INDONESIA' CRISIS RESPONSE TO COVID-19 PANDEMIC: FROM VARIOUS LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT AND NETWORK ACTIONS TO POLICY

Devi YULIANTI
Departement of Public Administration, Faculty of Political and Social Sciences,
Universitas Lampung, Indonesia
devi.yulianti@fisip.unila.ac.id

Intan Fitri MEUTIA
Departement of Public Administration, Faculty of Political and Social Sciences,
Universitas Lampung, Indonesia

Bayu SUJADMIKO
Department of International Law, Faculty of Law, Universitas Lampung, Indonesia

Wahyudi
Departement of Public Administration, Faculty of Political and Social Sciences,
Universitas Lampung, Indonesia

Abstract: *WHO China Office was informed and reported cases with no death of unknown pneumonia detected in Wuhan, Hubei Province in early December 2019. WHO published its risk assessment and advice on the status of patients by national authorities in Wuhan. On 10* th *January 2020, WHO issued its first guidance for novel coronavirus. WHO made visit to Wuhan by delegation to discuss the status of the virus. Officially on 11* th *February 2020, WHO named Corona Virus Disease (COVID-19) after declared the outbreaks. Many responses were coming from various countries to this crisis. The responses may vary according to crisis response management: public policies; networks interactions; and contextual condition that create the strategic and operational level (Boin & 't Hart, 2010). We adopt qualitative research. We focused on the actual textual documents as the objects of our analytical content from internet, articles from journals and reference books. The objectives of this research are: notifying government's actions towards COVID-19 pandemic; identifying government's policies on COVID-19 pandemic; and analyzing Indonesia's crisis response management to control COVID 19 pandemic. Indonesia is still slow to response the pandemic. The contextual dimensions from crisis response management in Indonesia include: citizen's behaviors, governments actions and the policy power.*
Keywords: *crisis response; government agencies; networks; collective action; policy*

INTRODUCTION

World Health Organization (WHO) China Office was informed and reported cases with no death of unknown pneumonia detected in Wuhan, Hubei Province in early December 2019. WHO (2020) published its risk assessment and advice on the status of patients by national authorities of Wuhan in January 2020 by issuing the first guidance to novel corona virus. WHO made visit to Wuhan, China by delegation to discuss the status of the virus. Officially, on 11 th February 2020, WHO named Corona Virus Disease

(COVID-19) after declared the outbreaks that could not refer to the geographical location, an animal, an individual or a group of people. On 13th January 2020, the first case of novel coronavirus was confirmed in Thailand and until 15th May 2020, WHO reported the total of new cases globally was 4.338.658 cases with 297.119 deaths. While total confirmed cases of Indonesia was 16.006 cases, 568 new cases, 1.043 total death, 15 new death through community transmission (*https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200515-covid-19-sitrep-116.pdf?sfvrsn=8dd60956_2 accessed on 16th May 2020 at 15:13).*

Compared to WHO updated news, there are 17.025 positive cases and 1.089 deaths reported on COVID-19 website of Indonesia (covid19.go.id *accessed on 17th May 2020 at 14:21*). This government's agency faces big challenge to stop the spread of COVID-19 in society because people are required to be discipline to follow the protocol and guidance on COVID-19 during everyday activities. Every citizen is expected to be able to survive by adjusting his or her lifestyle. Other issue on COVID-19 is the evaluation of Social Containment in Large Scale Policy. The results vary in four provinces with 72 districts/cities. There were numbers of decreased cases consistently but not drastically in a few regions. Whereas some areas have decreased cases inconsistently. The evaluation data was obtained from 10 provinces with most positive cases. The result of the evaluation showed only three provinces implemented that large scale of social containment: DKI Jakarta; West Java; and West Sumatra. Each region in its implementation is not encompassed within the limits of government's administration. The implementation of this containment requires interconnection with a number of large areas *(https://covid19.go.id/p/berita/pemerintah-evaluasi-pelaksanaan-psbb-secara-menyeluruh accessed on 16th May 2020 at 19:21).* The implementation is supported by National Police of Indonesia as a national assistant towards law enforcement of the acceleration government's COVID-19 agency to support the social containment *(https://covid19.go.id/p/berita/operasi-ketupat-dilakukan-lebih-awal-sebagai-antisipasi-psbb-cegah-covid-19 on 16th May 2020 at 19:25).*

The presence of this virus has successfully paralyzed all worlds' activities from various sectors, ranging from education, business, politics, tourism, and so forth. This condition does not only occur in Indonesia but also affects all countries in the world. It is necessary to provide a form of community empowerment practice of the various problems that arise in the middle of the community (Saleh & Mujahiddin, 2020, p.1105). Community empowerment practice needs the collective responses of the society. The response may be anger towards the state for its potential lack of preparedness; especially the pandemic problem is considered the responsibility of the state. On individual level, the disappointment with the reaction of the state to the pandemic can result in an increase need for an agency (San Lau et al, 2020, p.648).

Before declaring social containment for large scale, President had recommended social distancing to the society to stop the spread of COVID-19. The term social distancing is then changed to physical distancing due to unpleasant meaning. Now the government has decided to implement Social Containmet in Large Scale, which is a term that refers to the Health Quarantine Law *(https://www.bbc.com/indonesia/indonesia-52109439 accesses on 16th May 2020 at 20:44).*

COVID-19 has affected over 100 countries. People's response towards social distancing in the emerging pandemic is uncertain. From the research of Qazi et al (2020,

p.1) showed that an increase in situational awareness in times of public health crisis using formal information sources significantly increase the adoption of protective health behavior. Pandemic calls on citizens (Voorberg et al, 2015, p. 10) in realizing policy goals. Social distancing recommendation and stay at home campaigns ask the society to put away the interactions in their social life.

COVID-19 pandemic has substantially changed private and public life all around the world. To contain the spread of the disease, governments first called the individuals to change their social behavior and hygiene for example: avoiding handshakes, washing hands frequently and avoiding social gathering (Fetzer et al, 2020). 91% from the global survey result from Early March to Late April 2020 from 58 countries and over 100.000 respondents conducted by Fetzer et al (2020) that the respondent did not attend any gathering in the past weeks, 69% reported keeping a distance of at least 2 meters to other people and 78% said that they stayed home in the past week. Their perceptions about protective behavior shown in the survey that 92% say people should not shake each other hands, 90% of respondents believe that social distancing measures are effective or very effective.

Since the first case of COVID-19 announced in Indonesia on 2nd March 2020, many strategies were made in order to prevent transmission and death from this disease. One forum for social change namely change.org Indonesia collected data and information related to perception of citizens about the crisis situation of COVID-19 in Indonesia. This data was collected through a survey. Data is needed to design a COVID-19 pandemic response strategy. The survey results conducted on 24th March 2020 on 10.199 respondents in two days by online analyzed that various government agencies: President; Minister of Health; National Board of Management Disaster; and Local Governments showed that 42.8% of the government is less effective in crisis management response to pandemics; 36.3% of respondents think the President is not fast to response pandemic crisis; 35.1% of respondents think the Minister of Health is not fast to response pandemics, 43.6% of respondents assess National Board of Disaster Management is quite good to response the crisis; and 36.1% of respondents rated Local Government is quite good to response the pandemic. From these survey results, respondents have more trust in the performance of National Board of Disaster Management and Local Governments to response pandemic crisis *(https://www.kompas.com/sains/read/2020/04/02/100200323 /berbagai-respons-rakyat-untuk-pemerintah-terkait-penanganan-covid-19?page=2 accessed on 16th May 2020 at 21:11).*

President's response pandemic by declaring COVID-19 as a crisis disease causes emergency and harm public health. Government issued Presidential Decrees based on Law Number 6/2018 concerning self-isolation and quarantine. This is as the response of public health emergency. The emergency status made government determine and revoke the territory along the country. This ban the entrance and exit means of transporting people; and/or goods in the ports; airports and land border crossings *(https://www.bbc.com/indonesia/indonesia-52109439 accessed on 16th May 2020 at 20:23).*

LITERATURE REVIEW

Social Distancing and Containment

Social distancing has emerged as the principal line of defense for human to fight against the COVID-19. The logic is reducing social interactions between healthy people to slow the spreads of the virus (Long, 2020, p.3). Reducing the spreads of infectious disease during COVID-19 pandemic prompted recommendations for individuals to limit physical contact with others. The most commonly reported motivations for social distancing concerned social responsibility and not wanting others to get sick. Greater social distancing motivations are concerning state or city lockdowns (Oosterhof et al, 2020, p.2). Social distancing practices reduce the contacts between infected and non-infected people.

According to Musinguzi & Asamoah (2020), social distancing is a term that mainly used with reality meaning of physical distancing. Human needs social life and emotional closeness with family, friends, peers and so forth. In egocentrics society, people are socially distant so this instruction refers to that context. Clear massages with clear language about the needs to prevent the spreads of the virus are critical. The governments as policymakers need to be clear about the resolution. Sharing data from all level of policymakers are important. The governments need to move forward to protect their people in a non-threatening, non-panicky manner to ensure citizen's safety (Ventriglio et al, 2020).

The importance of social distancing as tool to limit virus transmission is well recognized but there are many difficulties challenges especially in densely populated urban slums in developing countries where people focus to occupy and live together in in poorly home. It is the responsibility of every citizen to join hands to mitigate its impact following guidance provided by the national authorities within the country (Bhatia; Chodijah et al, 2020).

Social distancing is the practice of increasing the space between people to decrease the spreading illness, spacing of 2 meters away, doing individuals action include: working remotely, avoiding public transportations, and staying at home. Social distancing is a realistic solution that all individuals can take parts to reduce the infection. We can still practice physical distancing while remaining connected socially, emotionally and spiritually (Sen-Crowe et al, 2020).

While social behavior affects the dynamics of the spreads of infectious disease. The virus contributes disruptions in society: possible occurrence of panic; restriction on migration and participation in social event. In contrast, in a micro scale, they lead to various responses of individuals from panic and fear to misinterpretation. In pandemic, badly informed people tend to panic that may lead to bad decision making, high stress level causing anxiety. People who are not fully informed seek further information on the internet, which is full of diverse content (Jarynowski et al, 2020, p.8).

Social interactions influence the emotions, opinions and behavior. Advanced technology in social media lead to more dynamic interactions. Containment control is a particular class of consensus (Kan et al, 2014, p.2). Social Containment means self-control to behavior (Flexon, 2014, p. 1).

Collective Behavior

Political legitimacy or durability of political power is not always being a result of accurate information about the critical situation. Decentralization of information on the local level transforms the dynamic of collective behaviors. Accurate and consistent information is central to the state in time of crisis (Brown, 2020, p.3).

There are steps for society to commit to participate in COVID-19 response according to Maston & Miles (2020, p.1):

a. Investing in coproduction
b. Build dialogue and reflection to responses to invest not only for this emergency but also for long-term preparedness.
c. Work with community groups
d. Build and use their expertise and networks to mobilize their wider communities.
e. Commit to diversity
f. Include the most marginalize, capture the broad range of knowledge.
g. Be responsive and transparent
h. Collaborate to review outcomes on diverse groups containing the ideas and make improvements.

Voluntary approaches have been adopted in many developed countries as well as in a number of developing countries. The term voluntary approach refers to class of policies, programs, and initiatives under which parties voluntarily agree to participate rather than forced to do so. The practical implication is that all successful voluntary approaches must satisfy the participation, which effects policy design (Segerson, 2013).

Policy

There are some definitions regarding public policy from various authors concluded by Birkland (2015, p.8).

a. Action of governments and the intentions that determine those actions.
b. The outcome of the struggle of the government.
c. Whatever the government choose to do or not do.
d. Political decisions for implementing programs to achieve societal goals.
e. The sum of governments activities, whether acting directly or through agents and influece life of citizens.

Public policy is decisions and non-decisions of government as a reflection of social values and priorities can take traditional form: law; regulation; executive order; local ordinance. In these forms, public policies represent priorities of society. They are varied in range from designs and contents. Governments adopt public policies with different pathways. The pathways of policy change during COVID-19 pandemic as the examples: Partial closures (mitigation) to strict lockdowns in United Kingdom (UK); Negotiated agreement (United States of America, Canada and Japan); Diffusing and transferring ideas across governments, the lessons from South Korea with widespread testing and China's strict quarantine. From these countries illustration of policy decisions, showed contextual factors including institutional (legalistic structures), cultural orientations, economics and political style (Weible et al, 2020, p.3).

Public policy is bridging administrative actions and the government's intention to do something (policy). Pandemic COVID-19 crisis needs span coordination's from different agencies across level of governments. Policy responses call for joint action among profit or non-profit government organizations, enterprises and individuals. Policy networks

include political parties, public agencies, elected offices, non-government organizations, interest groups and so forth. These entities relate in policymaking as resource exchange of information or collaboration. Policy networks react and contribute to policy issues and changing government's agenda in response of COVID-19 Pandemic. Jenkins Smith et al (2018) state that policy networks remain stable with regularized pattern of interactions.

The government must intervene the citizens to control the behavior. There are four policy instruments according to Tummers (2019, p.4): incentives, bans and mandate, communication and nudges that control citizen's behavior. It is not easy to control individual mentality, but behavior approach in policymaking process by the use of social attribute (norms) could lead to better societal outcomes (John, 2016, p.128). The purpose of policy instruments are to:

a. Achieve behaviour change within individuals.
b. Realize social, economic and political conditions.
c. Provided service to the public.

Government's choice of policy instruments is restrained by financial, social, international, and cultural pressures. While the type of policy instruments available to the government include:

a. Doing nothing: deciding not to intervene.
b. Information-based: influencing people through knowledge transfers, communication and moral persuasion (behaviour is based on knowledge, belief and value).
c. Expenditure-based: using money for direct instrument for outcome (grants, vouchers, contributons).
d. Regulation: Government's role to command and limit citizens's activities.
e. Acting directly: Providing direct service to achieve outcome.

In policy making process, there is a decision making that refers to governments adopt of particular course of action. Policy making is a set of interrelated framework for understanding the policy process of activities and relationships that examine the issue (Araral et al, 2013, p. 17).

Crisis Response and Management

Crisis management is a priority in policy agenda of many countries. Crisis management has been defined from different aspects; administrations; recovery and response activities; mitigation efforts and organizational collaboration. While the crisis management concepts consist of: rescue; preparedness; mitigation; resilience efforts made by government; volunteer's organizations or other local departments. A crisis may trigger rapid public policy changes since drawing public and media attention and threatened public trust (Unlu, 2010; p.156-157).

Crisis response and management are interdependence with: 1). Public policies, 2). Individuals, groups, networks and coalitions interactions, 3). Contextual condition (level of income, global level decisions and local interactions). The responses occur as the strategic and operational level (Boin & 't Hart, 2010, p. 358). The operational level refers to grounds decisions including medical personnel, epidemiologists, and others professionals with pandemic's immediate threat. The strategic level includes: political administrative leaders who carry political responsibility in making strategic decisions and

support collaboration. The adjustment of the response from COVID-19 pandemic crisis requires engagement from both levels.

Most crises and disasters pose challenges to response. These challenges include: designing, maintaining and evaluating crisis response capacity in organization, government and communities. We must differentiate the strategic and operational level of responses. At the operational level: we use professional expertise to threat the responders who are close to the disasters to minimize the consequences to provide immediate relief. At the strategic level: the political administrative executives carry political responsibility to make decisions with long-term consequences to provide guidance to public and participants of the response network.

The challenges in strategic level according to Boin&'t Heart (2010) are:

   a. Sense-making: diagnosing situation correctly.
   b. Meaning-making: providing persuasive public understanding.
   c. Decision-making: making strategic policy.
   d. Coordinating: collaboration among public networks.
   e. Circumscribing: targeting and rationing support among victims community.
   f. Consolidating: relating government and society to deliver long-term service to eligible community.
   g. Account-giving: managing the activities of media, expert, legislative and judicial that tends to follow crisis and disaster.
   h. Learning: organizations and systems are involved in drawing evidence based and reflective lessons for the future performance.
   i. Remembering: community should not forget the experience in time of crises or disasters.

While the challenges in operational level are:

   a. Diagnosing and deciding: accurateing the threat under pressure and incomplete information, choosing feasible response approach and updating information with circumstances.
   b. Mobilizing and Organizing: Soliciting the type of level operationally resources necessary to meet the demand of the situation.
   c. Containing and Mitigating: using available resources to contain the destruction.
   d. Informing and Empowering: making crisis response decisions to respective domains.
   e. Coordinating and Collaborating: involving different units, organizations and disciplines in responding crisis together.

Critical decisions enable organizations cope with consequential environments. Critical decisions involve a process for thinking and acting for optimal solutions in restricted time. The context of critical decisions can be due to scarce natural/economics resource, uncertain factors, aversive environment, environmental difficulties, ambiguous circumstances, and unclear situation (Coccia, 2020, p.1).

Research Questions

There are some questions formulated for this article:

   a. What are government's actions towards COVID-19 pandemic?
   b. What are government's policies on COVID-19 pandemic?
   c. How is Indonesia's crisis response management to control COVID-19 pandemic?

Research Objectives

Based on the formulation problems, the objectives of this research are:

a. Notifying government's actions towards COVID-19 pandemic.
b. Identifying government's policies on COVID-19 pandemic.
c. Analyzing Indonesia's crisis response management to control COVID 19 pandemic.

METHODS

According to Neuman (2014, p.28) social science research is about, for and conducted by people with the attention to the principles, rules and procedures. Social research is also a human activity. The researchers are conducted to discover new knowledge and understand social world. For this article, we adopt qualitative with some steps according to the type of qualitative research methods used (Neuman, 2014, p.5). We start with a topic of COVID-19 by situating the topic in socio-historical context then we choose some potential research questions. We design this study by collecting, analyzing and interpreting data. Qualitative research also provides a robust approach to enhance community-based research and action (Jason & Glenwick, 206, p. 21). Analytic work on documents divided in two areas: work that focuses on the actual textual or extra-textual content of documents, and work that focuses on some aspects of the use (Flick, 2014; p.378). We focused on the actual textual documents because this is as the objects of our analytical content from various digital data in internet. The development of internet and social media has changed social interactions. The transformation also changed the research methods. Social and cultural research about internet and digital media is due to its relative newness. This is a digital tool to enrich the method in information age as the new opportunity for analyzing society. Computer as a tool in searching the data and information by using internet is helpful in this era and enrich the qualitative data (Richards, 2015; p. 169).

We use concepts and theoretical interpretations. Finally, we inform others by writing a report. In this, case the article, this is an explanatory research because; we use conceptual theory, elaborate, link the issue or topic with those general concepts and determine several explanations (Neuman, 2014, p.43). We elaborate the general conceptual theory regarding the crisis response management from Boin and 't Hart (2010, p. 358) in figure 1:

Source: adopted from Bon and 't Hart (2010, p. 358), Crisis Response Management.

Conceptual framework explains the main things, the key factors, and variables to be studied either graphically or in narrative form and presumes interrelationships among them. This is a conceptual of the territory being studied. Theory building relies on a few general constructs containing many states, categories, processes and events (Miles et al, 2014; p. 37). We used quantitative statistical data from the survey (viewing in percentage) and qualitative data from content analysis as Leavy said that (2014, p.360) it was a technique for examining the content of information in written documents or other communication medias from newspaper online articles to record specific aspects regarding the research focus. Contents analysis lets us discover the documents of specific features.

RESULTS

The results of this research are displayed in three main focuses: Government's actions towards COVID-19 pandemic; Government's policy on COVID-19 pandemic; and Indonesia's crisis response management to pandemic.

A. Government's actions towards COVID-19 Pandemic

We retrieved the information from various news on website about the government's response:

1. Indonesian government was late to respond COVID-19 pandemic issue since last February 2020 with unclear opinions in mass media continuously *(https://ir.binus.ac.id/2020/03/23/respons-pemerintah-indonesia-terhadap-pandemi-covid-19-desekuritisasi-di-awal-sekuritisasi-yang-terhambat/ accessed on 26 th May 2020 at 16:19).*

2. Comparing cases of COVID-19 pandemic spreads in Southeast Asia, Indonesia has more chance to anticipate the spread of COVID-19. But the local governments were not showing fast response to this situation through coordination with the central government. When a number of countries in Southeast Asian region began to close their country's borders, the Indonesian government had just held a coordination meeting on 17 th February 2020 regarding the opportunity for tourism industry to give discounts to a number of national tourist destinations that resulted in spreading many cases of COVID-19 in Indonesia. Social distancing actions are taken as the first response to the handling of the spread of COVID-19 in Indonesia *(https://katadata.co.id/analisisdata/2020/03/26/pandemi-covid-19-yang-terlambat-diantisipasi-indonesia accessed on 26 th May 2020 at 16:30).*

3. Before declaring social containment for large scale, President had recommended social distancing to the society to stop the spread of COVID-19. The term social distancing is then changed to physical distancing due to unpleasant meaning. Now the government has decided to implement Social Containmet in Large Scale which is a term that refers to the Health Quarantine Law *(https://www.bbc.com/indonesia/indonesia-52109439 accesses on 16 th May 2020 at 20:44)*

4. The government formed COVID-19 task force as a mandate from the President. The task force should be led by an official at the level of the Coordinating Minister, reporting directly to the President, having budget coordinating with ministers and various local governments *(https://www.vivanews.com/berita/nasional/43205-pemerintah-indonesia-diminta-terbuka-dan-tegas-tangani-virus-corona?medium=autonext accessed on 26 th May 2020 at 20:27).*

We concluded that government responses the pandemic by various actions: recommend the society to do social distancing, physical distancing, and stay at home ; make the mandate to the minister regarding the needs to create special task force to respond COVID-19 pandemic spreads and issue the social containment policy on large scale with Presidential Decrees Number 11/2020.

B. Governmnet's Policy on COVID-19 Pandemic

We retrieved the policy from various website regarding the news on COVID-19 :

1. President's response pandemic by declaring COVID-19 as a crisis disease causes emergency and harm public health. Government issued Presidential Decrees based on Law Number 6/2018 concerning self-isolation and quarantine. This is as the response of public health emergency. The emergency status made government determine and revoke the territory along the country. This ban the entrance and exit means of transporting people; and/or goods in the ports; airports and land border crossings *(https://www.bbc.com/indonesia/indonesia-52109439 accessed on 16 th May 2020 at 20:23).*

2. The government issued five protocols for handling COVID-19 as pandemic management: health protocols; communication protocol; border surveillance protocols; education area protocols and public and transport area protocols. The five protocols were issued on 6 th March 2020 which were implemented simultaneously in all regions of Indonesia and coordinated by the Ministry of Health of the Republic of Indonesia. The protocol strengthens the health protocol

that was issued by the Ministry of Health on January 28 *th*, 2020 and the five protocols were evaluated by the Government on February 17*th*, 2020 *(https://www.liputan6.com/news/read/4201341/headline-covid-19-pandemi-global-bagaimana-protap-dan-koordinasi-pusat-daerah-di-indonesia accessed on 26 th May 2020 at 17:20).*

3. The government issued Social Containment Policy based on Regulation Number 21/2020 and Presidential Decree Number 11/2020 *(https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2020/04/26/19130971/kebijakan-presiden-terkait-penanganan-covid-19-disebut-bisa-berubah accessed on 26 th May 2020 at 20:20).*

From those information, we concluded the policy on COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia are Government Regulation Number 21/2020 and Presidential Decress Number 11/2020 also some operational protocols to support the policy.

C. Indonesia's Crisis Response to Pandemic

Since the first case of COVID-19 announced in Indonesia on 2 nd March 2020, many strategies were made in order to prevent transmission and death from this disease. One forum for social change namely change.org Indonesia collected data and information related to perception of citizens about the crisis of COVID-19 in Indonesia. This data was collected through a survey. Data is needed to design a COVID-19 pandemic response strategy. The survey results conducted on 24 th March 2020 on 10.199 respondents in two days by online analyzed that various government agencies: President; Minister of Health; National Board of Management Disaster; and Local Governments showed that 42.8% of the government is less effective in crisis management response to pandemics; 36.3% of respondents think the President is not fast to response pandemic crisis; 35.1% of respondents think the Minister of Health is not fast to response pandemics, 43.6% of respondents assess National Board of Disaster Management is quite good to response the crisis; and 36.1% of respondents rated Local Government is quite good to response the pandemic. From these survey results, respondents have more trust in the performance of National Board of Disaster Management and Local Governments to response pandemic crisis *(https://www.kompas.com/sains/read/2020/04/02/100200323 /berbagai-respons-rakyat-untuk-pemerintah-terkait-penanganan-covid-19?page=2 accessed on 16 th May 2020 at 21:11).*

Based on the news from kompas.com, we concluded that Indonesia is still slow to response the pandemic and the citizens have more trusts in the performance of National Board of Disaster Management and Local Governments.

DISCUSSION

A. Government's Actions towards COVID-19 Pandemic

The result shows that government responses the pandemic by various actions: recommend the society to do social distancing, physical distancing, and stay at home ; make the mandate to the minister regarding the needs to create special task force to respond COVID-19 pandemic spreads and issue the social containment policy on large scale with Presidential Decrees Number 11/2020.

From the literature review, that social distancing is the principal line of defense for human to fight against the COVID-19 by reducing social interactions between healthy people to slow the spreads of the virus (Long, 2020, p.3; Sen-Crowe et al, 2020). According to Musinguzi & Asamoah (2020), social distancing is a term that mainly used with reality meaning of physical distancing. The importance of social distancing as tool to limit virus transmission is well recognized but there are many difficulties challenges especially in densely populated urban slums in developing countries where people focus to occupy and live together in poorly home. It is the responsibility of every citizen to follow guidance provided by the national authorities within the country (Bhatia; Chodijah et al, 2020) so the Indonesia government made clear the actions by informing the five ptotocols.

Citizens are challenged to commit to participate in COVID-19 response to slow the spreads by working with community groups to make improvements (Maston & Miles, 2020, p. 1). These actions from governments and citizens called voluntary if refers to class of policies, programs, and initiatives to participate rather than forced to do so. The voluntary approaches will effect policy design (Segerson, 2013).

The government must intervene the citizens to control the behavior. There are four policy instruments according to Tummers (2019, p.4): incentives, bans and mandate, communication and nudges that control citizen's behavior. It is not easy to control individual mentality, but behavior approach in policymaking process by the use of social attribute (norms) could lead to better societal outcomes (John, 2016, p. 128). In this case, the government issued the mandate to all the ministers for doing the collaborative and voluntary action on COVID-19 pandemic. Government also intervene citizen's behavior by bans and nudges to stay at home, doing physical distancing and following the protocols in everyday activities.

Public policy is bridging administrative actions and the government's intention to do something (policy). Pandemic COVID-19 crisis needs span coordination's from different agencies across level of governments. Policy responses call for joint action among profit or non-profit government organizations, enterprises and individuals. Jenkins Smith et al (2018) state that policy networks remain stable with regularized pattern of interactions. By issuing the social containment policy on large scale with Presidential Decrees Number 11/2020 and Government Regulation Number 21/2020 that would stable and regulate governments actions to control citizen's behavior.

B. Government's Policies on COVID-19 Pandemic

From the analytical content retrieved from news documentation, it is clear that the policy on COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia are Government Regulation Number 21/2020 and Presidential Decress Number 11/2020 also some operational protocols to support the policy. In policy making process, there is a decision-making that refers to governments adopt of particular course of action. Policymaking is a set of interrelated framework for understanding the policy process of activities and relationships that examine the issue (Araral et al, 2013, p.17). From international health organization board information, recommendations actions from various level of government's agencies towards pandemic then voluntary approaches will effect policy design (Segerson, 2013). In this case, a crisis may trigger rapid public policy changes since drawing public and media attention and threatened public trust (Unlu, 2010; p.156-157). There are many media mass news related

to COVID-19 pandemic that effect citizens trust towards government's actions and policies to control the spreads of the virus.

Crisis response and management are interdependence with: 1). Public policies, 2). Individuals, groups, networks and coalitions interactions, 3). Contextual condition (level of income, global level decisions and local interactions). The responses occur as the strategic and operational level (Boin &'t Hart, 2010, p.358). The adjustment of the response from COVID-19 pandemic crisis requires engagement from both levels.

Most crises and disasters pose challenges to response. These challenges include designing, maintaining and evaluating crisis response capacity in organization, government and communities. We must differentiate the strategic and operational level of responses. At the operational level: we use professional expertise to threat the responders who are close to the disasters to minimize the consequences to provide immediate relief. At the strategic level: the political administrative executives carry political responsibility to make decisions with long-term consequences to provide guidance to public and participants of the response network.

C. Indonesia's Crisis Response to Pandemic

Indonesia is still slow to response the pandemic and the citizens have more trusts in the performance of National Board of Disaster Management and Local Governments. This is the challenge for coordination from strategic and operational level responses. The strategic level must diagnosing situation correctly, building public understanding, making strategic policy, coordinating and supporting victims, mitigating the victims and informing public on COVID-19 pandemic (Boin & 't Hart, 2010). These steps will enable organizations cope with consequential environments due to scarce natural/economics resource, uncertain factors, aversive environment, environmental difficulties, ambiguous circumstances, and unclear situation (Coccia, 2020, p.1).

CONCLUSION

Indonesia is still slow to respond the pandemic. The government's actions still slow to respond the spreads of COVID-19 pandemic. The policy and protocols on pandemic crisis must be monitored, strictly implemented and evaluated to control citizen's behavior. The contextual dimension from crisis response management in Indonesia include citizen's behaviors, government's actions and the policy power. The government must regulate the actions to be Regulation based on clear Law regarding on isolation, quarantine and social containment on large scale and be well coordinated with all levels and networks.

References

1. Araral, Jr., Eduardo., Fritzen, Scott., Howlett, Michael., Ramesh, M., & Wu, Xun. (2013). *Routledge Hanbook of Public Policy*. Routledge. New York.
2. Bhatia, R. (2020). Public engagement is key for containing COVID-19 pandemic. Indian Journal of Medical Research, 151(2), 118. Retrieved from http://www.ijmr.org.in/temp/IndianJMedRes1512118-5468957_151129.pdf
3. Birkland, T. (2015). *;,kq[=/jmi*. Routledge. New York.

4. Boin, A., & 't Hart, P. (2010). Organising for effective emergency management: Lessons from research 1. *Australian Journal of Public Adsterministration*, *69*(4), 357-371.Retrieved from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1467-8500.2010.00694.x

5. Brown, P. (2020). Studying COVID-19 in light of critical approaches to risk and uncertainty: research pathways, conceptual tools, and some magic from Mary Douglas. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/13698575.2020.1745508

6. Chodijah, S., Octavia, V., Sonya, E. R., & Kurniasari, D. (2020). The impact of social distancing in economic, cultural and religious views. *Artikel Work From Home*. Retrieved from http://digilib.uinsgd.ac.id/30680/2/dampak_inggris-converted.pdf

7. Coccia, M. (2020). Critical Decisions in Crisis Management. Working Paper Coccia Lab, n45/2020. CNR. National Research Council of Italy. Retrieved from http//:orcid.org/0000-0003-1957-6731

8. Fetzer, T. R., Witte, M., Hensel, L., Jachimowicz, J., Haushofer, J., Ivchenko, A., ... & Gómez, M. (2020). *Global Behaviors and Perceptions at the Onset of the COVID-19 Pandemic* (No. w27082). National Bureau of Economic Research. file:///C:/Users/LING.KOM/Downloads/GlobalBehaviorsPerceptions_COVID19%20(1).pdf

9. Flexon, J. L. (2014). Containment Theory. *The Encyclopedia of Theoretical Criminology*, 1-5. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9781118517390.wbetc023

10. Jarynowski, A., Wójta-Kempa, M., Płatek, D., & Czopek, K. (2020). Attempt to understand public health relevant social dimensions of COVID-19 outbreak in Poland. *Available at SSRN 3570609*. file:///C:/Users/LING.KOM/Downloads/22533-Article%20Text-46320-1-10-20200413%20(1).pdf

11. Jason, Leonard., A., and Glenwick., David., S. (2016). *Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods.* Oxford University Press. UK

12. Jenkins-Smith, H. C., Nohrstedt, D., Weible, C. M., & Ingold, K. (2018). The advocacy coalition framework: An overview of the research program. In *Theories of the policy process* (pp. 135-171). Routledge.

13. John, P. (2016). Behavioral approaches: How nudges lead to more intelligent policy design. In *Contemporary approaches to public policy* (pp. 113-131). Palgrave Macmillan, London. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Philippe_Zittoun/publication/309611268_contemporary_appr oaches_on_public_policy_theories_Controversies_Perspectives/links/5bc47f0d458515a7a9e7e9e1 /contemporary-approaches-on-public-policy-theories-Controversies-Perspectives.pdf#page=128

14. Kan, Z., Klotz, J. R., Pasiliao Jr, E. L., & Dixon, W. E. (2015). Containment control for a social network with state-dependent connectivity. *Automatica*, *56*, 86-92. Retrieved from https://arxiv.org/pdf/1402.5644.pdf%22

15. Leavy, Patricia. (2014). *The Oxford Handbook of Qualitaive Research*. Oxford Univerity Press. UK.

16. Long, N. J. (2020). From social distancing to social containment: reimagining sociality for the coronavirus pandemic. *Medicine Anthropology Theory*. Retrieved from http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/103801/1/

17. Marston, C., Renedo, A., & Miles, S. (2020). Community participation is crucial in a pandemic. *Lancet (London, England)*. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7198202/pdf/main.pdf

18. Miles., Matthew., B., Huberman., A., Michael., and Saldana., Johnny. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis : A Methods Source Book.* SAGE Publication, Inc. USA.

19. Musinguzi, G., & Asamoah, B. O. (2020). The Science of Social Distancing and Total Lock Down: Does it Work? Whom does it Benefit?. *Electronic Journal of General Medicine*, *17*(6). Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Geofrey_Musinguzi/publication/340500169_The_Science_of _Social_Distancing_and_Total_Lock_Down_Does_it_Work_Whom_does_it_Benefit/links/5e8d8 341a6fdcca789fdf92c/The-Science-of-Social-Distancing-and-Total-Lock-Down-Does-it-Work-Whom-does-it-Benefit.pdf

20. Neuman, W. Lawrence. (2014). Social Research Methods : Qualitative and Quantitatives Approaches. Pearson Education Limited. UK.

21. Oosterhoff, B., Palmer, C. A., Wilson, J., & Shook, N. (2020). Adolescents' Motivations to Engage in Social Distancing during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Associations with Mental and Social

Health. *Journal of Adolescent Health.* Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7205689/pdf/main.pdf

22. Qazi, A., Qazi, J., Naseer, K., Zeeshan, M., Hardaker, G., Maitama, J. Z., & Haruna, K. (2020). Analyzing Situational Awareness through Public Opinion to Predict Adoption of Social Distancing Amid Pandemic COVID-19. *Journal of Medical Virology.* https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/jmv.25840

23. Richards, Lyn. (2015). *Handling Qualitative Data : A Practical Guide.* SAGE Publications Inc. USA.

24. Saleh, A., & Mujahiddin, M. (2020). Challenges and Opportunities for Community Empowerment Practices in Indonesia during the Covid-19 Pandemic through Strengthening the Role of Higher Education. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*, *3*(2), 1105-1113. Retrieved from https://bircu-journal.com/index.php/birci/article/view/946/pdf

25. San Lau, L., Samari, G., Moresky, R. T., Casey, S. E., Kachur, S. P., Roberts, L. F., & Zard, M. (2020). COVID-19 in humanitarian settings and lessons learned from past epidemics. *Nature Medicine*, 1-2. Retrieved from https://www.nature.com/articles/s41591-020-0851-2.pdf

26. Segerson, K. (2013). Voluntary approaches to environmental protection and resource management. *Annu. Rev. Resour. Econ.*, *5*(1), 161-180 Retrieved from https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev-resource-091912-151945

27. Sen-Crowe, B., McKenney, M., & Elkbuli, A. (2020). Social distancing during the COVID-19 pandemic: Staying home save lives. *The American Journal of Emergency Medicine*. Retrieved from https://www.ajemjournal.com/article/S0735-6757(20)30221-7/pdf

28. Tummers, L. (2019). Public Policy and Behavior Change. *Public Administration Review*, *79*(6), 925-930. Retrieved from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/puar.13109

29. Unlu, A., Kapucu, N., & Sahin, B. (2010). Disaster and crisis management in Turkey: a need for a unified crisis management system. *Disaster Prevention and Management: An International Journal*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Naim_Kapucu/publication/235315605_Disaster_and_Crisis_Management_in_Turkey_A_Need_for_a_Unified_Crisis_Management_System/links/5485e97a0cf2ef344789a5a5/Disaster-and-Crisis-Management-in-Turkey-A-Need-for-a-Unified-Crisis-Management-System.pdf

30. Ventriglio, A., Watson, C., & Bhugra, D. (2020). Pandemics, panic and prevention: Stages in the life of COVID-19 pandemic. Retrieved from https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0020764020924449

31. Voorberg, W. H., Bekkers, V. J., & Tummers, L. G. (2015). A systematic review of co-creation and co-production: Embarking on the social innovation journey. *Public Management Review*, *17*(9), 1333-1357. file:///C:/Users/LING.KOM/Downloads/14719037.2014%20(1).pdf

32. Weible, C. M., Nohrstedt, D., Cairney, P., Carter, D. P., Crow, D. A., Durnová, A. P., ... & Stone, D. (2020). COVID-19 and the policy sciences: initial reactions and perspectives. *Policy sciences*, 1-17. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7165254/pdf/11077_2020_Article_9381.pdf

33. WHO. (2020). Situation Report. Retrieved from https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/situation-reports/20200515-covid-19-sitrep-116.pdf?sfvrsn=8dd60956_2