

Journal of Government & Civil Society

Journal of Government
and Civil Society

Volume 9

No. 1

Pages 1 - 193

April 2025

ISSN 2579-4396



Daftar Isi (Table of Content)

Journal of Government & Civil Society

- Governance Strategies for Community-Based Eco-Tourism Development in Damaran Baru Village, Bener Meriah Regency: Opportunities and Challenges
- 1 – 20 **Vellayati Hajad¹, Zuhrizal Fadhly¹, Cut Asmaul Husna¹, Ahmad Harakan², Ikhsan Ikhsan¹**
- (¹Departement of Public Administration, Universitas Teuku Umar, Aceh, Indonesia)*
(²Doctoral School of International Relations and Political Science, Corvinus University of Budapest, Hungary)
- COVID-19 Vaccination Policy: The United States and China
- 21 – 42 **Inrinofita Sari¹, Asriadi Asriadi¹, Achmad Nurmandi², Nurul Wahdaniyah³**
- (¹Governmental Science Study Program, Universitas Pamulang, Indonesia)*
(²Jusuf Kalla School of Government, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia)
(³Government Affairs and Administration Program, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia)
- Post-Pandemic Crisis Management: Grassroots Political Mobilization and Participation in Sigi
- 43 – 56 **Ariana Yunus¹, Sunardi Sunardi², Haryanto Haryanto¹**
- (¹Department of Political Science, Universitas Hasanuddin, Indonesia)*
(²Department of Islamic Political Thought, Datokarama State Islamic University, Indoneisa))
- Democracy and Human Development: Conceptualizing the Pathways of Influence
- 57 – 88 **Rizki Hegia Sampurna¹, Chih-Chieh Chou²**
- (¹Public Administration Study Program, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sukabumi, Indonesia)*
(²Department of Political Science, National Cheng Kung University, Taiwan)
- Digital Transformative Resilience: Measuring Urban Governance Capacity to Improve Quality Public Services
- 89 – 111 **Muhammad Kamil¹, Ayu Evita Sari¹, Rifki Muhammad¹**
- (¹Department of Government Studies, Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang, Indonesia)*

- Effectiveness of Box Container Assistance for Indigenous Papuan MSMEs in Sorong City
- 112 - 134 **Masni Banggu¹, Siti Nurul Nikmatul Ula², Januari Christy Wanma², Lukman Rais²**
(¹ Governmental Science Study Program, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sorong, Indonesia)
(² Sociology Study Program, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sorong, Indonesia)
- Mapping Determinant Factors and Minimizing the Emergence of a Single Candidate in Regional Elections: A Case in Buton
- 135 - 152 **Junaid Gazalin¹, Nur Inzana¹, La Asiri¹, Sry Mayunita¹, Tawakkal Baharuddin²**
(¹ Department of Government Science, Universitas Muhammadiyah Buton, Indonesia)
(² Department of Government Science, Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar, Indonesia)
- The Role of Religious Figures in Supporting the Acceleration of Stunting Reduction in East Nusa Tenggara
- 153 - 171 **Intje Picauly¹, Marselinus Laga Nur¹, Grouse Oematan¹, Nadia Ridwan¹, Yohanes Dwi Putra Jegili¹, Michelle Revival Nenabu¹, Diana Aipipedelys²**
(^{1,2} Public Health, Faculty of Public Health, Nusa Cendana University, East Nusa Tenggara)
(² Psychology, Faculty of Public Health, Nusa Cendana University, East Nusa Tenggara)
- Green Budgeting Review at Local Government: Case Study of Batu Government, Indonesia
- 172 - 193 **Salahudin Salahudin¹, Mohamad Syahri², Tinuk Dwi Cahyani², Muhammad Firdaus³**
(¹ Department of Government Studies, Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang, Indonesia)
(² Pancasila and Civic Education Study Program, Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang, Indonesia)
(³ Master of Sociology Program, Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang, Indonesia)

Post-Pandemic Crisis Management: Grassroots Political Mobilization and Participation in Sigi

Ariana Yunus¹ , Sunardi Sunardi² , Haryanto Haryanto¹ 

¹ Department of Political Science, Universitas Hasanuddin, Indonesia

² Department of Islamic Political Thought, Datokarama State Islamic University, Indonesia

Email Correspondence: ariana@unhas.ac.id

Submitted:

16 January 2025

Revised:

19 March 2025

Accepted:

9 April 2025

Abstract

This article aims to examine crisis management in the villages of Sigi Regency, Indonesia, with a focus on government policy interventions and grassroots mobilization in overcoming the post-COVID-19 crisis. This article uses a qualitative approach with a case study method, where data collection is carried out using interview and observation techniques. This article highlights the crisis management policy scheme in Sigi, which tends to be centralistic with more dominance by central government policies. However, grassroots social movements have emerged as an alternative to mitigating the post-pandemic crisis. We argue that the political participation of communities and voluntary movements has significant social resilience implications. Therefore, policy interventions involving grassroots communities have proven effective in crisis management. This study contributes to seeing citizen mobilization and participation as a form of alternative social resilience and offers insights into the importance of collaboration between government policy and community activism in dealing with crises in rural Indonesia.

Keywords: Social protection policy, social movement, social resilience, politics of participation

Abstrak

Artikel ini bertujuan mengkaji manajemen krisis di desa-desa kabupaten Sigi, Indonesia dengan fokus pada intervensi kebijakan pemerintah dan mobilisasi akar rumput dalam mengatasi krisis pasca COVID-19. Artikel ini menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif dengan metode studi kasus, dimana pengumpulan data dilakukan dengan teknik wawancara dan observasi. Artikel ini menyoroti skema kebijakan penanganan krisis di Sigi yang cenderung sentralistik dengan lebih banyak di dominasi oleh kebijakan pemerintah pusat. Namun, gerakan sosial dari akar rumput muncul sebagai alternatif dalam memitigasi krisis pasca pandemi. Kami berpendapat bahwa partisipasi politik komunitas dan gerakan sukarela memiliki implikasi ketahanan sosial yang signifikan. Oleh karena itu intervensi kebijakan yang melibatkan komunitas akar rumput terbukti efektif dalam manajemen krisis. Penelitian ini berkontribusi dalam melihat mobilisasi dan partisipasi warga sebagai bentuk ketahanan sosial alternatif dan menawarkan wawasan terkait pentingnya kolaborasi antara kebijakan pemerintah dan aktivisme komunitas dalam menghadapi krisis di pedesaan Indonesia.

Kata Kunci: Kebijakan perlindungan sosial, gerakan sosial, ketahanan sosial, politik partisipasi

CITATION Yunus, A., Sunard, & Haryanto. (2025). Post-Pandemic Crisis Management: Grassroots Political Mobilization and Participation in Sigi. *Journal of Government and Civil Society*, 9(1), 43-56.



INTRODUCTION

In contrast to the majority of Indonesian villages, the impact of COVID-19 has exacerbated preexisting challenges in several villages within Sigi Regency, imposing a dual burden on these communities. On the one hand, the communities are attempting to recover from the social downturn caused by the earthquake that occurred in 2018. According to data, the confluence of seismic events, tsunamis, and liquefaction that transpired in Central Sulawesi resulted in the loss of 2,256 lives, the disappearance of 1,039 individuals, 4,612 injuries, and the displacement of 223,751 individuals. Not even a year later, the region was confronted with another crisis, namely the global pandemic of COVID-19. The succession of crises has exerted a pervasive effect on socioeconomic conditions. This series of events prompted this study to examine the management of the crisis, with a particular focus on the role of government policy interventions in local communities. It is the background to the main question of this study, how the government is managing the crisis and to what extent rural communities are involved.

A number of studies in several countries have attempted to explain how governance is carried out during times of crisis. China, as the first country to be infected with COVID-19, has implemented crisis management strategies with a focus on three main issues: the centralization of policies in handling the crisis, the mobilization of bureaucracy, and the strengthening of regulations that limit citizen activities (He, Shi, & Liu, 2020). The Chinese approach has been demonstrated to be effective in addressing the challenges posed by crises, particularly the ongoing pandemic. Despite the prevailing sentiment among other nations that China is the origin of the virus, its crisis management strategies have been lauded. Nevertheless, a salient lesson from the Chinese case study is the manner in which they optimized bureaucracy, positioning the government as the primary agency combating the crisis and fostering community compliance with policy restrictions through voluntary self-help. The centralization of controlled policies down to the lowest level is the most influential feature of China's success in crisis management during the period of the pandemic.

Other countries, including France, Germany, and Sweden, have exhibited different characteristics in their handling of the COVID-19 crisis. France has opted for a centralized crisis management structure, while Germany and Sweden have adopted a decentralized approach. The adoption of these divergent governance models is attributable to the distinct institutional features and administrative cultural characteristics inherent in each nation (Kuhlmann, Hellström, Ramberg, & Reiter, 2021). The findings of this study indicate that a centralized crisis management approach tends to yield more efficacious outcomes than a decentralized approach. In summary, the historical development of institutional features and administrative cultural characteristics has significantly influenced the specific approach to pandemic governance.

In Indonesia, the management of crises through post-pandemic policy schemes has prompted substantial discourse among scholars (Adams, Choe, Mostafanezhad, & Phi, 2021; Damayanti, Yuswanto, & Hariri, 2022; Hadi et al., 2022). From the extant debate, two principal axes have emerged. First, a body of research posits that the most efficacious policy scheme to emerge from the post-pandemic era is to prioritize augmenting social spending. This social spending scheme is channeled through government agencies and disseminated to lower levels. This approach is regarded as a catalyst for the economic growth of rural communities. The rationale behind this approach is that the distribution of direct cash assistance will catalyze a swift economic recovery. The second axis of focus pertains to policies that are conducive to investment. The focal point of this party is the plight of the 72,983 residents who lost their jobs during the period of the pandemic. However, the post-pandemic period has been characterized by the country's struggle to generate employment opportunities due to its limited resources. The expectation is that investment will engender increased job opportunities for the community.

In general, the handling of crises portrayed by scholars in Indonesia mostly sees crisis handling within a policy framework that marginalizes political aspects, especially political participation from the community. In the end, the viewpoint that was developed gave more of a portion to government activity while at the same time leaving little room for social activism at the grassroots. The effect is that the proposed settlement agreement with a bureaucratic scheme is more straightforward. This simplification then ignores other, more political aspects that the COVID-19 pandemic has revealed the existence of an unequal relationship between the government and society at the grassroots (Haryanto, 2021; Morris, 2021; Mudhoffir & Hadiz, 2021). So, in the context of overcoming post-pandemic crisis problems, intervening only through policy without highlighting the ongoing political actor relationships will not significantly impact society, especially in rural areas. Moreover, unequal power relations from the start have conditioned the poorest communities in rural areas as the most vulnerable group not to be involved in the formulation and monitoring of the implementation of policies made by the government. As a result, handling the post-pandemic with a policy scheme to increase social resilience will increase the social distance between the government and the rural poor, whose effect could increase the vulnerability of low-income people.

Furthermore, extant studies have not adequately addressed crisis management in rural areas, which emphasizes crisis management policies and grassroots responses. However, in the context of Indonesia, grassroots activism, manifesting in the form of social movements initiated by individuals and collectives, has emerged as a prevalent phenomenon in the wake of the pandemic (Meckelburg, 2021; Yuda, Damanik, & Nurhadi, 2021). Noteworthy examples include the food solidarity initiatives spearheaded by the Habis Gelap Terbitlah Terang (HGTT) Community in Malang and Jogja Food Solidarity (SPJ), which provides public kitchens for residents. Other notable initiatives include the Karang Tina house in Banjarmasin, initiated by a social community, and food donations for migrant workers in Sumatra organized by

villagers (Yuda et al., 2021). In the context of Palu, the 2018 earthquake disaster has provided empirical evidence of how residents can overcome crises by relying on movements that prioritize social capital. Therefore, the present study aims to examine crisis management by focusing on the role of government policy interventions in villages and the extent to which grassroots communities are involved in crisis management.

METHOD

This study is field research using qualitative methods. The research location occurred in two villages in Sigi Regency, Central Sulawesi. The villages were determined by considering the criteria: villages with the highest COVID-19 cases during the pandemic and villages affected by the largest earthquake in Sigi in 2018. Based on these criteria, we chose Kalubula village as one of the villages with the highest cases of COVID-19 spread in Sigi Regency. The second village, Ampanau village, represents villages with characteristics that were extremely severely affected by the earthquake in 2018. The selection of the two villages is congruent with the research objective of examining crisis management and grassroots community mobilization. The crisis that has befallen these two villages offers a concrete illustration of the crisis management scheme that has been implemented, as well as of the community's mobilization in response to the crisis.

The data were collected through various methods, including direct observation and interviews. In this particular method, the researcher engaged directly with the informants, fostering a direct interaction. The researcher closely observed all the informants' activities and responses. This direct observation process was particularly salient in the context of observing informants from the community, such as the mobilization and political participation of the community. To gain acceptance into the community, initial contact was established through Instagram messages. Establishing rapport with the community proved to be a relatively uncomplicated endeavor. In this city, the prevalence of alternative movements engaged in humanitarian issues, including the responses to the 2018 earthquake and COVID-19 pandemic, facilitated our entry. This environment fostered a high degree of autonomy, enabling us to engage and participate in the role of activists actively focused on addressing the challenges posed by the pandemic. The community's openness facilitated our full involvement. These conditions fostered a conducive environment for observation activities.

In addition, data collection was carried out through semi-structured interviews. We prepared several critical questions as a guide and then improvised these questions according to the conditions of the informants we were dealing with. The duration of the interviews we conducted for each informant ranged from 45 to 70 minutes. The informants we interviewed consisted of the head of Ampanau and Ampanau Village, several village staff in both villages, activist of the Roa Jaga Roa Community (NGO), the Expert Staff of the Chair of the Provincial Parliament, and the Women's community activist. We also interviewed a dozen people in

two villages randomly. For convenience, we use anonymized names for each informant. We did field visits for two periods—the first period, April-May 2022, and the second in March-April 2023. Finally, we visited the Balaroa Memorial Museum to find several documents and archives related to the 2018 earthquake.

In data collection, there are three categories of data grouping. The first category is grouping data with policy keywords. All documents, archives, and interview results containing transcripts about policies are grouped into this category. They were second, grouping data using the keywords implementation and distribution of aid. Like the first category, all information and data related to the implementation and distribution of aid is included in the second category. Finally, they group the data using the keywords mobilization and political participation. We analyze the patterns between data groups one, two, and three. This process begins by determining the dependent variable first. The policy is the dependent variable, while the independent variables are implementation and distribution, political mobilization, and participation. Then, we analyze the causal relationship between the dependent and independent variables. The framework that has been developed by Mudhoffir regarding “social resilience” as an analytical tool used to understand the dependent variable “policy” (Mudhoffir & Hadiz, 2021) for implementation and distribution as well as mobilization and participation, adopts the results of Kowalewski’s work on political participation and voluntary mobilization (Kowalewski, 2021).

RESULTS, DISCUSSION, AND ANALYSIS

Socioeconomic Crisis, From Earthquake to Pandemic

The Sigi in Central Sulawesi province faces numerous crises. Before the COVID-19 pandemic, this area had been affected by a severe crisis due to a significant natural disaster in 2018. The combination of the earthquake and tsunami that occurred in Central Sulawesi claimed the lives of 2,256 people; 1,039 people were missing, 4,612 people were injured, and as many as 223,751 people had to evacuate. The total material losses due to this incident reached IDR 13.82 trillion, with details in the productive economic sector experiencing losses reaching IDR 1.66 trillion, settlements reaching IDR 7.95 trillion, the social sector IDR 3.13 trillion, infrastructure IDR 701.8 billion, and across sectors reaching IDR 378 billion (Table 1).

Table 1. Casualties and Large Losses Due to the 2018 Earthquake, Tsunami and Liquidation.

Loss	Impact	Amount
Fatalities	Die	2.256 people
	Is lost	1.039 people
	Wounds	4.612 people
	Evacuate	223.751 people
Total		231.658
Damage	Settlement Sector	Rp 7,95 Trillion
	Infrastructure Sector	Rp 701,8 Billion
	Productive Economic Sector	Rp 1,66 Trillion
	Social Sector	Rp 3,13 Trillion
	Cross-Sector	Rp 378 Billion

Source: bnpb.go.id.

Table 2 Material Losses Due to Earthquake, Tsunami, and Liquidation Based on Districts in Central Sulawesi

No	Regency/City	Fatalities	Loss
1	Palu	1,703 people	Rp 7, 63 Trillion
2	Sigi	366 people	Rp 4,28 Trillion
3	Donggala	171 people	Rp 1,61 Trillion
4	Moutong	15 people	Rp 393 Billion

Source: bnpb.go.id/berita/kerugian-dan-corusan-dampak-bencana-di-sulawesi-tengah-mencapai-1382-trillion-rupiah

Sigi was recorded as the area most affected by earthquakes, tsunamis, and liquefaction in Central Sulawesi after Palu, the capital province (Table 2). Material and building losses reached IDR 4.28 trillion, and 336 people died. Then, during the rehabilitation and reconstruction process after the 2018 earthquake, at the beginning of 2020, this area had to face a new problem: the COVID-19 pandemic. In Central Sulawesi, the first COVID-19 case was confirmed on Thursday, March 26, 2020, or around 20 days after the announcement of the first case in Indonesia. Sigi has the highest transmission rate in Central Sulawesi (Darmawan, 2022). This situation was then responded to quickly by the Sigi Regency government. A month after the first case in Central Sulawesi, on April 20, 2020, the government revised the 2020 APBN through Regent Regulation No. 9 of 2020. As a result, several budget items experienced very significant changes. However, what attracted the most attention was that of the ten items that experienced changes, only two items experienced an increase in allocation, and the rest decreased (Table 3). First, IDR was allocated to unexpected expenditure items, whereas the previously running principal APBN was allocated.

1,800,000,000, becomes 7,300,000,000 or an addition of IDR 5,500,000,000. Second, from the previous 548,610,765,000, social assistance spending has increased by IDR 1,135,000,000 to IDR 549,745,765,000.

Table 3. Regional Revenue and Expenditure Budget (APBD) of Sigi in 2020

Item	Initial Allocation	Increase	Reduce	Allocation After Change
Balance Fund	957.071.883.000		187.115.739.001	769.956.143.999
Other valid local revenues	222.016.024.495		1.483.268.000	220.532.756.495
Employee Expenditure	470.474.618.251		19.598.728.356	450.875.889.894
Grant Expenditure	53.522.500.000		1.061.300.000	52.461.200.000
Social Assistance Expenditure	548.610.765.000	1.135.000.000		549.745.765.000
Financial Assistance Expenditure	217.137.285.000		8.887.585.100	208.249.699.900
Unexpected Expenditure	1.800.000.000	5.500.000.000		7.300.000.000
Direct Expenditure	42.619.171.300		3.470.284.361	39.148.886.939
Goods and Services Expenditure	247.122.269.253		28.977.626.329	218.144.542.924
Capital Expenditure	235.077.626.084		132.438.482.854	102.639.143.229

Source: Collected from various sources

After the COVID-19 pandemic, the government continues to strive to restore the socioeconomic situation of society in Indonesia (Indrawati, Satriawan, & Abdurohman, 2024; Ispriyarso & Wibawa, 2023; Rosyidiana & Narsa, 2024) through various policy schemes, including health care, strengthening economic recovery and protecting the community. This social protection policy scheme was launched to increase affected communities' social resilience and restore the post-pandemic economic situation (Nurlinah, Haryanto, & Ansar, 2024). In 2022, the government spends around 214.9 trillion APBN, consisting of health care, amounting to IDR 38.4 trillion, then community protection, amounting to IDR 100 trillion, and strengthening economic recovery, amounting to IDR 76.4 trillion. Specifically for rural communities, policies for economic recovery and increasing social resilience are carried out through community protection schemes, with various programs including direct cash assistance to village funds (BLT-DD). For BLT-DD, the government, through the Ministry of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions and Transmigration, has budgeted 40% of 68 trillion village funds. The BLT-DD program is intended for 74,000 villages throughout

Indonesia. The hope is that through the BLT-DD scheme, communities affected by the pandemic can have a safety net that can at least reduce the risk of crisis due to the effects of the pandemic.

Unexpectedly, COVID-19 has caused almost all countries, such as Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand, and Indonesia, to fall into a long-lasting crisis (Yuda, Kim, Pholpark, & Rahman, 2022). On the bright side, this situation contributes positively to social policy reform in these countries. The COVID-19 pandemic has forced the Indonesian government to expand the reach of social security policy targets. This is the third time in history that social security policies have seen an expansion of beneficiaries since the 1998 crisis, then the 2008 crisis, and finally, the crisis caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. The most extreme positive change can be seen in policy, from a productive and inclusive orientation after being impacted by the crisis due to the pandemic to a protection and development orientation (Yuda et al., 2021).

In the context of the pandemic, the Indonesian government has issued two policy schemes for dealing with the social crisis. First is a social crisis management policy scheme oriented towards protective efforts. This scheme is a crisis management effort that provides a social safety net to communities affected by COVID-19. There are several schemes included in the policy, including the Family Hope Program (PKH), Basic Food Cards, Village Direct Cash Assistance (BLT), Cooking Oil BLT, and BT-PKLWN (Cash Assistance for Street Vendors, Stalls, and Fishermen). The goal is to maintain people's household consumption and spending. Second, a development-oriented policy scheme. This scheme focuses on increasing the abilities and soft skills of affected communities. Some examples are pre-employment programs. But, at the local level, there is no policy scheme intended for social protection for the community. In Sigi, and perhaps in other areas, the social protection policy scheme is still attached to the central program. In the context of Sigi Rural, many crisis management policy schemes are realized through protective programs. This is direct cash assistance from village funds (BLT-DD).

Voluntary Mobilization and Political Participation from the Grassroots

In Sigi, the grassroots movement was depicted in two forms: food donations from the grassroots were initiated by individuals utilizing the women's network, namely helping neighbors from the kitchen; a grassroots movement was initiated by the community, with the name of the movement Roa Jaga Roa. The first of these is a grassroots solidarity movement that utilizes a network of women at the neighborhood level in Kalubula. The objective of this movement is to collect food donations from residents on a voluntary basis. These donations are intended to distribute to individuals who are self-isolating due to suspected cases of COVID-19. The inception of this movement occurred in February 2022. Secondly, Roa Jaga Roa, a movement was initiated on July 24, 2021, in Palu, Central Sulawesi, by a group of journalists. The objective of this initiative is to serve as a liaison between

residents and health services. This initiative is formally known as “friend helping friend” while in the local Kaili language, it is referred to as Roa Jaga Roa. The movement’s primary objective is to facilitate community access to oxygen assistance. In addition, Roa Jaga Roa facilitates the distribution of food to individuals infected with the virus who are undergoing home isolation. Finally, the movement has launched a virtual people’s health house in collaboration with the community protection coalition.

The voluntary mobilization movement can be interpreted as a form of grassroots political participation that provides alternative assistance to the community in the midst of a crisis (Donoso, Puga, Moya, & Gerber, 2022; González, 2021) when the government is unable to provide protection and community access to services is very limited (Bentkowska, 2021; Heller, 2020). This kind of solidarity movement has been observed in numerous locations throughout Indonesia. The presence of robust social capital and cultural ties has been identified as a contributing factor (Yuda et al., 2021). In times of crisis, whether natural disasters or epidemics, these cultural ties and social capital are often transformed into a collective political action aimed at mutual assistance. This phenomenon is frequently characterized by a narrative of “cooperation.” This phenomenon can be understood as the formation of an alternative community-based system that fosters solidarity during periods of crisis, as evidenced by the case of the community’s response to the pandemic (Kowalewski, 2021). However, the sustainability of such movements remains a subject of concern. According to some scholars (Mercer, 2002; Srinivas, 2009), such movements are characterized by their rapid emergence, yet they are also notably fragile. The movement is characterized by its textual nature. It adheres closely to the issue, which contributes to its rapid dissolution.

Community Political Participation in the Policy Process

The emergence of voluntary mobilization as a form of grassroots political participation was triggered by unequal political relations between the community and policymakers. This imbalance in political relations is reflected in the conditioning during the formulation of crisis management policies, which, from the start, did not involve the lowest levels of society as the policy (Mudhoffir & Hadiz, 2021). Finally, crisis management policy products are predominantly built from the imagination of bureaucrats. Meanwhile, society is isolated from the policy arena. As a result, policy implementation in the field represents more the character of bureaucrats than the public. This can be seen from the service process, which prioritizes bureaucratic procedures rather than aspects of public safety.

In the context of Sigi, the conditioning of community involvement is reflected in the cases found by Roa Jaga Roa. When the public complained to the government regarding urgent complaints regarding the need for oxygen, the government prioritized bureaucratic procedures. At the same time, the community’s condition was in a very emergency situation. In short, unbalanced political relations affect products and policy implementation. The level of

community participation and involvement in the policy process could be much higher. Thus triggering the creation of alternative participation spaces by encouraging solidarity-based movements from the grassroots to help each other.

Furthermore, a centralist policy that is well institutionalized down to the lowest level is a feature that is conducive to success in building crisis management (He et al., 2020; Weiss, Hutchcroft, Hicken, & Aspinall, 2021). This feature is not apparent in the case of crisis management in Sigi. Despite the implementation of a centralized policy, the institutionalization of policy implementation at the local government level remains inadequate. In Indonesia, the prevailing challenge lies in the fact that the prevailing governance norm has been implemented within a decentralized framework. Normatively, the practice of centralization has long been abandoned, and even for the last ten years, efforts have been made to expand decentralization to the village level. Consequently, when confronted with crises that are addressed through centralist policies, local governments often respond with mediocrity. This phenomenon can be understood as a kind of tacit rejection, originating from the grassroots level and permeating throughout the community, which, in turn, conforms to the policy.

Within the decentralized framework, there is a discernible weakening of control over central government authority at the regional level. A case in point is the crisis management strategy employed in rural Sigi, which was marked by a high degree of centralization, notably through the implementation of direct cash assistance. However, the implementation of this policy has been suboptimal. This is further compounded by the absence of robust oversight from central authorities, exacerbating the challenges associated with implementing centralized policies. The management of large-scale disasters, including natural disasters and pandemics, necessitates an effective chain of command, a crucial element for effective communication (He et al., 2020; Weiss et al., 2021).

In summary, the centrally controlled crisis management policy remains ill-suited to the Indonesian context. China's success in resolving crises through a centralist approach is attributable to its long-standing institutionalized democracy and the presence of well-established political parties. The country's history of lenient governance has facilitated the implementation of stringent command-control measures, enabling the mobilization of state resources, including the bureaucracy. The legacy of Leninism has contributed to citizen compliance and has facilitated China's management of the crisis. The country's institutional framework, characterized by a streamlined command system with clearly defined political channels, has played a pivotal role in its crisis management.

In contrast, Indonesia has a more decentralized general norm of government administration. The lingering effects of authoritarianism in Indonesia have been found to constrain control over specific domains, yet the development of robust democratic institutional frameworks does not accompany this legacy. The growing liberalism in Indonesian democracy

has led to actions that challenge state authority, including the deviation from the policy framework designed to address the pandemic.

Nevertheless, a favorable aspect of the prevailing circumstances is the emergence of alternative movements within society, a development that has precipitated the consolidation of central authority. A notable example is the emergence of grassroots movements that have emerged to fill the gaps left by the government in assisting communities (Frey, 2020; Nurlinah, Haryanto, Haeranah, & Sunardi, 2025). It is noteworthy that the coexistence of alternative grassroots movements and central government domination is not inherently antagonistic. However, it is crucial to acknowledge that the crisis management policy implemented during the pandemic functions merely as a tool that serves to marginalize citizens while concurrently fortifying the government's dominance within the policy domain. González (2021) conceptualizes this dynamic as an indirect conflict. In the context of Sigi, the policy of crisis management functions as an instrument that connects the conflict between the government and the community. The escalation of this conflict is especially evident during the policy implementation process. This dynamic is a consequence of the imbalanced political relations that have been previously discussed, which create a significant distance between policy actors and the community. Consequently, during the implementation of the policy, the government, with its bureaucratic, procedural, and systematic processes, is confronted with the pressure of a society that demands prompt, direct, and uncomplicated services. The interpretation of the implementation of crisis management policies by these two entities differs significantly.

CONCLUSION

The implementation of a centralized policy intervention approach to crisis management has demonstrated a lack of efficacy in addressing crises in Sigi. The implementation of crisis policy through a centralized framework stands in direct opposition to the prevailing local governance practices across all levels. Decentralization, a fundamental principle in governance, is a key component of policy design. However, even in crises, some scientists have found that decentralized designs have proven ineffective in resolving crises (Kuhlmann et al., 2021) in comparison to centralized policy designs, which are more adept at managing crises (He et al., 2020). However, within the paradigm of the research conducted in Sigi, a salient benefit emerges: the resolution of the crisis through a centralist policy scheme has precipitated the emergence of grassroots citizen activism.

It is imperative to deliberate on the means through which grassroots citizen activism can be integrated into the formulation of crisis management policies. It is indisputable that their involvement contributes meaningfully to crisis resolution, particularly their presence in social groups that the state has been unable to reach. Consequently, the magnitude of this citizen mobilization directly corresponds to the number of individuals who can be reached. This

article proposes that, in the future, it is necessary to consider the expansion of the role and involvement of grassroots activism in the design of crisis management policies. This issue is a salient one that merits further research, including the examination of how citizen activism, in their capacity as informal policy actors, can expand their role into the formal policy realm. This line of research is crucial for enhancing our understanding of the intricate relationship between the state and citizens in crisis management, particularly in the context of developing effective policy designs for crisis mitigation.

REFERENCES

- Adams, K. M., Choe, J., Mostafanezhad, M., & Phi, G. T. (2021). (Post-) pandemic tourism resiliency: Southeast Asian lives and livelihoods in limbo. *Tourism Geographies*, 23(4), 915–936. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2021.1916584>
- Aklin, M., Cheng, C. Y., & Urpelainen, J. (2021). Inequality in policy implementation: Caste and electrification in rural India. *Journal of Public Policy*, 41(2), 331–359. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X20000045>
- Bentkowska, K. (2021). Response to governmental COVID-19 restrictions: The role of informal institutions. *Journal of Institutional Economics*, 17(5), 729–745. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S174413742100028X>
- Damayanti, R., Yuswanto, A., & Hariri, A. (2022). Post-Pandemic Covid-19: Factors Affecting Startup Success in the Indonesian Economy. *East Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 1(4), 691–706. <https://doi.org/10.55927/EAJMR.V1I4.435>
- Darmawan, A. D. (2022). Jumlah Konfirmasi Positif Mingguan di Sulawesi Tengah, Paling Tinggi Terjadi di Sigi. Retrieved March 19, 2025, from Katadata website: <https://databoks.katadata.co.id/layanan-konsumen-kesehatan/statistik/c20826a3edef47b/jumlah-konfirmasi-positif-mingguan-di-sulawesi-tengah-paling-tinggi-terjadi-di-sigi>
- Donoso, S., Puga, I., Moya, C., & Gerber, M. M. (2022). Is it Worth the Risk? Grievances and Street Protest Participation During the COVID-19 Pandemic in Chile. *Journal of Politics in Latin America*, 14(3), 338–362. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1866802X221127712>
- Frey, B. (2020). Platform Labor and In/Formality: Organization among Motorcycle Taxi Drivers in Bandung, Indonesia. *Anthropology of Work Review*, 41(1), 36–49. <https://doi.org/10.1111/AWR.12187>
- González, J. J. L. (2021). Indigenous people's self-determination in the context of COVID-19 in northern Mexico. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 17(4), 524–531. <https://doi.org/10.1177/11771801211058546>
- Hadi, H., Triastanti, R. K., Anggraeni, D., Nurwanti, E., Lewis, E. C., Colon-Ramos, U., ... Gittelsohn, J. (2022). The Role of the School Food Environment in Improving the

- Healthiness of School Canteens and Readiness to Reopen Post COVID-19 Pandemic: A Study Conducted in Indonesia. *Journal of Public Health Research*, 11(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.4081/JPHR.2021.2287>
- Haryanto. (2021). Public trust deficit and failed governance: The response to COVID-19 in Makassar, Indonesia. *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, 43(1), 45–52.
- He, A. J., Shi, Y., & Liu, H. (2020). Crisis governance, Chinese style: distinctive features of China's response to the Covid-19 pandemic. *Policy Design and Practice*, 3(3), 242–258. <https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2020.1799911>
- Heller, M. (2020, April 14). COVID-19: Why informal networks will be key to the recovery. Retrieved August 24, 2021, from World Economic Forum website: <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2020/04/covid-19-why-informal-networks-will-be-key/>
- Indrawati, S. M., Satriawan, E., & Abdurrohman. (2024). Indonesia's Fiscal Policy in the Aftermath of the Pandemic. *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, 60(1), 1–33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00074918.2024.2335967>
- Ispriyarso, B., & Wibawa, K. C. S. (2023). Reconstruction of the national economy post-covid-19 pandemic: Critical study of tax reforms in Indonesia. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 9(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2023.2174517>
- Kowalewski, M. (2021). Street protests in times of COVID-19: adjusting tactics and marching 'as usual.' *Social Movement Studies*, 20(6), 758–765. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2020.1843014>
- Kuhlmann, S., Hellström, M., Ramberg, U., & Reiter, R. (2021). Tracing divergence in crisis governance: responses to the COVID-19 pandemic in France, Germany and Sweden compared. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 87(3), 556–575. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852320979359>
- Meckelburg, R. (2021). Indonesia's COVID-19 emergency: Where the local is central. *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, 43(1), 31–37.
- Mercer, C. (2002). NGOs, civil society and democratization: a critical review of the literature. *Progress in Development Studies*, 2(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1464993402PS027RA>
- Morris, C. (2021). A centralized pandemic response in decentralized Indonesia. *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, 43(1), 38–44.
- Mudhoffir, A. M., & Hadiz, V. R. (2021). Social Resilience Against COVID-19 Masks Indonesian Class Divide. *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs*, 22(1), 45–52. <https://doi.org/10.1353/gia.2021.0014>

- Nurlinah, Haryanto, & Ansar, M. C. (2024). Comparative study of social welfare programme effectiveness perception in peri-urban and rural in Indonesia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Social Work and Development*, 0(0), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/29949769.2024.2342794>
- Nurlinah, Haryanto, Haeranah, & Sunardi. (2025). Empowering the Urban Middle Class: Sustainability Strategy for Local NGOs in Makassar, Indonesia. *Voluntas*, 0(0), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11266-025-00718-2/METRICS>
- Rosydiana, R. N., & Narsa, I. M. (2024). Micro, small, and medium-sized enterprises (MSMEs) during the post-pandemic economic recovery period: digitalization, literacy, innovation, and its impact on financial performance. *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2342488>
- Srinivas, N. (2009). Against NGOs? [Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1177/0899764009334308](http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1177/0899764009334308), 38(4), 614–626. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764009334308>
- Weiss, M. L., Hutchcroft, P. D., Hicken, A., & Aspinall, E. (2021). One War, Many Battles: COVID-19 in Urban Southeast Asia. *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, 43(1), 1–7.
- Yuda, T. K., Damanik, J., & Nurhadi. (2021). Examining emerging social policy during COVID-19 in Indonesia and the case for a community-based support system. *Asia Pacific Journal of Social Work and Development*, 31(1–2), 13–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02185385.2020.1829499>
- Yuda, T. K., Kim, M., Pholpark, A., & Rahman, H. N. B. A. (2022). Unmasking the social policy responses of COVID-19 in four Southeast Asian Nations: Institutional patterns and policy adjustment. *Asia Pacific Journal of Social Work and Development*, 32(4), 294–317. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02185385.2022.2136234>