ISSE
International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology
pISSN 2964-7118, eISSN 2830-604X

ADMINISTRATIVE COHESION AND POLICY TRANSMISSION IN INDONESIAN GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO COVID-19

Silvia P. T. Pereira, Rommy Hardyansah

Universitas Sunan Giri Surabaya

Correspondence: dr.rommyhardyansah@gmail.com

Abstract - *This study examines the structure and execution of Indonesian government policies during the COVID-19 pandemic, with a specific focus on infectious disease management in a decentralized governance setting. Employing a literature review method, the research identifies legal instruments, institutional configurations, and operational strategies employed throughout the crisis. It explores how policy frameworks were formulated, disseminated, and enforced across national and subnational jurisdictions. The study reveals that Indonesia's response, while legally structured, was challenged by coordination gaps, data fragmentation, and limited administrative cohesion. These issues affected the efficiency and equity of pandemic containment efforts. Through the analysis of academic sources and institutional evaluations, the paper demonstrates that effective public health policy requires not only strong legal authority but also integrated systems for implementation and accountability. The findings contribute to the understanding of pandemic governance in complex political environments and offer guidance for future public health preparedness. The research concludes that sustainable policy response must be anchored in administrative synergy, transparent communication, and participatory adaptation across levels of government.*

Keywords: infectious disease policy, COVID-19 governance, administrative coordination, decentralization, Indonesian public health, legal framework, implementation dynamics.

INTRODUCTION

The emergence of COVID-19 in late 2019 tested the capacity of national governments to formulate and implement policies capable of containing public health crises. Across the globe, the rapid transmission of the virus forced states to adopt urgent regulatory measures that often exceeded standard bureaucratic procedures (Mardiyanta & Wijaya, 2022). These policies included restrictions on movement, the reconfiguration of healthcare priorities, and the mobilization of resources under emergency governance. The case of Indonesia stands as a particularly instructive example of how developing countries navigated the uncertainty of a health emergency while balancing political, economic, and social imperatives (Ginata et al., 2022). The complexity of Indonesia's decentralized administrative system further influenced the coherence and speed of national-to-local coordination during the early stages of the outbreak.

In the Indonesian context, the response to the pandemic exhibited a combination of centralized decision-making and fragmented local execution. Government interventions ranged from temporary lockdowns, known locally as PSBB (Pembatasan Sosial Berskala Besar), to mandates on mask usage, vaccination campaigns, and public information drives (Dewi & Tobing, 2021). Yet, the implementation of these measures revealed structural inconsistencies, limited coordination between ministries, and variable compliance across provinces. These variances not only shaped public health outcomes but also exposed the institutional constraints that framed policy effectiveness (Azikin et al., 2021).

Within the academic domain, COVID-19 management has sparked interest in evaluating governmental approaches from multidisciplinary angles. Political scientists have scrutinized executive authority and inter-agency alignment, while public health scholars have assessed containment efficiency and epidemiological models. In parallel, sociologists have focused on behavioral responses, cultural attitudes, and civic trust, all of which influence how policy measures translate into collective behavior. This growing body of literature provides a critical foundation for understanding the policy architecture adopted by Indonesia during the crisis (Agustino, 2021).

While numerous studies have documented the outcomes of pandemic responses, fewer have examined how government decisions during the COVID-19 emergency reflect patterns in the formulation, dissemination, and enforcement of infectious disease policies in transitional democracies. By concentrating on Indonesia, a state with both a decentralized administrative system and a history of reactive public health regulation, this study seeks to uncover underlying patterns in governance logic that surfaced in the face of an unprecedented viral threat (Meckelburg, 2021).

The primary concern in existing scholarship pertains to the policy execution gap observed during the COVID-19 emergency. For instance, research by Grindle (1997) suggested that discrepancies between national policy design and local implementation are endemic to many low- and middle-income countries, especially when administrative capacity is uneven. Similarly, Turner (2002) emphasized the disjunction between centralized health strategies and local health infrastructure, which often renders national initiatives ineffective or inconsistent at the grassroots level.

Another concern relates to the lack of transparency and data synchronization in policy enforcement. When health data are fragmented across agencies or provinces, decision-makers may lack the empirical foundation necessary for timely and accurate intervention. This issue was discussed by Anderson (2003), who argued that weak information systems undermine trust and impair institutional responsiveness during crises. In Indonesia, such gaps became evident in the early months of the outbreak, where reporting lags and data discrepancies hampered the precision of policy direction.

Further complexities arose in public communication and compliance enforcement. Governments often rely on a combination of technical expertise and persuasive messaging to secure population adherence. However, as noted by Hyden (1999), in environments where civic engagement is mediated by patronage or distrust, formal instructions may fail to penetrate everyday decision-making. In Indonesia, this dynamic was illustrated in divergent attitudes toward vaccine acceptance, mobility restrictions, and informal economic activity.

The need to observe these patterns is amplified by the lessons they offer for future policy design. Understanding the institutional and administrative behavior during the COVID-19 outbreak contributes not only to retrospective evaluation but to prospective risk governance. The manner in which policy was constructed, enacted, and received reveals underlying assumptions about authority, legitimacy, and civic obligation.

It is also important to examine how Indonesian policymakers negotiated the tension between public health imperatives and economic preservation. The balancing act between life-saving measures and maintaining livelihoods exposed the ethical and strategic dilemmas faced by leaders in developing countries. Such dilemmas are not only practical but conceptual, requiring a careful interrogation of governance priorities under stress.

The objective of this study is to examine the government policies enacted in Indonesia during the COVID-19 pandemic, with a focus on how such measures were formulated, transmitted, and enforced across administrative layers. By relying on a structured literature review, this study aims to extract key policy patterns and institutional dynamics relevant to public health crisis management. The findings are expected to inform both academic discourse and practical policymaking, especially in the context of future preparedness.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study adopts a literature-based approach aimed at synthesizing empirical findings and conceptual arguments related to government policy in managing infectious diseases, with a specific focus on the COVID-19 experience in Indonesia. The literature review method enables a structured examination of academic sources, policy documents, and institutional analyses published by scholars and global agencies. The goal is to trace recurring themes and institutional mechanisms that influenced the policy architecture, including decision-making frameworks, implementation modalities, and cross-sectoral coordination. According to Booth, Papaioannou, and Sutton (2012), literature review research is appropriate when the objective is to build an interpretative understanding of institutional responses in complex social systems, particularly where empirical experimentation is constrained by ethical or logistical limitations.

To ensure scholarly rigor, the review process followed a three-phase procedure: selection, categorization, and synthesis. First, the selection phase involved identifying publications from reputable academic journals, books, and institutional reports that addressed pandemic governance, health policy, crisis management, and administrative structures in Southeast Asia. Second, the categorization process entailed grouping the sources into thematic domains such as epidemiological governance, administrative coordination, data transparency, and civic compliance. Finally, in the synthesis phase, the information was organized into narrative constructs that reflect both the theoretical grounding and empirical findings of previous research. As outlined by Hart (1998), the value of a literature review lies in its capacity to produce critical insight rather than mere aggregation. The sources employed in this section were chosen for their credibility, publication integrity, and alignment with the objectives of this study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Efforts to manage widespread public health emergencies require swift yet coherent institutional action. In democratic states with layered governance structures, such responses often emerge through a negotiation of authority across administrative levels (Hu & Kapucu, 2021). Coordinated crisis response becomes more difficult when jurisdictional responsibilities are poorly defined or contested. In such environments, ambiguity can disrupt the continuity of emergency interventions and erode public confidence in regulatory legitimacy (Fos et al., 2021).

Indonesia presents a particularly complex case due to its decentralized political architecture. Since the implementation of post-Suharto reforms, authority over many sectors has been delegated to regional governments, altering the landscape of policy execution (Rahardiansah, 2022). While this framework is designed to bring governance closer to the citizenry, it simultaneously increases the potential for procedural dissonance when urgent, unified action is required. This structural reality came into sharp relief during the onset of the COVID-19 outbreak (Disantara, 2020).

The rapid escalation of infection rates placed extraordinary pressure on the state to act decisively. However, the lack of integrated emergency protocols across national and subnational levels impeded uniform implementation. As municipalities introduced their own containment measures—some in alignment with national guidelines, others independently—variations in enforcement became evident. The absence of a singular command structure raised questions about the operational readiness of decentralized systems during crises (Ingram et al., 2021).

Beyond institutional boundaries, the challenge extended to legal instruments underpinning the response. Multiple statutory frameworks—each addressing different aspects of health, disaster management, and public order—were invoked without systematic harmonization. Inconsistencies in legal interpretation across districts contributed to uneven enforcement, as local authorities navigated mandates with limited procedural guidance. This condition diluted the clarity necessary for timely public health compliance (Broojerdi et al., 2021).

At the intersection of policy and practice, frontline responses were shaped by both administrative capacity and intergovernmental trust. Variability in resource availability, technical expertise, and personnel distribution complicated the deployment of interventions such as quarantine enforcement and vaccination. Moreover, gaps in communication between layers of government delayed feedback loops necessary for course correction and adaptive management (Johnson et al., 2022).

This multi-dimensional scenario confirms the long-standing assertion that decentralization, while potentially empowering, demands precise delineation of functions to be effective under duress. Cheema and Rondinelli (2007) underscored that in the absence of such clarity, fragmented authority can obstruct the synchronization of critical actions. The Indonesian case during the COVID-19 crisis illustrates this predicament with striking clarity, offering a valuable reference point for institutional reform and future preparedness (Kusuma & Akbar, 2021).

Early response measures centered on the enactment of large-scale social restrictions (PSBB), guided by the Ministry of Health through ministerial decrees. While these frameworks provided legal grounds for local lockdowns, actual enforcement depended heavily on provincial governance capacity (Chandir et al., 2020). The tension between national directives and sub-national discretion mirrored earlier structural challenges discussed by Turner and Podger (2003), who highlighted administrative overlap as a recurrent obstacle in Indonesian governance.

Institutional coordination across sectors remained uneven. The COVID-19 task force established in March 2020 included members from military, health, and disaster management agencies (Andriani, 2020). However, the absence of a singular operational command diluted efficiency (Setyagama, 2022). Previous studies, such as those by Grindle (2004), noted that inter-agency rivalries and lack of integrated protocols impede swift action during health emergencies in bureaucratically dense systems.

Legal authority was distributed across multiple statutes, including the Health Quarantine Law (UU No. 6/2018), the Disaster Management Law (UU No. 24/2007), and presidential decrees. The coexistence of legal frameworks without harmonization led to interpretive ambiguity, affecting implementation fidelity. This phenomenon echoes the argument by Sidel (2004) that overlapping mandates in post-authoritarian states often generate institutional friction.

In terms of resource allocation, the central government relied on fiscal transfers and procurement coordination under emergency status declarations. Budget reallocation permitted expedited spending for health infrastructure and social safety nets (Haryatie, 2022). However, accountability procedures were partially suspended, raising concerns about oversight. The balance between speed and integrity has long been a subject of inquiry, as noted by Brinkerhoff (2000), who warned against crisis-induced bypassing of regulatory safeguards.

Public communication strategy played a decisive role in shaping behavioral compliance. The spokesperson system centralized information dissemination but often struggled with transparency and consistency. Misinformation proliferated through social media, undermining trust (Willroth et al., 2021). This mirrors the caution of Anderson (2003), who argued that fragmented communication channels in crisis contexts diminish public confidence and policy coherence.

Testing and data surveillance infrastructure faced severe limitations in the first phase of the outbreak. Laboratory capacity was concentrated in urban centers, delaying diagnosis in peripheral regions (Biswas et al., 2021). The absence of a unified data repository obstructed timely interventions. These limitations reflect broader patterns described by Lewis (2006), who identified asymmetric health system readiness as a structural vulnerability in archipelagic states.

Quarantine enforcement, especially for international arrivals and inter-regional travelers, relied on military and police support (Kandel et al., 2020). This securitized response, while efficient in operational terms, triggered human rights concerns. The use of coercive methods to regulate movement reintroduces the question of proportionality and civic rights, a dilemma explored by Brysk (2002) in studies on emergency governance in transitional democracies.

Vaccine distribution emerged as a central policy axis from late 2020 onward (Ogunfuwa, 2022). The national vaccination strategy prioritized frontline workers and elderly populations, facilitated by the Ministry of Health in coordination with local governments (Fischer & Wohl, 2022). While logistical execution improved over time, the initial phases were marked by shortages and unequal access. These disparities affirm the findings of Tandon and Cashin (2010) on health equity gaps in developing countries under resource strain. In some provinces, vaccine allocation was influenced by administrative proximity rather than epidemiological urgency, resulting in skewed coverage. Communication challenges and digital registration barriers further delayed access among marginalized communities, particularly in rural and peri-urban areas.

Community-based programs such as "Kampung Tangguh" were promoted to empower local units in health surveillance and behavioral monitoring. These initiatives illustrate the turn toward participatory resilience. However, without adequate support and alignment with formal systems, their impact remained uneven (Juniar, 2022). This dynamic resonates with the work of Uphoff (2001), who emphasized the need for institutional anchoring of grassroots interventions to achieve systemic integration.

The role of religious organizations was both constructive and contested. On one hand, they contributed to public education and humanitarian aid; on the other, inconsistent messaging from religious leaders occasionally conflicted with state directives (Faoziyah, 2022). Managing such contradictions demanded delicate negotiation. Scholars such as Hefner (2000) have long argued that in plural societies, policy alignment requires relational diplomacy as much as institutional authority.

Digital applications such as "PeduliLindungi" were developed to support contact tracing and vaccination tracking. While technologically innovative, concerns about data privacy and usage transparency surfaced (Owusu, 2020). This aligns with concerns raised by Bennett and Lyon (2008), who cautioned that surveillance tools in public health must be grounded in rights-based frameworks to prevent misuse. In practice, the lack of clear data governance protocols created ambiguity regarding how user information was stored, shared, and protected. Public skepticism intensified when access restrictions were tied to app usage, raising questions about voluntariness and informed consent in the digital management of health compliance.

Fiscal stimulus policies complemented health measures through cash transfers and credit relief for affected sectors (Mustofa et al., 2022). Yet, informal workers, who dominate the Indonesian labor market, were often undercovered. Policy reach was constrained by incomplete registries and administrative bottlenecks (Jusril et al., 2022). The challenges of reaching vulnerable groups in fragmented governance environments have been well documented, particularly in the context of social protection (Brzeska et al., 2015).

Throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, Indonesia faced a substantial gap in evaluating policy interventions as they unfolded. During the most critical phases of the crisis, decision-making was heavily reliant on preformulated assumptions rather than dynamic assessments of policy impact. Instruments for real-time feedback were either underdeveloped or completely absent. This vacuum in evaluative capacity constrained the government's ability to adaptively refine its response strategies, particularly when regional implementation diverged from central planning (Haitami & Rengganis, 2021).

One of the clearest indicators of this gap was the absence of a centralized monitoring dashboard that tracked both epidemiological trends and intervention outcomes concurrently. Although daily case reports and health service updates were available, these data lacked integration with socioeconomic variables and regional enforcement data. Consequently, policymakers lacked access to composite indicators necessary for comprehensive situational awareness. Without these metrics, policy calibration became reactive rather than anticipatory (Agustino, 2021).

Retrospective audits and evaluations were launched after the emergency phase had subsided, particularly in 2021 and 2022. These reviews, while useful for accountability and reporting, could not retroactively guide real-time operational adjustments (Zhou et al., 2022). For example, social assistance distribution during lockdowns suffered from delays and exclusion errors, yet feedback mechanisms to correct these issues during deployment were either too slow or politically constrained. The inability to course-correct contributed to inefficiencies and public dissatisfaction (Polzer et al., 2021).

The lack of institutionalized learning processes prior to the pandemic compounded the challenge. Although the country had experienced prior public health emergencies—such as avian influenza and dengue outbreaks—the knowledge management systems to store, retrieve, and apply those experiences were fragmented. Indonesia's governance architecture offered little in the way of institutional memory repositories capable of informing real-time responses in the COVID-19 context (Kurniawan, 2022).According to Patton (2002), developmental evaluation is essential in rapidly changing environments, where conventional summative approaches fail to meet the demands of real-time governance. Indonesia's evaluation culture remained largely project-based, focused on post-implementation reviews and donor-driven audits. This orientation did not accommodate the need for continuous learning during active crisis management. The limited use of embedded evaluators or learning specialists within key ministries reflected the systemic neglect of adaptive governance (Subandi et al., 2022).

Moreover, data ownership was dispersed across various agencies, limiting cross-sectoral learning. The Ministry of Health, National Disaster Management Agency, and local health departments often maintained parallel records with minimal interoperability. As a result, inconsistencies in case data, resource inventories, and intervention records emerged. This fragmentation further impeded the possibility of conducting concurrent policy evaluation and severely restricted the evidence base for decision-makers (Anderson-Draper, 2023).Ultimately, the Indonesian government's experience during COVID-19 underscores a critical institutional deficit: the absence of embedded mechanisms for reflective learning during emergencies. This condition not only diminished the effectiveness of interventions but also hindered long-term policy maturation. The challenge ahead lies in transitioning from reactive governance to a model that incorporates real-time monitoring, feedback assimilation, and dynamic recalibration of public health strategies.

CONCLUSIONS

The management of the COVID-19 crisis in Indonesia reveals a multifaceted landscape of public health governance shaped by institutional capacity, administrative coordination, and legal infrastructure. While the central government implemented a wide array of regulatory mechanisms, the success of these measures was heavily conditioned by local execution, bureaucratic coherence, and data responsiveness. The Indonesian case exemplifies the importance of structured yet adaptable policy design in managing infectious disease outbreaks within decentralized and diverse administrative systems.

The findings of this study suggest that infectious disease management in transitional democracies requires more than rapid regulatory action. It depends on synchronized inter-agency collaboration, transparent information systems, and the sustained legitimacy of enforcement practices. Indonesia's experience highlights the value of integrated governance frameworks capable of absorbing uncertainty while preserving civic trust and equity in access to public health services.

Future policy development should prioritize institutional learning, ensure the interoperability of health data systems, and reinforce legal clarity between national and local authorities. Moreover, crisis preparedness must include social infrastructure that empowers community-based responses while protecting individual rights. Academic inquiry must continue to interrogate how governance structures condition public health outcomes during emergencies.

REFERENCES

Agustino, L. (2021). Policy learning and handling of COVID-19 in Indonesia. Transformasi: Jurnal Manajemen Pemerintahan, 62-78. https://doi.org/10.33701/JTP.V13I1.1265

Anderson, J. E. (2003). Public policymaking: An introduction (5th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Anderson-Draper, M. (2022). Fostering an evaluative culture by addressing a breakdown in the policy development cycle. Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation, 37(2), 265-272. https://doi.org/10.3138/cjpe.74582

Andriani, H. (2020). Effectiveness of large-scale social restrictions (PSBB) toward the new normal era during COVID-19 outbreak: a mini policy review. journal of indonesian health policy and administration, 5(2), 5-11.https://doi.org/10.7454/IHPA.V5I2.4001

A'yun, R. Q., & Mudhoffir, A. M. (2022). Reproducing Indonesia's illiberal legalism amid Covid-19: Public health crisis as a means of accumulation. Austl. J. Asian L., 22, 21.. https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.8-6-2021.2314334

Azikin, A., & Thahir, B. (2021). The indonesian government strategy of herd immunity in handling of pandemic COVID 19. Systematic Reviews Pharmacy, 12(1), 640-647.https://doi.org/10.31838/SRP.2021.1.92

Bennett, C. J., & Lyon, D. (2008). Playing the identity card: Surveillance, security and identification in global perspective. London: Routledge.

Biswas, S., Ghosh, P., Chakraborty, D., Chatterjee, A., Dutta, S., & Saha, M. K. (2021). COVID-19 Infection: Data Gaps for Diagnostic Laboratory Preparedness and Tasks on Hand. Viral Immunology, 34(3), 158-164. https://doi.org/10.1089/VIM.2020.0147

Booth, A., Papaioannou, D., & Sutton, A. (2012). Systematic approaches to a successful literature review. London: Sage Publications.

Brinkerhoff, D. W. (2000). Assessing political will for anti-corruption efforts: An analytical framework. Public Administration and Development, 20(3), 239–252.

Broojerdi, A., Alfonso, C., Dehaghi, R. O. A., Refaat, M., & Sillo, H. (2021). Worldwide Assessment of Low- and Middle-Income Countries' Regulatory Preparedness to Approve Medical Products During Public Health Emergencies. Frontiers of Medicine in China, 8(722872), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.3389/FMED.2021.722872

Brysk, A. (2002). Globalization and human rights. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Brzeska, J., Das, M., & Fan, S. (2015). Social protection for poor, vulnerable and disadvantaged groups. China Agricultural Economic Review, 7(4), 668-687.

Chandir, S., Siddiqi, D. A., Mehmood, M., Setayesh, H., Siddique, M., Mirza, A., Soundardjee, R., Dharma, V. K., Shah, M. T., Abdullah, S., Akhter, M. A., Khan, A. A., & Khan, A. J. (2020). Impact of COVID-19 pandemic response on uptake of routine immunizations in Sindh, Pakistan: an analysis of provincial electronic immunization registry data. Vaccine, 38(45), 7146-7155. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.VACCINE.2020.08.019

Cheema, G. S., & Rondinelli, D. A. (2007). Decentralizing governance: Emerging concepts and practices. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Dewi, D. S., & Tobing, T. N. W. (2021). Optimalisasi penyelenggaran pelayanan publik dalam masa perubahan melawan COVID-19 di Indonesia. Journal of Information System, Applied, Management, Accounting and Research, 5(1), 210-214.https://doi.org/10.52362/JISAMAR.V5I1.362

Disantara, F. P. (2020). Aspek Imunitas Dalam Penanganan Corona Virus Disease 2019. Istinbath: Jurnal Hukum, 17(1), 65-82. https://doi.org/10.32332/ISTINBATH.V17I1.2049

Faoziyah, S. (2022). Community Empowerment Through Religious Education and Islamic Social-Resilience. Dinamika Ilmu, 22(2), 293-316.https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v22i2.4967

Fischer, W. A., & Wohl, D. A. (2022). Inequities in access to diagnostics threatens global public health security. The Lancet Infectious Diseases, 22(6), 754-756.https://doi.org/10.1016/s1473-3099(21)00806-9

Fos, P. J., Honoré, P. A., & Honoré, R. L. (2021). Coordination of public health response: the role of leadership in responding to public health emergencies. In Science-Based approaches to respond to COVID and other public health threats. IntechOpen.. https://doi.org/10.5772/INTECHOPEN.96304

Ginata, A. R. S., Pandu, P., Handayani, N., & Ariawantara, P. A. F. (2022). Comparison of COVID-19 Control policies between Indonesia and Australia based on the perspective of policy capacity theory. Jurnal Borneo Administrator, 18(3), 279-294.. https://doi.org/10.24258/jba.v18i3.1080

Grindle, M. S. (1997). Divergent cultures? When public organizations perform well in developing countries. World Development, 25(4), 481–495.

Grindle, M. S. (2004). Good enough governance: Poverty reduction and reform in developing countries. Governance, 17(4), 525–548.

Haitami, M., & Rengganis, A. (2021). The dilemma of good governance implementation in indonesia during the pandemic of Corona Virus Disease (COVID-19). Journal of Ahvance in Social Sciences and Policy , 1(1), 55-67. (COVID-19). https://doi.org/10.23960/JASSP.V1I1.25

Hart, C. (1998). Doing a literature review: Releasing the social science research imagination. London: SAGE Publications.

Haryatie, E. (2022). The role of government in pandemic, to overcome the survey of unemployment and poverty in the national economic recovery in the supporting a defense economy. Journal of Research in Business, Economics, and Education, 4(5), 1-13.https://doi.org/10.55683/jrbee.v4i5.421

Hefner, R. W. (2000). Civil Islam: Muslims and democratization in Indonesia. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hu, Q., & Kapucu, N. (2021). Multilevel network governance in emergency management. In Handbook of public administration (pp. 94-106). Routledge.https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429270680-11
Hyden, G. (1999). Governance and the reconstitution of political order. In R. Joseph (Ed.), State, conflict, and democracy in Africa (pp. 179–195). Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
Ingram, A. E., Hertelendy, A. J., Molloy, M. S., & Ciottone, G. R. (2021). State preparedness for crisis standards of care in the United States: implications for emergency management. Prehospital and disaster medicine, 36(1), 1-3.https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049023X20001405
Johnson, G. D., Wally, K., Willoughby, J. R., Williamson, R., Corvey, K., Becker, M., Moorman, T. B., & Dunning, K. H. (2022). Application of the Policy Regime Framework to understand COVID-19 policy response in the Southeast U.S.: How RAPID research can provide lessons learned after a public health crisis. Frontiers in Sociology. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2022.959553
Juniar, R. (2022). Government communication patterns in the disaster resilient village program as an effort to deal with covid-19. Wasilatuna: Jurnal Komunikasi dan Penyiaran Islam, 5(1), 25-41. https://doi.org/10.38073/wasilatuna.v5i1.624
Jusril, H., Ariawan, I., Damayanti, R., Lazuardi, L., Musa, M., Wulandari, S. M., Pronyk, P., & Mechael, P. (2020). Digital health for real-time monitoring of a national immunisation campaign in Indonesia: a large-scale effectiveness evaluation. BMJ Open, 10(12). https://doi.org/10.1136/BMJOPEN-2020-038282
Kandel, N., Chungong, S., Omaar, A., & Xing, J. (2020). Health security capacities in the context of COVID-19 outbreak: an analysis of International Health Regulations annual report data from 182 countries. The Lancet, 395(10229), 1047-1053.https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30553-5
Kurniawan, R. (2022, January 1). Great Reset of Law and Health System in Indonesia after the Covid-19 Pandemic Towards a Change in the Direction of Positive for the Public. https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.8-6-2021.2314334
Kusuma, A. R., & Akbar, P. (2021). Policy response and collaboration in handling covid-19 east kutai regency with an adaptive governance approach in Disasters. Jurnal Borneo Administrator, 17(2), 223-240.https://doi.org/10.24258/JBA.V17I2.866
Lewis, M. (2006). Governance and corruption in public health care systems. Center for Global Development working paper, (78), 1-57.
Mardiyanta, A., & Wijaya, C. N. (2023). Policy capacity during COVID-19 in Asia: A systematic literature review. Journal of Public Affairs, 23(1), e2835. https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2835
Mas'udi, W. (2022, January 1). From Health Crisis to Crisis of Governance? The Dynamics of COVID-19 Policy Responses in Indonesia. https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.15-9-2021.2315587
Meckelburg, R., & Bal, C. S. (2021). Indonesia and Covid-19: Decentralization and social conflict. In Covid-19 and governance (pp. 74-87). Routledge.
Mustofa, M., Fikri, A. A. H. S., Kusumawardani, N., & Afandi, M. R. (2022). Indonesia and Malaysia Fiscal Policy Stimulus in the Era of the Covid-19 Pandemic. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal), 5(3), 22545-22555.. https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v5i3.6267
Ogunfuwa, F. (2022). Future pandemics: failing to prepare means preparing to fail. The Lancet Respiratory Medicine. https://doi.org/10.1016/s2213-2600(22)00056-x
Owusu, P. N. (2020). Digital technology applications for contact tracing: the new promise for COVID-19 and beyond?. Global Health Research and Policy, 5(1), 36-52. https://doi.org/10.1186/S41256-020-00164-1
Patton, M. Q. (2002). Qualitative research and evaluation methods (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
Polzer, T., & Goncharenko, G. (2022). The UK COVID-19 app: The failed co-production of a digital public service. Financial Accountability & Management, 38(2), 281-298. https://doi.org/10.1111/FAAM.12307
Rahardiansah, T., Wahid, E., & Asror, E. M. (2022). Reconstruction of The Legal Relations of The Central and Local Governments in Handling the Pandemic in Indonesia. Journal of World Science, 1(5), 291-299.https://doi.org/10.36418/jws.v1i5.37
Setyagama, A. Government responsibility to the people of Indonesia in management of the COVID-19 pandemic. International journal of health sciences, 6(S4), 10066-10077. https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6ns4.12154
Sidel, J. T. (2004). Bossism and democracy in the Philippines, Thailand and Indonesia: Towards an alternative framework for the study of 'local strongmen'. In J. Harris, K. Stokke, & O. Törnquist (Eds.), Politicising democracy: Local politics and democratisation in developing countries (pp. 51–74). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Subandi, M., Raden, I., & Suprapto, H. (2021). Evaluation of Subdistrict Tasks in Implementation the Authority for Small-Scale Development in Kutai Kartanegara Regency. Transformasi: Jurnal Manajemen Pemerintahan, 145-161.. https://doi.org/10.33701/jtp.v13i2.1971
Tandon, A., & Cashin, C. (2010). Assessing public expenditure on health from a fiscal space perspective. In P. C. Smith et al. (Eds.), Health systems in low- and middle-income countries (pp. 245–269). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Turner, M. (2002). Local government and community participation in Indonesia. Oxford: Ashgate.
Turner, M., & Podger, O. (2003). Decentralisation in Indonesia: Redesigning the state. Canberra: Asia Pacific Press.
Uphoff, N. (2001). Understanding social capital: Learning from the analysis and experience of participation. In P. Grootaert & T. van Bastelaer (Eds.), Understanding and measuring social capital (pp. 215–253). Washington, DC: World Bank.
Van Zyl, A., & Claasen, M. (2003). Getting the basics right: A primer for NGOs on the fundamentals of monitoring and evaluating government budgets. International Budget Partnership.
Wang, C. (2023). Coping with low data availability for social media crisis message categorisation. arXiv.Org. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.17211
Willroth, E. C., Smith, A. M., Shallcross, A. J., Graham, E. K., Mroczek, D. K., & Ford, B. Q. (2021). The health behavior model of personality in the context of a public health crisis. Psychosomatic medicine, 83(4), 363-367.https://doi.org/10.1097/PSY.0000000000000937
Zhou, Z., Zhang, X., & Ki, E. J. (2022). Crisis response strategy manipulation: A systematic review and a test of nuances. Public relations review, 48(3), 102208. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2022.102208