in some cases relationships with spouses were disrupted and even destroyed during trafficking absences. Infidelity was a not uncommon problem faced by trafficked women. Some women were abandoned or divorced by their husbands while trafficked. Trafficked men also experienced disruptions in and destruction of their marriages as a consequence of trafficking. Most commonly, marital problems were a function of an inability to remit money while away, bring money upon return and/or support the family after return. Another important factor in marital problems was failing to stay in touch with family while exploited. In some cases, domestic violence was an issue within marriages after trafficking and at various stages of reintegration.

Damage to marriages was not easily resolved and many victims described the on-going problems in their marriage as one of, if not the most, pressing issue over the course of reintegration. Some marriages collapsed over time, under the weight of financial and interpersonal pressures. Twenty of the 108 respondents had separated or divorced since being trafficked and/or since returning from trafficking. Several others described marital discord and problems that had the potential to lead to divorce.

Tension in the immediate and extended family

Some family members were a key source of support. Others, in difficulties, presented additional conflict and problems. This included parents (and parents-in-law), siblings, aunts and uncles, grandparents as well as a range of other close and distant relatives. Victims also described fractures and fissures in many of these relationships.
A number of victims migrated to help and support their adult parents and their failed migration was a source of tension with their parents. Many parents of trafficking victims had cared for their grandchildren, with the understanding that their children would remit money for the grandchildren and return with money to improve the family situation. Failure to do so was a source of strain, the degree of which varied by family.

This was further complicated when failed migration meant that adult parents had to support their child/trafficking victim and commonly also the victim’s spouse and children after return. A victim returning home with a child or children born of trafficking was another source of stress in the wider family. Many victims also described tension with various members of their family-in-law. In some cases, family tragedy occurred while trafficking victims were away, having a devastating impact on the individual and the wider family environment. In some cases, family members were involved and complicit in the individual’s trafficking, which made for a complicated (and potentially unsafe) situation during reintegration.

“[My] parents now see me as incapable, undeserving. I no longer feel as part of the family like it used to be. I’m aware of my unemployment status and my parents don’t have that much”. *(Man trafficked for labor)*

“We got food from my father-in-law. However sometimes I am not comfortable with his talk. Sometime he says bad things about us to our neighbors. He is upset with his son because he only stays at home without working. In the meantime, the income only comes from my father-in-law’s little store”. *(Woman trafficked for domestic work)*

*A mother and her child in a village in West Java. Photo: Peter Biro.*
5.2.5 Multiple issues, tensions and vulnerabilities within the family
The challenges and vulnerabilities discussed above are seldom self-standing. Trafficked persons and their families faced many, most and sometimes all of these issues and tensions, to different degrees and at different stages. That is, financial difficulties commonly created or increased conflict and tensions within the family, including feelings of shame and blame, as well as fractured relationships. Being physically or psychologically unwell often meant being unable to work, which amplified economic problems, as well as issues of stress and blame within the family. Issues and tensions were most commonly mutually reinforcing and coterminous and victims and their families struggled on many levels in moving on from trafficking.

5.3 Different reactions within the family – supportive and unsupportive, positive and negative
Family is not a homogeneous unit; family members reacted differently to trafficking victims at return and over the course of reintegration. Some respondents found “home” to be both supportive and unsupportive, healthy and destructive, positive and negative. Not only did individual family members react differently to the trafficked person’s return, but reactions also changed over time. Overall, trafficked persons described a wide range of family environments following trafficking. For many trafficked persons, family was an important foundation for successful reintegration, with family members providing emotional, social and/or economic support. Other respondents described unhealthy and negative (sometimes even dangerous) family relationships, which challenged reintegration. And some trafficked persons faced mixed reactions from different family members, which were fluid and changed over time.
6. At home. Experiences of community reintegration

The community environment is an important factor in and feature of the reintegration process. The community includes any number of individuals of varying degrees of intimacy and distance to the trafficking victim – friends, acquaintances, neighbors, peers, work colleagues, community leaders and so on. Whether returning to the home community or settling into a new community setting, reintegration is directly impacted by the wider socio-cultural environment in which victims live over time. And, as with family, the community setting can be a complex and contradictory environment, which is both supportive and unsupportive and entails different (even contradictory) reactions from friends, neighbors and others, including changes over time.

A former migrant worker in her home in a district of West Java. Photo: Peter Biro.

About community life

The community environments in which trafficking victims lived after trafficking differed substantially. Some victims returned to live in their home communities; others integrated in new communities. And some victims moved between different community settings at different stages of reintegration, based on changes and developments in their lives.

Many victims (79 of 108) reintegrated in their home communities, returning to the same or similar living arrangements as when they were trafficked. By contrast, some victims (29 of 108) integrated in “new communities”. However, this meant different things in different victims’ lives. In some cases, integration in a new community was only temporary. In the other cases (18 out of 29), victims were living permanently in a new community, having settled there after trafficking. In a handful of cases (7 of 29) this was integration in a community setting where they were exploited, most commonly women who had been
trafficked for prostitution in Jakarta and had since remained in the capital city. Other victims (8 of 29) integrated in a new community with a spouse, living with his or her family. In some situations, this meant moving quite far from their home communities (and support networks) including to villages in different and sometimes quite distant provinces. In still other instances (3 of 29), victims integrated in entirely new areas after being trafficked, locations where they had no connections.

*Diagram #4. Community settings into which trafficking victims reintegrate/integrate*

Some individuals eventually moved from new communities back to their home communities. Others who had been reintegrating in their home communities later moved to new communities for work or due to marriage. Living situations were fluid over time and some victims moved multiple times over the course of interviews.

**About community life over time**

Some living arrangements changed over time and in response to evolving (or deteriorating) family situations. For example, two women who initially lived in their home communities subsequently integrated in their husbands’ communities and then, after divorcing from their husbands, returned again to their home communities. In addition, some respondents had longer-term plans to move their households.

An important factor in many victims’ reintegration success is having support within the community. In some situations, the community setting was a constructive and supportive setting, which offered fertile ground and opportunity for recovery and reintegration. In other cases, victims were exposed to discrimination, exclusion, vulnerability and structural inequality in their community environments. At the same time, the reaction of community was often uneven and trafficking victims described different reactions from different friends, neighbors and community members. The nature of community impacted how trafficking victims were (or were not) received. Some communities were close, cohesive and supportive, others were not. Some victims had long-standing relationships within their communities, others were new to the area.

**6.1 Supportive communities**

Many victims described a positive reception and a supportive community setting when they returned home from trafficking and moved on with their lives. Trafficking victims described receiving reassurance and encouragement; pity and sympathy; support and kindness; and overall acceptance from friends, neighbors, peers and community members. Some friends
and neighbors offered tangible support, including financial support, food and basic needs and assistance in finding work. A supportive community was more common among those who were trafficked for labor and less common among those trafficked for sexual exploitation. In some cases, this was because a woman’s involvement in prostitution was known in the community where she lived and she was looked down upon as a consequence. It was also, arguably, because many women trafficked for sexual exploitation integrated into new communities and, therefore, could not rely on existing contacts and relations with friends and neighbors.

6.2 Tensions, issues and challenges within communities
While some trafficking victims found support in their communities, this was not always the case. Many trafficking victims felt uncomfortable, stressed and even ashamed in the wider community because of their exploitation and failed migration. In a number of cases, shame and discomfort were a function of how victims themselves felt rather than judgments or critiques from friends, neighbors or community members. Shame was particularly acute when others in the community had migrated successfully. However, some victims were ashamed, embarrassed and uncomfortable because of how they were treated in their communities at return and during reintegration. Many victims faced gossip, discrimination, criticism and censure. There were different triggers for these negative reactions and attitudes, including: failed migration and not returning with money; criticism for being “ambitious”; reactions to stressed or “problematic” behavior at home; discrimination because of “unacceptable” behavior (e.g. prostitution, pregnancy); and jealousy about being assisted.

I felt ashamed [with my neighbors]. It’s far away to [the destination country] and I didn’t bring anything (money) home. (Man trafficked for labor)

I never sat together with the neighbors. I was embarrassed at that time... my condition at the time was so mentally [weak]. (Man trafficked for fishing)
When I first got home, it was so stressful. I did not bring money home. I wished I had not returned home. I wanted to go back sailing. Why should I go home without money? It’s just embarrassing for my wife for her to face the neighbors. It was just disappointing. *(Man trafficked for fishing)*

I never told neighbors about my bad experience...I do not trust them. I worry that they will spread it [around]. *(Woman trafficked for sexual exploitation)*

When I had just arrived at the village, I felt ashamed. All of the people knew that I did not succeed. All of the people wanted to know more about my story. I still have debt to [the money lender] that I still needed to pay back. *(Woman trafficked for domestic work)*

6.2.1 Not returning with money; failed migration; not being “successful”

A number of trafficking victims were criticized and gossiped about because of their failed migration, for not having returned home with money nor having remitted money while abroad. In some cases, “failed migration” (i.e. trafficking) led to unfair and untrue accusations from friends and neighbors – e.g. that they had squandered their salaries on themselves while abroad or that they had not worked hard. Failed migration also meant that victims/migrants were unable to realize their social obligations within the community – e.g. to bring gifts for friends and neighbors or loan (or sometimes give) money from their earnings. Many trafficking victims did not reveal that they had been exploited (or the full extent of their exploitation) to friends and neighbors, which led to miscommunication and misunderstanding. Negative responses from community members not only impacted victims’ mental well-being, but also influenced their decision of where to live and what to do after trafficking.

6.2.2 Criticized for ambition, “aiming too high”

Another source of tension was what was perceived as the individual’s “ambition” – i.e. “aiming too high”, wanting too much, not being satisfied with what they had (not appreciating life in the village). Even in situations when the trafficking victim had suffered a great deal, he/she was still sometimes exposed to such criticism.

6.2.3 Because of stressed or “problematic” behavior at home

Many trafficked persons returned home stressed, anxious, depressed and generally unwell. Many were also stressed and depressed for some time after their return – months and even years. This often led trafficked persons to behave and react in stressed ways, behaviors and actions that were a source of gossip and criticism among neighbors and friends. This type of criticism was especially likely to be the case when community members did not know what had happened to victims and many victims chose not to share their stories with their
families, let alone within the community. This meant that friends and neighbors did not always understand why the individual was behaving in erratic and stressed manner, leading to misunderstanding and also maltreatment.

6.2.4 Discrimination because of “unacceptable” behavior - prostitution, pregnancy, being arrested

Some victims were subjected to discrimination and censure because of things they had been forced to do while trafficked. Women and girls trafficked for sexual exploitation often faced discrimination, as well as harassment and abuse, within their communities because of their involvement in prostitution. Blame was levied at sexually exploited women and girls even when the forced nature of their prostitution was known by community members. Trafficking victims also suffered discrimination and criticism because of things that occurred while they were trafficked – e.g. rape, pregnancy out of wedlock. Victims were also discriminated against as criminals when they were arrested and detained as irregular migrants.

6.2.5 Jealousy about being assisted

Some victims described problems because community members were jealous that they had been assisted over the course of their reintegration. In other cases, victims described how others in the community resented them being able to buy or afford things that they could not and “doing well” when they themselves were not doing as well.

6.2.6 Multiple sources of tension and issues within the community

In some instances, issues and tensions between victims and community members were multiple, coterminous and mutually reinforcing. Community gossip and censure severely impacted some relationships with community members when individuals were regularly and over a long period of time exposed to negative stories.

6.3 Different reactions – some positive, some negative

In many communities, reactions to and treatment of trafficked persons during reintegration differed from person to person. Some friends and neighbors were a source of support or comfort to victims, while others gossiped, criticized and discriminated against them. Some respondents faced mixed reactions within their communities – receiving support and understanding from some friends and neighbors, but not others. Even in the midst of an overall negative response within the community, it was often possible to find someone (or some people) who were supportive. In a number of instances, community reactions changed over time. But time did not inevitably lead to an improvement in community relations for victims.
7. Conclusion and recommendations

Indonesian trafficking victims bore substantial scars and burdens from their exploitation – physical, psychological, economic, emotional – and often struggled to recover and move on after trafficking. They also returned to face pre-existing problems and vulnerabilities in their lives and families, which they had hoped to address or alleviate through their migration. Reintegration policies and programs should address the wide range of victims’ needs and vulnerabilities. But it is insufficient to consider reintegration after trafficking only from the perspective of individual trafficking victims. Reintegration takes place within a wider social field of family and community. It involves often very many different family and community members, each of whom has the potential to (positively or negatively) influence and impact the recovery and reintegration of trafficking victims.

The family is a key factor in either the success or failure of a trafficking victim’s reintegration. In addition to managing their own individual challenges, trafficked persons must navigate and manage the reactions and responses of their various family members when they return from trafficking and also family reactions and responses over time. Trafficking exploitation took a heavy toll on the families of Indonesian trafficking victims – their children, spouses, parents, siblings and relatives. Equally important is to take into account the social environment into which trafficked persons reintegrate or integrate. Whether returning to their home communities or settling into a new community setting, reintegration was directly impacted by the wider socio-cultural environment in which victims lived over time. And, as with family, the community setting was a complex and contradictory environment, both supportive and unsupportive and involved different (sometimes contradictory) reactions from friends, neighbors and others, including those that changed over time.

The many challenges and vulnerabilities in the family and community settings were seldom self-standing. Trafficked persons and their families faced many, most and sometimes all of the issues and tensions discussed, to different degrees and at different stages. At the same time, in addition to tensions, issues and challenges faced within the family and community settings, there were also significant sites of resilience and support, which supported, bolstered and galvanized victims’ recovery and reintegration. This is a significant finding in a setting where so many victims are unidentified and unassisted and indicates a great need to identify and replicate indigenous and informal forms of support and assistance.

These findings highlight the need to better understand the complex and contradictory family and community environments to which trafficked persons return when designing and implementing reintegration (and all protection) interventions. Identifying and disentangling common points of tension and resilience help us to better understand reintegration within families and communities after a trafficking experience. Taking into account family dynamics and community relationships in the design of reintegration responses can contribute substantially to more efficient and appropriate assistance and protection. Failure to take the trafficking victim and the family and community into account in any discussion or intervention misses an important, arguably pivotal, factor in the reintegration process and the likelihood of its success. The following recommendations are aimed at improving reintegration policy and programs for trafficking victims and are offered to practitioners and policymakers to support their work with victims and their families to “move on” from trafficking.
Recommendations for supporting individual trafficking victims

- Offer long-term, comprehensive assistance programs aimed at reintegration.
- Offer assistance to meet all of victims’ needs and address all vulnerabilities.
- Offer assistance to all trafficking victims.
- Enhance victims’ access to services at a village level.
- Ensure that trafficking-specific needs are identified and addressed.
- Increase the role and competency of social workers at a local level.
- Protect victims’ rights when assisting family members.

Recommendations for work with trafficking victims’ families

- Identify the impact of trafficking on victims’ families.
- Include trafficking victim’s family members in the provision of assistance.
- Understand and accommodate the family setting in all reintegration work.
- Offer opportunities for family mediation and counselling.
- Provide assistance that takes into account the various needs and situations of victims (with their different families, constellations and needs).

Recommendations for enhancing reintegration of trafficking victims within their communities

- Recognize and accommodate community dynamics in reintegration programs and policies.
- Sensitize community leaders to the issue of trafficking, including all forms of trafficking and all types of victims, and the rights/needs of victims.
- Work with community leaders in the identification and referral of trafficking victims.
- Address discrimination, marginalization and stigmatization as part of reintegration efforts in communities.
- Identify different causes of community tension, stigma and discrimination for different victims, forms of trafficking and in different settings.
- Offer assistance that is not visible within the community.