

Decision-Making Process in Indonesia Immigration Policy During The Covid-19 Pandemic

Muhammad Sairi¹, Siti Yeni Aisyah²

^{1,2}Fakultas Ushuluddin, UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta, Indonesia

Corresponding email: muhammad.sairi@uinjkt.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Article History

Submission : 22-03-2026
Received : 02-04-2026
Revised : 15-04-2026
Accepted : 19-04-2026

Keywords:

*Immigration Policy,
COVID-19 Pandemic,
Decision-Making,
Public Health,
Economy,*

DOI:

10.59066/ijoms.v5i1.2260

ABSTRACT

The COVID-19 pandemic has had a significant impact on various sectors of life, including immigration policy in Indonesia. This article aims to analyze the decision-making process in Indonesian immigration policy during the COVID-19 pandemic. Using a qualitative approach, this article examines policy documents and legislation, and conducts in-depth interviews with relevant policymakers. The results indicate that the immigration policy decision-making process during the pandemic was influenced by several factors, including: (1) pressure to prevent the spread of COVID-19, (2) the need to maintain economic stability, and (3) considerations of humanitarian aspects. In response to the pandemic, the Indonesian government has issued various dynamic and adaptive immigration policies. These policies include restrictions on the entry of foreign nationals, extensions of stay permits, and the repatriation of Indonesian citizens. While these policies have been successful in suppressing the number of COVID-19 cases, they have also presented several challenges, such as negative impacts on the tourism and investment sectors. This article concludes that the immigration policy decision-making process during the COVID-19 pandemic is complex and multidimensional. The government needs to continuously evaluate and improve existing immigration policies and strengthen coordination between relevant institutions in decision-making.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.
Copyright© 2026 by Author. Published by CV. Era Digital Nusantara



Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic became one of the most significant global crises in the twenty-first century because it affected not only the health sector but also social, political, and economic systems throughout the world. The World Health Organization (WHO) officially declared Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) a global pandemic on 11 March 2020 after the rapid spread of infections across continents. By October 2021, global confirmed cases had exceeded 236 million with more than 4.8 million deaths, demonstrating the extraordinary scale of the crisis (WHO, 2021). Indonesia was among the countries

severely affected, recording more than 4.2 million confirmed cases and over 142,000 deaths during the same period (Kementerian Kesehatan RI, 2021). The rapid transmission of the virus required governments to adopt urgent and extraordinary measures to protect public health, maintain social order, and preserve national stability. In this context, immigration policy emerged as one of the most strategic instruments available to modern states.

Immigration policy is closely related to the authority of the state to regulate the movement of persons across borders. In political and legal theory, border control is often understood as an essential manifestation of sovereignty. A state possesses the right to determine who may enter, stay in, or leave its territory, and under what legal conditions such movement may occur (Gill, 1978). For that reason, immigration institutions are frequently described as the “last bastion of sovereignty,” particularly in the era of globalization where the movement of goods, capital, and people increasingly transcends national boundaries (Dauvergne, 2008). During a health emergency such as COVID-19, this sovereign authority becomes even more relevant because border management is no longer merely an administrative matter, but also a mechanism of disease prevention and national protection.

Indonesia’s immigration policy during the pandemic reflected the difficult balance between safeguarding public health and sustaining economic interests. Before the pandemic, Indonesia had implemented relatively open policies in several sectors, including visa-free entry for tourists from many countries, in order to encourage tourism revenues, foreign investment, and international mobility. However, once COVID-19 spread globally, the same openness that once supported economic growth became a source of vulnerability. Cross-border travel created risks of imported cases, transmission clusters, and new virus variants. Consequently, the Indonesian government was compelled to revise its immigration framework rapidly through a series of ministerial regulations, circular letters, and emergency measures issued by the Ministry of Law and Human Rights and the Directorate General of Immigration.

The pandemic also generated a policy dilemma between economic necessity and human security. Restrictive border policies could reduce the spread of disease, yet they also harmed sectors highly dependent on international mobility, especially tourism, aviation, hospitality, and investment. Indonesia, as an archipelagic country with major tourist destinations such as Bali, Lombok, and Yogyakarta, experienced a severe decline in foreign arrivals during 2020 and 2021. Data from the tourism sector showed dramatic decreases in visitor numbers and foreign exchange earnings (UNWTO, 2020). At the same time, completely open borders could increase infection rates and place enormous pressure on the national healthcare system. Therefore, immigration policy during the pandemic was shaped by competing objectives: health protection, economic recovery, humanitarian obligations, and sovereign control.

From a human rights perspective, immigration restrictions also required careful consideration. International mobility concerns not only tourists and investors but also migrant workers, students, family members, refugees, diplomats, and individuals requiring

urgent medical or humanitarian assistance. Policies that are excessively restrictive may create unintended consequences, such as stranded foreigners, separated families, disrupted labor migration, and barriers to repatriation. Thus, governments needed to adopt selective and adaptive approaches rather than absolute closure. Indonesia's response illustrated this principle through temporary entry bans combined with exemptions for diplomatic personnel, essential workers, permanent residents, transport crews, and humanitarian cases.

The concept of selective policy has long been embedded in Indonesian immigration law. Law Number 6 of 2011 concerning Immigration emphasizes that only foreigners who are beneficial to the nation, do not threaten security and public order, and comply with legal requirements may be admitted into Indonesian territory (Law No. 6/2011). During the COVID-19 crisis, this principle became the normative foundation for decision-making. The state sought to admit individuals considered necessary for economic continuity or strategic interests while excluding those deemed to create unacceptable epidemiological risks. In this sense, pandemic-era immigration policy was not entirely new; rather, it represented an intensified application of pre-existing selective principles under emergency conditions.

This article examines the decision-making process behind Indonesia's immigration policy during the COVID-19 pandemic. Rather than merely listing regulations, the study seeks to understand how policy choices were formulated, what factors influenced decision-makers, and how those decisions were translated into operational outcomes. The analytical framework adopted in this study is Michael Brecher's decision-making model, which divides policy formation into three interconnected stages: input, process, and output (Brecher, 1974). Inputs include external pressures, perceptions of threats, domestic demands, and institutional constraints. The process stage concerns deliberation, evaluation, bargaining, and prioritization among policy actors. Outputs are the final policies, regulations, and actions implemented by the state.

This framework is particularly suitable for analyzing Indonesia's pandemic immigration response. The inputs included WHO declarations, rising domestic infection numbers, pressure from the tourism industry, public anxiety, and evolving international travel standards. The process involved interactions among ministries, immigration authorities, health agencies, political leaders, and economic stakeholders. The outputs took the form of visa suspensions, border closures, quarantine requirements, stay permit extensions, selective reopening measures, and travel corridor arrangements. Through this perspective, immigration policy is understood not as a single legal act, but as a dynamic sequence of decisions responding to changing circumstances.

Several previous studies have discussed Indonesian immigration policy, selective policy, and the impact of COVID-19 on border management. Kusumawardani (2020) analyzed restrictions on foreign visits as a mechanism to prevent virus spread. Latifah (2021) examined the suspension of visa-free policy during the pandemic. Malensang (2021) emphasized immigration innovation and human rights protection during crisis management. However, relatively few studies have systematically focused on the broader decision-making

process behind these policies. This article contributes by integrating legal developments with decision-making theory in order to explain how Indonesia adapted its immigration governance under unprecedented uncertainty.

Therefore, the central research question of this study is: how did the decision-making process of Indonesian immigration policy occur during the COVID-19 pandemic? To answer this question, the article aims to explain the determinants, institutional dynamics, and policy outcomes that shaped Indonesia's border governance between 2020 and 2021. Understanding this process is important not only for historical evaluation but also for future crisis preparedness. Pandemics, transnational emergencies, and global mobility disruptions are likely to reappear in different forms. Lessons from Indonesia's experience may therefore provide valuable insights into how immigration systems can remain effective, lawful, and adaptive during times of crisis.

Method

This study employs a qualitative descriptive research design to analyze the decision-making process of Indonesia's immigration policy during the COVID-19 pandemic. A qualitative approach is appropriate because the research focuses on policy dynamics, legal adaptation, and institutional responses rather than statistical measurement. It seeks to understand how the Indonesian government formulated immigration policies under emergency conditions and how those policies changed over time.

The research is descriptive in nature because it aims to systematically explain the chronology, characteristics, and relationships between policy developments during the pandemic (Koentjaraningrat, 1985). Rather than testing hypotheses, this study reconstructs the process through which immigration regulations were issued and implemented between 2020 and 2021. This period was selected because it represents the most critical phase of the pandemic response, beginning with emergency border restrictions and continuing to selective reopening during the implementation of Community Activity Restrictions (PPKM).

The primary data sources consist of official government documents, particularly regulations issued by the Ministry of Law and Human Rights, the Directorate General of Immigration, Presidential Decrees, and circular letters related to international travel and border control. Important examples include Presidential Decree Number 11 of 2020, Presidential Decree Number 12 of 2020, Ministerial Regulation Number 11 of 2020, and Ministerial Regulation Number 34 of 2021. These documents are used to trace the evolution of Indonesia's immigration policies during the pandemic.

Secondary data sources include books, academic journals, reports, and previous studies discussing immigration law, sovereignty, crisis governance, and COVID-19 policy responses. These materials provide theoretical support and contextual understanding.

Data were collected through document analysis and literature review. Official regulations were examined to identify legal changes, policy priorities, and administrative responses. Secondary literature was used to interpret these findings.

The analytical framework applied in this study is Michael Brecher's decision-making model, which consists of input, process, and output (Brecher, 1974). Inputs include external pressures such as the pandemic and domestic economic concerns. The process stage refers to governmental consideration and coordination in formulating policy. Outputs are the final immigration measures, including visa suspensions, entry restrictions, stay permit extensions, and controlled reopening. This framework helps explain how Indonesia adapted immigration governance during the COVID-19 crisis.

Results and Discussion

The World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic on 11 March 2020. By 8 October 2021, global cases had reached 236,599,025 with 4,831,486 deaths (WHO, 2021). In Indonesia, confirmed cases reached 4,227,932 with 142,651 deaths as of 10 October 2021 (Kemkes.go.id, 2021). The pandemic quickly evolved from a health emergency into a broader crisis affecting human rights, economic stability, and state governance. Many countries implemented quarantine, isolation, and social restrictions to reduce transmission. However, these policies also triggered economic slowdown and recession in many regions (Inman, 2020). As a result, governments faced a difficult dilemma between protecting public health and preserving economic activity. In Indonesia, this tension was addressed through the "New Normal" policy, which attempted to balance economic continuity with health protection (Purwanto & Emilia, 2020). Susanto and Asmara (2020) argue that framing economics and human rights as opposites is misleading because economic rights are also part of human rights. Nevertheless, the principle *salus populi suprema lex esto* the safety of the people is the highest law, placed health protection as the primary concern.

In responding to the crisis, Indonesia adopted three broad approaches: health services, fiscal support, and regulation of social activities (Vlieg et al., 2017). One important aspect of regulating social activities involved immigration policy, particularly control over entry and exit from Indonesian territory. Several legal instruments were issued, including Presidential Decree No. 12 of 2020, Minister of Law and Human Rights Regulation No. 26 of 2020, and Circular Letter No. 8 of 2021. Immigration policy is closely linked to state sovereignty because it concerns the regulation of cross-border movement involving citizens and foreigners. Immigration is often described as the "last bastion of sovereignty," since migration law reflects a state's authority to decide who may enter and remain within its territory (Dauvergne, 2008). Globalization has increased cross-border mobility, making immigration policy even more important as a tool of national control (Krasner, 1999).

During the pandemic, one key policy instrument was restricting foreign nationals from entering Indonesia. Law No. 6 of 2011 concerning Immigration defines entry restrictions as prohibitions based on immigration grounds, reflecting the state's authority to maintain security and public order. The deportation of U.S. citizen Kristen Gray after promoting Bali as a destination for foreigners during the pandemic illustrated the use of immigration enforcement and discretionary state power (Anggraeni, 2021). Such actions also demonstrate the application of Indonesia's selective policy principle, under which only foreigners considered beneficial and non-threatening may enter the country. This principle is rooted in sovereignty, which gives the state supreme authority over territorial access (Gill, 1978; Pemberton, 2009).

To prevent imported transmission, the government issued several immigration regulations, including Ministerial Regulation No. 3 of 2020, which temporarily suspended visa-free visits and visas on arrival for Chinese nationals while granting emergency stay permits. These measures were continuously reviewed as the pandemic developed. Previous studies have examined restrictions on foreign visits (Kusumawardani, 2020), selective immigration policy (Sande, 2020), immigration innovation during the pandemic (Malensang, 2021), and visa-free policy suspension (Latifah, 2021). However, fewer studies focus specifically on the broader decision-making process behind Indonesia's immigration response.

Decision-making theory helps explain state behavior during crises. Simon first popularized the concept in *Administrative Behavior* (1947), while later scholars emphasized that policy decisions are shaped by internal and external factors such as domestic politics, public opinion, geography, international pressure, and national interests (Snyder, 1962; Xing, 2015). Therefore, Indonesia's immigration policy during COVID-19 can be understood as the result of balancing health security, economic needs, legal authority, and international developments.

Next, this article will use Brecher's decision-making process theory to analyze the dynamics and process of formulating Indonesian immigration policies during the Covid-19 pandemic. Regarding the decision-making process, Brecher (1974) argues that a decision is an explicit act of choice within the appropriate time and space. Thus, the decision-making process can be described and explained, allowing for research and identification of the decision. According to Brecher, the decision-making process is formed through a mechanism of input, process, and output stages.



Figure 1. Decision Making Process
(Source: Michael Brecher, 1974: 5)

Holsti (1987:133–135) explains that policy inputs generally originate from the international system, elite perceptions, geographic location, and socioeconomic needs. The international system refers to patterns of domination, dependence, and leadership among states, while elite perceptions relate to how decision-makers interpret threats and opportunities. Snyder et al. (Rosenau, 1969:199–205) further argue that foreign policy decisions are shaped by both actor assumptions and environmental factors considered relevant by policymakers. Snyder identifies two major influences on decision-making. First is the subjective factor, namely the perception of actors in defining a situation. Decision-makers do not react mechanically to objective conditions, but respond according to how they interpret those conditions. As Brecher noted, the operational environment affects outcomes directly, yet policy choices are filtered through the images and perceptions of decision-makers (Dougherty & Pfaltzgraff, 1990:470). Second are potential sources originating from internal and external settings. Internal sources include domestic politics, bureaucratic interests, and public opinion, while external sources involve non-state actors, international interaction, trade, cultural exchange, and relations with other countries (Viotti & Kauppi, 1990:199). Therefore, state action is the product of actors, goals, available means, and the

surrounding situation (Snyder, Bruck, Sapin, 1995:202). Output, in this framework, refers to actions or policies resulting from decisions taken by recognized political authorities (Jensen, 1982:7).

The method used in this study is qualitative descriptive research. Qualitative research produces descriptive data in the form of written or spoken words and observable behavior (Moleong, 1991:3). It seeks to understand social and political phenomena in their natural setting and formulate broader interpretations from collected evidence (Hadari, 1992:209). This study is descriptive because the data are presented in the form of words, documents, and factual explanations rather than statistical calculations. Descriptive research aims to provide a systematic, factual, and accurate account of phenomena and the relationships among them (Musa, 1988; Soehartono, 1995:35). According to Koentjoroningrat (1985:32), descriptive research explains the characteristics of individuals, situations, or groups and identifies recurring relationships within society. In this article, the approach is used to explain Indonesian immigration policy during the COVID-19 pandemic. Primary sources include official documents from the Directorate General of Immigration and the Ministry of Law and Human Rights from 2020–2021, while secondary sources consist of books, academic journals, reports, and other relevant literature. Data collection was conducted mainly through literature review and document analysis of immigration regulations.

The history of Indonesian immigration demonstrates that immigration institutions have long been linked to sovereignty, economic interests, and political change. During the Dutch East Indies era, Indonesia's natural wealth attracted foreign traders and investors. To regulate foreign arrivals, the colonial government established the Secretary of the Immigration Commission in 1913, later transformed into the *Immigratie Diens* in 1921. Colonial immigration policy followed an open-door approach (*opendeur politiek*), allowing foreigners to enter, settle, and support plantation exports. Regulations such as the *Toelatings Besluit* (1916), *Toelatings Ordonnantie* (1917), and Passport Regulations (1918) governed entry permits, residence, and citizenship. Japanese occupation after 1942 brought few major changes, as Dutch regulations largely remained in place.

Following independence in 1945, immigration became central to state-building. Important post-independence developments included repatriation of prisoners and Japanese soldiers, diplomatic missions abroad using the first Indonesian travel documents, and the establishment of immigration offices in Aceh. Colonial laws were gradually replaced, including the *Penetapan Ijin Masuk* (1949) and *Ordonansi Ijin Masuk* (1949). In 1950, the Dutch immigration service was formally transferred to the Indonesian government, and Mr. H.J. Adiwinata became the first indigenous head of immigration. Although early facilities and expertise were limited, the institution expanded rapidly during the 1950s and 1960s. By 1960, Indonesia had immigration headquarters in Jakarta, 26 regional offices, branch offices, overseas posts, and more than 1,200 employees.

A major transformation during the parliamentary democracy era was the shift from colonial open-door policy to a selective policy. This policy prioritized national interests and greater protection for Indonesian citizens through both prosperity and security approaches. New regulations addressed foreign population control, foreign supervision, immigration crimes, citizenship, and travel documents, including Law No. 14 of 1959 on Travel Documents of the Republic of Indonesia. During the New Order era, immigration institutions expanded further and became more professional. In 1966, the Directorate of Immigration was upgraded into the Directorate General of Immigration. Computerization began in 1978–

1979, improving data systems and border administration. Numerous regulations were introduced covering visas, cross-border control, migrant workers, prevention and deterrence, and illegal entry. The most important achievement was Law No. 9 of 1992 concerning Immigration, which consolidated scattered colonial and postcolonial regulations into a modern national immigration law.

After the 1997 economic crisis and the fall of the New Order, Indonesia entered the reform era. Public demands for democratization, human rights, transparency, accountability, and regional autonomy reshaped state institutions. At the same time, globalization increased international mobility, trade, and information flows, narrowing practical state borders. Indonesia's strategic geographic position made it highly exposed to transnational issues such as irregular migration, terrorism, and fugitive movement. Immigration institutions therefore faced new challenges requiring stronger law enforcement, improved services, and more advanced infrastructure. While earlier immigration paradigms emphasized service efficiency and support for global markets, the reform era required a better balance between facilitation, security, and legal enforcement. This historical development shows that Indonesian immigration policy has consistently adapted to changing political regimes, economic priorities, and international pressures.

During the Reform Era, the Directorate General of Immigration responded to growing domestic and international challenges through institutional reform, modernization, and legal improvement. One of the most important agendas was revising Law Number 9 of 1992 concerning Immigration, which was considered no longer adequate for new realities. Several developments encouraged legal reform: Indonesia's strategic geographic position and increasingly complex cross-border problems; international agreements and conventions affecting immigration functions; the rise of international and transnational crime; inadequate regulation of detainees and detention periods; the need for a systematic immigration system supported by modern information technology; reorganization of immigration offices and detention centers under the Directorate General of Immigration; changes in citizenship law through Law Number 12 of 2006; reciprocity principles in visa policy; harmonization of international travel document security standards; weak immigration law enforcement; and the need for heavier sanctions against immigration offenders, including corporations and guarantors facilitating violations. These developments eventually led to Law Number 6 of 2011 concerning Immigration, which strengthened sovereignty, supervision, and selective policy principles.

The outbreak of COVID-19 created a new crisis that significantly influenced immigration decision-making. The pandemic caused rising casualties, economic losses, and disruptions to social life in Indonesia and globally. On 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization declared COVID-19 a global pandemic. In response, the Indonesian government issued Presidential Decree Number 11 of 2020 concerning the Public Health Emergency and Presidential Decree Number 12 of 2020 declaring COVID-19 a national non-natural disaster. These decrees established the legal basis for extraordinary state measures, including immigration restrictions. In this emergency context, the Ministry of Law and Human Rights adopted a selective immigration policy to regulate foreign nationals entering Indonesia. Temporary restrictions on visa-free entry and tighter border controls were justified as necessary to protect public health while remaining temporary and proportionate.

Indonesia's selective immigration policy is rooted in the principle that only foreigners who provide benefits, do not endanger security or public order, obey Indonesian law, and have a clear purpose of stay may enter and remain in Indonesia (Syahrin, 2019). This principle reflects the sovereign right of every state to regulate entry, stay, and exit within its territory (Santoso, 2017). During the pandemic, the selective policy also functioned as a health security instrument. The government, through immigration officials, could prohibit entry to foreigners carrying contagious diseases or coming from high-risk areas. Thus, immigration policy became an essential part of Indonesia's national strategy to prevent imported COVID-19 transmission while safeguarding sovereignty (Kusumawardani, 2020).

One major policy area was restrictions on visa-free visits. Before the pandemic, visa-free visits were regulated under Presidential Regulation Number 21 of 2016, granting visa-free access to citizens of 169 countries, including China. This facility was based on reciprocity and benefit principles, allowing short visits for tourism, family, government duties, seminars, business meetings, or transit. Visa-free stays were valid for a maximum of 30 days and could not be extended or converted into another permit. However, the pandemic forced a reconsideration of this openness. The government used the same legal framework to temporarily suspend visa-free access when public health conditions required it.

The suspension began with Minister of Law and Human Rights Regulation Number 3 of 2020, later replaced by Regulation Number 7 of 2020, which temporarily revoked visa-free visits and visa on arrival for Chinese citizens. It also restricted visa applications from foreigners who had recently visited China. As the pandemic worsened, stricter measures followed through Regulation Number 11 of 2020, which imposed a temporary ban on most foreign nationals entering Indonesia. Exceptions were granted to holders of limited and permanent stay permits, diplomatic and service visa holders, humanitarian and medical aid personnel, and transport crews. These measures reflected the balancing of health protection with essential diplomatic, logistical, and humanitarian needs.

The impact of these restrictions was particularly severe in the tourism sector. According to UNWTO data, international tourist travel from January to October 2020 declined by 72 percent globally, resulting in losses of US\$935 billion. In Indonesia, foreign tourist arrivals fell sharply from 16.11 million in 2019 to only 3.89 million in 2020 (Umi Kulsum, 2021). This dramatic decline affected employment, local businesses, airlines, and hospitality industries. To address these consequences, the government introduced the Travel Corridor Arrangement (TCA), a controlled mobility mechanism for businesspeople, diplomats, experts, and strategic travelers. Indonesia established such arrangements with the United Arab Emirates, South Korea, China, and Singapore. These corridors were designed to maintain investment and economic cooperation while applying strict health protocols (Mandasari, 2020).

Another challenge during the pandemic involved foreigners already inside Indonesia whose home countries were under lockdown. Many were unable to return home because flights were suspended or borders were closed. In response, immigration offices issued or extended Emergency Stay Permits to prevent overstays and legal uncertainty. This demonstrated that immigration governance during the pandemic was not solely restrictive but also adaptive and humanitarian.

The emergence of new COVID-19 variants, including the B117 strain first identified in the United Kingdom, led to additional measures through Circular Letter of the COVID-

19 Task Force Number 4 of 2020. This regulation required foreign travelers to present negative RT-PCR test results taken within 48 hours before departure, complete electronic health declarations, undergo repeat testing on arrival, and undertake quarantine. If positive, Indonesian citizens were treated at government expense, while foreigners bore their own treatment costs. Between 6 February and 21 April 2020, immigration authorities refused entry to 231 foreign nationals (Hariyanto, 2020), illustrating active border enforcement.

During the implementation of Community Activity Restrictions (PPKM) in 2021, immigration policy entered a more adaptive phase. To support economic recovery, Regulation Number 27 of 2021 was replaced by Regulation Number 34 of 2021, allowing visas and stay permits for certain categories of foreigners under strict health protocols. Eligible entrants included diplomatic and official permit holders, KITAS and KITAP holders, APEC Business Travel Card holders, transport crews, and traditional border crossers. At the same time, the government retained authority to prohibit entry from countries with high transmission rates. Data from Soekarno-Hatta Airport showed that between 1 August and 17 September 2021, 15,343 foreigners entered Indonesia while 22,122 departed (Jelita, 2021).

Experts supported reopening only with strong safeguards. Epidemiologist Dicky Budiman argued that Indonesia need not fully close borders, but should enforce tighter screening, seven-day quarantine, and full vaccination requirements. Masdalina Pane similarly warned that foreign arrivals could increase transmission if controls were weak. Government spokesperson Siti Nadia Tarmizi emphasized coordination among airport, maritime, and land-border authorities. Overall, Indonesia's immigration policy during COVID-19 evolved from emergency closure toward controlled reopening, balancing sovereignty, health protection, and economic recovery.

Conclusion

This concludes the article's description of the decision-making process in Indonesian immigration policy during the COVID-19 pandemic. Based on Brecher's decision-making theory, this article concludes that the input into Indonesian immigration policy during the COVID-19 pandemic includes decision-makers' perceptions of the COVID-19 pandemic as a global pandemic, a disease that has caused a public health emergency, and a national non-natural disaster. The output, which is a collection of decisions in response to the Covid-19 pandemic within the Indonesian Directorate General of Immigration, includes several policies from 2020 to 2021, such as restrictions on visa-free visits during the Covid-19 pandemic and the granting of visas and residence permits during the implementation of PPKM (Community Activity Restrictions).

Furthermore, this article also aims to emphasize that the policies of the Indonesian Directorate General of Immigration under the Ministry of Law and Human Rights during the Covid-19 pandemic are one of Indonesia's national interests in the field of immigration to safeguard Indonesia's sovereignty from various threats that may be faced by the entry of foreigners, including the threat of the spread of the Covid-19 pandemic. Therefore, the

government, through immigration officials, can prohibit or impose restrictions on foreigners entering Indonesian territory if the foreigner is suffering from a contagious disease that endangers public health. Moreover, immigration officials can carry out prevention or rejection in accordance with the immigration function, namely the security function.

References

- Acosta-Prado, J., Rincón, J. S. R., Martínez, A. M. M., & Tarazona, A. R. R. (2024). Trends in the Literature About the Adoption of Digital Banking in Emerging Economies: A Bibliometric Analysis. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm17120545>
- Adil, M., Singh, Y., Subhan, M., Al-Faryan, M. A. S., & Ansari, M. S. (2023). Do trust in financial institution and financial literacy enhances intention to participate in stock market among Indian investors during COVID-19 pandemic? *Cogent Economics & Finance*, *11*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23322039.2023.2169998>
- Afzal, M., Meraj, M., Kaur, M., & Ansari, M. S. (2024). How does cybersecurity awareness help in achieving digital financial inclusion in rural India under escalating cyber fraud scenario? *Journal of Cyber Security Technology*, *9*, 88–126. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23742917.2024.2347674>
- Al-Saedi, K., & Al-Emran, M. (2021). *A Systematic Review of Mobile Payment Studies from the Lens of the UTAUT Model*. 79–106. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64987-6_6
- Almaiah, M. A., Al-Otaibi, S., Shishakly, R., Hassan, L., Lutfi, A., Alrawad, M., Qataweh, M., & Alghanam, O. A. (2023). Investigating the Role of Perceived Risk, Perceived Security and Perceived Trust on Smart m-Banking Application Using SEM. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *15*(13). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15139908>
- Apau, R., Titis, E., & Lallie, H. (2025). Towards a Better Understanding of Mobile Banking App Adoption and Use: Integrating Security, Risk, and Trust into UTAUT2. *Comput.*, *14*, 144. <https://doi.org/10.3390/computers14040144>
- Ashofi, A. A., & Migunani, M. (2025). The impact of Data Security, Ease of Use, and Access Speed on User Trust in Mobile Banking Applications. *Journal of Management and Informatics*. <https://doi.org/10.51903/jmi.v2i3.148>
- Balogun, O., & Olaleye, S. (2022). Demystifying Mobile Banking App Security Through Gender, Education, Privacy, and Trust Intervention. *Int. J. E Adopt.*, *14*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.4018/ijea.294859>
- Cavus, N., Mohammed, Y. B., Bulama, M., & Isah, M. L. (2021). Examining User Verification Schemes, Safety and Secrecy Issues Affecting M-Banking: Systematic Literature Review. *SAGE Open*, *13*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231152379>
- Daah, C., Qureshi, A., Awan, I.-U., & Konur, S. (2024). Enhancing Zero Trust Models in the Financial Industry through Blockchain Integration: A Proposed Framework. *Electronics*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics13050865>
- Dawood, H., Liew, C., & Lau, T. (2021). Mobile perceived trust mediation on the intention and adoption of FinTech innovations using mobile technology: A systematic literature review. *F1000Research*, *10*. <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.74656.2>
- Fitri Fadilah Widyaputri, & Edy Yusuf Agung Gunanto. (2023). Shariah Mobile Banking Adoption Trends: Analysis Mob Mentality, Reputation, Perceived Risk, and Islamic Financial Literacy. *Jurnal Ekonomi Syariah Teori Dan Terapan*, *10*(5).

- <https://doi.org/10.20473/vol10iss20235pp482-495>
- Goyal, V., Pandey, D. U. S., & Batra, S. (2012). Bio-metric Trust and Security in Mobile Banking. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Computer Science and Electronics Engineering, 1*. <https://consensus.app/papers/biometric-trust-and-security-in-mobile-banking-goyal-pandey/0af63c41a86b503d8254d4b997a53d45/>
- Ha, K.-H., Canedoli, A., Baur, A., & Bick, M. (2012). Mobile banking — insights on its increasing relevance and most common drivers of adoption. *Electronic Markets, 22*, 217–227. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-012-0107-1>
- Hamakhan, Y. T. (2020). The effect of individual factors on user behaviour and the moderating role of trust: an empirical investigation of consumers' acceptance of electronic banking in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq. *Financial Innovation, 6*. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40854-020-00206-0>
- Hooda, A., Gupta, P., Jeyaraj, A., Giannakis, M., & Dwivedi, Y. K. (2022). The effects of trust on behavioral intention and use behavior within e-government contexts. *Int. J. Inf. Manag., 67*, 102553. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2022.102553>
- Jafri, J. A., Amin, S. I. M., Rahman, A. H. A., & Nor, S. M. (2023). A systematic literature review of the role of trust and security on Fintech adoption in banking. *Heliyon, 10*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e22980>
- Karjaluoto, H., Glavee-Geo, R., Ramdhony, D., Shaikh, A., & Hurpaul, A. (2021). Consumption values and mobile banking services: understanding the urban–rural dichotomy in a developing economy. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijbm-03-2020-0129>
- Khobragade, A., Balachandran, R., Gupta, B., Saroy, R., Awasthy, S., Singh, G., Misra, R., & Dhal, S. (2024). Mobile banking adoption for financial inclusion: insights from rural West Bengal. *Journal of Social and Economic Development, 27*, 525–543. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40847-024-00376-y>
- Kumar, P., Chauhan, S., Gupta, P., & Jaiswal, M. P. (2023). A meta-analysis of trust in mobile banking: the moderating role of cultural dimensions. *International Journal of Bank Marketing, 41*(6). <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJBM-02-2022-0075>
- Lal, S., Khoso, R. A., & Ahmed, Q. M. (2025). Enhancing Financial Inclusion through Mobile Banking in Rural Pakistan: Opportunities and Challenges. *Bulletin of Management Review*. <https://doi.org/10.63075/bmr.v2i2.137>
- Malaquias, R., & Silva, A. F. (2020). Understanding the use of mobile banking in rural areas of Brazil. *Technology in Society, 62*, 101260. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2020.101260>
- Martinez, E., Jun, J., Rack, M., Biehler, S., Guo, X., & Chang, S. (2025). Perceptions on financial exploitation and technology-based solutions among older adults. *Journal of Elder Abuse & Neglect, 37*, 444–453. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08946566.2025.2544278>
- Mei, H., Bodog, S.-A., & Badulescu, D. (2024). Artificial Intelligence Adoption in Sustainable Banking Services: The Critical Role of Technological Literacy. *Sustainability*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16208934>
- Moshi, A. (2024). The Effect of Perceived Security Risks on Mobile Banking Adoption in Fashion Retail Industry. A Case Study of Mwanza Region, Tanzania. *Journal of Economics, Finance And Management Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.47191/jefms/v7-i12-28>
- Nedeljkovic, I. I. (2022). Determinants and consequences of user trust in mobile banking.

- Bankarstvo*. <https://doi.org/10.5937/bankarstvo2204170n>
- Ogunola, A. A., Sonubi, T., Toromade, R. O., Ajayi, O. O., & Maduakor, A. H. (2024). The intersection of digital safety and financial literacy: Mitigating financial risks in the digital economy. *International Journal of Science and Research Archive*. <https://doi.org/10.30574/ijrsra.2024.13.2.2183>
- Panos, G., & Wilson, J. (2020). Financial literacy and responsible finance in the FinTech era: capabilities and challenges. *The European Journal of Finance*, 26, 297–301. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1351847x.2020.1717569>
- Patel, S., Gajpal, L., & Kumar, F. (2025). Adoption of Mobile Banking in Rural Chhattisgarh: A Review. *Journal of Ravishankar University (PART-A)*. <https://doi.org/10.52228/jrua.2025-31-2-13>
- Pizam, A., Ozturk, A. B., Hacikara, A., Zhang, T., Balderas-Cejudo, A., Buhalis, D., Fuchs, G., Hara, T., Meira, J., Revilla, R. G. M., Sethi, D., Shen, Y., & State, O. (2024). The role of perceived risk and information security on customers' acceptance of service robots in the hotel industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2023.103641>
- Rahman, H., & Ahsan, W. Bin. (2024). *Fraud Mitigation, Usability Challenges, and Financial Literacy in Mobile Financial Services for Rural Bangladesh*. <https://doi.org/10.58947/journal.wpgr45>
- Ramtiyal, B., Verma, D., & Rathore, A. (2022). Role of risk perception and situational factors in mobile payment adoption among small vendors in unorganised retail. *Electronic Commerce Research*, 1–39. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10660-022-09657-2>
- Rana, M. (2025). Factors Influencing FinTech Adoption Behavior of Millennials in Nepal: Evidence from Karnali Province, Nepal. *The Lumbini Journal of Business and Economics*. <https://doi.org/10.3126/ljbe.v12i2.77404>
- Raza, M., Bilal, M. A., & Khan, A. B. (2024). FinTech Adoption and Sustainability Performance: The Role of Digital Financial Literacy and Financial Inclusion in Pakistan's Banking Sector. *Journal of Innovative Research in Management Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.62270/jirms.v5i4.80>
- Rehman, Z., & Shaikh, F. (2020). Critical Factors Influencing the Behavioral Intention of Consumers towards Mobile Banking in Malaysia. *Engineering, Technology & Applied Science Research*, 10, 5265–5269. <https://doi.org/10.48084/etasr.3320>
- Rizvee, M. B., Siddik, M. N. A., & Kabiraj, S. (2025). Exploring Antecedents of Rural Users' Continuance of Use Intention Toward Mobile Financial Services in Bangladesh: Deployment of Expectation Confirmation Model. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm18050236>
- Sharma, H., & Díaz-Andrade, A. (2023). Digital financial services and human development: current landscape and research prospects. *Information Technology for Development*, 29, 582–606. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02681102.2023.2199189>
- Simatele, M., & Maciko, L. (2022). Financial Inclusion in Rural South Africa: A Qualitative Approach. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm15090376>
- Souiden, N., Ladhari, R., & Chaouali, W. (2020). Mobile banking adoption: a systematic review. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijbm-04-2020-0182>
- Srivastava, R., Singh, S., & Srivastava, V. (2013). The Role of Trust and Technology

- Acceptance Model(TAM) on Customer Acceptance of Mobile Banking: An Integrated Model to Improve Mobile Banking in Banking Sector-A Conceptual Paper. *Int. J. Asian Bus. Inf. Manag.*, 4, 31–43. <https://doi.org/10.4018/jabim.2013010104>
- Suryawan, T. G. A. W. K., & Santikasari, N. N. (2024). A Behavioral Analysis of Online Loan Application Adoption: The Roles of Ease of Use, Risk, and Trust in Rural Bali. *JURNAL ILMU MANAJEMEN*. <https://doi.org/10.21831/jim.v21i2.78161>
- Susanto, E., Solikin, I., & Purnomo, B. (2022). A REVIEW OF DIGITAL PAYMENT ADOPTION IN ASIA. *Advanced International Journal of Business, Entrepreneurship and SMEs*. <https://doi.org/10.35631/aijbes.411001>
- Tay, L.-Y., Tai, H., & Tan, G. (2022). Digital financial inclusion: A gateway to sustainable development. *Heliyon*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e09766>
- Trisnadewi, N. K. A. (2025). The Impact of Financial Technology Innovation and Trust Perception on Financial Transaction Interest Through the Risk of Using LPD Mobile. *International Journal of Social Science and Business*. <https://doi.org/10.23887/ijssb.v9i3.98437>
- Waliullah, M., George, M. Z. H., Hasan, M. T., Alam, M. K., Munira, M. S. K., & Siddiqui, N. A. (2025). Assessing the influence of cybersecurity threats and risks on the adoption and growth of digital banking: a systematic literature review. *ArXiv, abs/2503.2*. <https://doi.org/10.63125/fh49gz18>
- Wang, M., Zhang, R., & Voronov, M. (2025). Building Bridges in the Digital Age: How Online Platforms Foster Trust During a Crisis. *Organization Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01708406251326647>
- Wanner, J., Herm, L., Heinrich, K., & Janiesch, C. (2022). The effect of transparency and trust on intelligent system acceptance: Evidence from a user-based study. *Electronic Markets*, 32, 2079–2102. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-022-00593-5>
- Xie, J., Ye, L., Huang, W., & Ye, M. (2021). Understanding FinTech Platform Adoption: Impacts of Perceived Value and Perceived Risk. *J. Theor. Appl. Electron. Commer. Res.*, 16, 1893–1911. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jtaer16050106>
- Zakiyyah, A. M., Gunasti, A., & Fadah, I. (2021). Does Financial Literacy Influencing the University Student's Decision to Use M-Payment? *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Sustainable Management and Innovation, ICoSMI 2020, 14-16 September 2020, Bogor, West Java, Indonesia*. <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.14-9-2020.2304489>
- Zhu, Q., Lyu, Z., Long, Y., & Wachenheim, C. (2021). Adoption of mobile banking in rural China: Impact of information dissemination channel. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, 101011. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seps.2021.101011>