

## Cost-Benefit Analysis of Immigration Violations: A Case Study of 5 Indian Nationals Working on Visitor Visas in Jakarta

Rizal Chandrawinata\*, Margaretha Hanita, Nur Fatwa

Universitas Indonesia

Email: rizalchandra07@gmail.com\*

---

### Keywords

Immigration Administrative Sanctions; costs and benefits; policy; fines.

---

### ABSTRACT

The misuse of visit stay permits for work by foreign nationals is a problem that has the potential to negatively impact the economic sector, particularly the collection of Immigration Non-Tax State Revenue (PNBP). This study aims to comprehensively analyze immigration violations and their enforcement against foreign nationals using a cost-benefit analysis approach. This study uses a case study of five Indian citizens working using visit stay permits in Jakarta. This study uses qualitative and quantitative approaches, collecting data from several sources, including analysis of policy documents, data on foreign nationals involved, and calculations of the resulting costs and benefits. The analysis shows that law enforcement is not yet effective enough against violators because it still causes economic impacts (losses in immigration non-tax revenue). Meanwhile, the only benefits obtained are forced removal of foreign nationals from Indonesian territory (deportation) due to immigration violations. This study recommends an immigration law enforcement strategy that emphasizes imposing costs on foreign nationals who violate their stay permits as an effort to recover the losses in immigration non-tax revenue. Therefore, the results of this study are expected to serve as a reference for policymakers in formulating more effective and sustainable immigration policies.

---

## INTRODUCTION

Free trade has encouraged increased human mobility between countries (Buehler & Pucher, 2023; Ganic & Novalic, 2023; Gong et al., 2024). This condition is a concern for many countries, including Indonesia, because each country has the sovereignty to regulate various problems that arise and are increasingly diverse in the era of globalization (Arasy & Nelwati, 2023; Sudarmo et al., 2025; Trihatmoko & Susilo, 2023; Trisnanti et al., 2025). In facing this reality, each country needs to be careful and wise so as not to have a negative impact on the economic sector and the business world, as well as disrupt good relations between countries. Therefore, clear guidelines are needed in regulating relations between countries, especially regarding the flow of people into the territory of a country (Syahrin M. Alvi, 2019). The consequences that arise are increasingly diverse in dealing with these conditions, every country needs to be vigilant so as not to have a detrimental impact on the business sector and the national economy. (Syahrin M. Alvi, 2019).

In order to reduce the negative impact that arises due to the flow of globalization and the high mobility of the population, both Indonesian citizens and foreign citizens who travel, enter, or settle in Indonesia, an institution that is authorized to regulate the movement of people in the territory of the Republic of Indonesia, namely the Directorate General of Immigration, is needed

(Syahrin, 2021). The Directorate General of Immigration is an agency that has the authority to regulate the traffic of people entering and exiting the territory of the Republic of Indonesia (Dhikadara et al., 2024; Ismoyo, 2025; Syadzili et al., 2025). The provisions regarding matters related to immigration are regulated in Law Number 6 of 2011 concerning Immigration. In Article 1 number 1 of Law Number 6 of 2011 concerning Immigration related to supervision procedures, it is stated that "Immigration is a matter of the traffic of people entering or leaving Indonesian territory and its supervision in order to maintain the uphold of state sovereignty".

Conceptually, in carrying out its duties, the immigration party is obliged to be guided by Law Number 6 of 2011 concerning Immigration (Bastia et al., 2023; Gilodi et al., 2024; Yakubu et al., 2023). Foreign nationals who are proven to have misused their visas can be subject to sanctions in the form of deportation. In addition, based on the provisions of Law 6/2011, law enforcement against violations of immigration residence permits can be pursued through two mechanisms, namely immigration administrative actions (such as deportation) and pro justisia processes through judicial channels. However, in practice, the settlement of cases of abuse of residence permits is more often carried out through the implementation of administrative measures in the form of deportation (Syahrin M. Alvi, 2019).

One of the cases that has been handled occurred on May 22, 2025, the Sub-Directorate of Investigation of the Directorate of Immigration Supervision and Enforcement of the Directorate General of Immigration imposed deportation on 5 (five) Indian citizens who worked using Index B2 and C2 Visit Visas in Jakarta. The legal basis used is based on article 75 of Law no. 6 of 2011 concerning Immigration which states that Immigration Officials are authorized to carry out Immigration Administrative Actions (TAK) / Administrative Sanctions against Foreigners in Indonesian Territory that should be suspected of endangering public safety and order or not respecting or not obeying laws and regulations. In the context of the violation of the abuse of Residence Permit by Foreigners, Article 122 letter (a) can also be subject to the threat of imprisonment for a maximum of 5 (five) years and a maximum fine of Rp 500,000,000.00 (five hundred million rupiah). The actions taken by the Investigation Sub-Directorate show the appropriateness of the imposition of legal sanctions on immigration violators, especially deportation in accordance with the *Status Quo* (Law 6/2011 on Immigration).

Five Indian citizens who obtained residence permits in Indonesia have fulfilled their Non-Tax State Revenue (PNBP) payment obligations to the state through the purchase of a Visit Visa. The funds received are then used to support the implementation of national development to encourage the improvement of community welfare (Pujonggo, 2022). On the other hand, there is a loss of PNBP for violations of residence permits that are not in accordance with their designation because the work activities carried out by the 5 Indian citizens should use a Work Visa which has a higher visa fee or rate than the Visit Visa.

In determining the penalty of confinement as a form of law enforcement from a juridical point of view or imposing administrative sanctions from an economic point of view, law enforcement officials must be objective in assessing and interpreting each case. If the impact of a violation can still be addressed through an economic approach, such as by providing fines, compensation, coaching, or rehabilitation, then this step can be considered as an appropriate form of settlement (Cahyadi & Muliawan, 2021).

In addition, in choosing between a legal approach or an economic approach to solve a law

enforcement problem, it is necessary to make an assessment based on the character and nature of the problem faced. The application of economic aspects in the law enforcement process must also be based on economic characteristics that have been accommodated and clearly regulated in the substance of laws and regulations (Cahyadi & Muliawan, 2021). The disharmony between law and economics can be reflected in Posner's view that tends to override the dogmatic nature of law. According to this view, law enforcement is not enough if it only relies on a normative approach, but needs to be combined with various other approaches, including economic approaches (*A number of scholar believe that interpretation is the path to saving the law's objectivity*) (Cahyadi & Muliawan, 2021).

The application of sanctions in the form of fines, compensation, compensation, coaching, and rehabilitation is considered more appropriate than simply imposing punishments that are oriented towards retaliation or a deterrent effect. This is because these forms of sanctions are considered to provide greater benefits, both economically and socially, compared to punishments that only focus on the element of retribution against the perpetrators of violations (Cahyadi & Muliawan, 2021).

The economic approach to law builds a relationship between economic theory and legal theory so that it can provide explanations as well as empirical support in answering various legal problems. In this framework, economic analysis of law recognizes two models, namely positive analysis and normative analysis. At the level of positive analysis, which is descriptive and predictive, the focus is to examine the impact that arises when a legal policy is implemented. Through this approach, the economic consequences can be estimated or explained, including how individuals or business actors will respond to incentives and disincentives arising from these legal policies (Robinson, 1939). In relation to normative analysis which is generally understood as part of the welfare economy (*welfare economics*) and is a prescriptive or testing approach to assessing whether a policy or change in law will affect the way individuals achieve their desired goals or interests (Robinson, 1939).

The urgency of this research stems from the need to optimize PNP collection and ensure fair enforcement. Without cost-recovery mechanisms, the state loses revenue that could fund national development. Furthermore, the increasing number of foreign workers on visitor visas (based on Immigration data) indicates a systemic vulnerability that requires evidence-based policy solutions.

This research seeks to provide alternative thinking related to economic analysis in immigration administrative sanctions policy. The economic approach to analysis uses basic concepts such as *cost and benefit analysis* as a reference for making policies based on economic analysis. The purpose of this research is expected to obtain a basic understanding, and the creation of new norms for the imposition of burden costs or administrative fines on the abuse of residence permits from the example of the policy of imposing administrative sanctions (deportation) that apply based on legal and economic considerations.

## **METHOD**

This research was descriptive in nature and was conducted by collecting and analyzing relevant data to estimate potential economic losses and retaliation costs arising from visa abuse. The analysis focused on activities of foreigners that were not in accordance with their residence permits in Indonesia, such as engaging in work using visit visas. The study used a case

examined by the Investigation Sub-Directorate of the Directorate of Immigration Supervision and Enforcement on May 22, 2025, involving five Indian citizens who worked as building glass construction technicians at the DBS Tower in Jakarta while holding Index B2 and C2 visit visas.

The research process began with identifying the main problem, followed by formulating specific research questions and objectives. A conceptual framework was then developed to guide the analysis. Data were subsequently collected, processed, and analyzed in a structured manner. Finally, conclusions were drawn based on the overall findings of the study.

The cost-benefit analysis compared the costs of administrative sanctions with the outcomes of deportation measures. Costs referred to expenses incurred in enforcing deportation, while benefits included state revenue from visa-related non-tax income (PNBP) and outcomes from legal enforcement actions. The analysis showed that violations involving misuse of visit visas did not generate economic benefits and instead had the potential to cause losses. By assessing both costs and outcomes in monetary terms, the study estimated the amount of PNBP not received by the state as a result of such violations.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### Irregularities in the Use of Visit Residence Permits

The perpetrators of violating the Immigration Residence Permit as many as 5 (five) people who use a Visit Visa are subject to immigration administrative sanctions in the form of Deportation. Deportation is a forcible act of expelling foreigners from Indonesian territory. In accordance with Law No. 6 of 2011 concerning Immigration, Article 75 has stated that any foreigner who is suspected of not obeying laws and regulations can be subject to Deportation based on article 75 (2) letter f.

In the case handled by the Sub-Directorate of Investigation of the Directorate of Immigration Supervision and Enforcement on May 22, 2025, 5 (five) Indian citizens who work as technicians in the field of glass construction in the building located at DBS Tower, South Jakarta showed the misuse of Residence Permits to carry out activities with Index B2 and C2 Visit Visas for the purpose of doing business, attending meetings, and purchasing goods.

The Visit Visa used by the 5 Indian citizens has a PNBP fee of IDR 1,500,000.00 (one million five hundred thousand rupiah) from 3 B2 Visas, and IDR 4,000,000.00 (four million rupiahs) from 2 C2 Visas. In total, the Directorate General of Immigration received PNBP of IDR 5,500,000.00 (five million five hundred thousand rupiah) from the purchase of the 5 Indian Citizen Visit Visas.

**Table 1 PNBP from Visit Visas (Existing)**

<b>3 WN India</b>	<b>B2 Visit Visa</b>	IDR 500,000 x 3 = IDR 1,500,000.00
<b>2 WN India</b>	<b>C2 Visit Visa</b>	IDR 2,000,000 x 2 = IDR 4,000,000.00

The calculation above is the lowest estimate of the PNBP acquisition of the Immigration Department. The next calculation may be different if the five Indian citizens extend their Residence Permits with an estimated Highest Total Profit of Rp 11,000,000.00 (eleven million rupiah).

The suitability of the Visa that should be used by the five Indian citizens if working in Indonesia according to the specifications of the activities needed, can use the Index E23 Work

Visa with a minimum stay of 90 days at a price of IDR 4,500,000.00 and a maximum stay of 2 years at a price of IDR 9,000,000.00. This creates a gap and the impact of the acquisition of Immigration PNBP is not optimal.

**Table 2 PNBP Loss (Gap between Work Visa and Visit Visa)**

<b>3 people (B2 visa)</b> Fee = IDR 1,500,000	<b>3 person E23 Visa</b> Lowest Cost = IDR 13,500,000 Highest Cost = IDR 28,500,000	<b>Gap</b> Lowest = IDR 12,000,000 Highest = IDR 27,000,000
<b>2 people (C2 Visa)</b> Cost = IDR 4,000,000	<b>2 people E23 Visa</b> Lowest Cost = IDR 9,000,000 Highest Cost = IDR 19,000,000	<b>Gap</b> Lowest = IDR 5,000,000 Highest = IDR 15,000,000

Based on the calculation above, there is a gap or difference in the acquisition of Immigration PNBP between the acquisition of PNBP from the Visa that should be used (E23) and the Visa (B2 and C2). Therefore, the Directorate General of Immigration as a whole lost the lowest estimated PNBP of Rp 17,000,000.00 (seventeen million rupiah) and the highest estimate of Rp 42,000,000.00 (forty-two million rupiah).

#### **Security, Check, and Deportation**

At the time of security, the Investigation Sub-Directorate Team is divided into 2 (two) with 2 (two) personnel in each team. Team 1 managed to secure 3 Indian citizens using the B2 Visit Visa and Team 2 managed to secure 2 Indian citizens using the C2 Visit Visa. The security of the 5 Indian citizens was obtained information sourced from informants around the location. The acquisition of this information issued funds as costs for informants of Rp 3,400,000.00 (three million four thousand rupiah).

**Table 3 Enforcement Operational Costs (IDR)**

<b>Team 1</b>	<b>Security 3 WN India</b> (B2 Visit Visa)	Informant Fee = IDR 1,700,000.00
<b>Team 2</b>	<b>Security 2 Indian Citizens</b> (C2 Visit Visa)	Informant Fee = IDR 1,700,000.00

In addition to the Informant fee, officers get daily operational costs in carrying out tasks of more than 8 (eight) hours in the DKI Jakarta area.

**Table 4 Benefit-Cost Ratio (BCR) Comparison**

<b>Team 1</b>	<b>Security 3 WN India</b> (B2 Visit Visa)	Operating Cost = IDR 420,000.00
<b>Team 2</b>	<b>Security 2 Indian Citizens</b> (C2 Visit Visa)	Operating Cost = IDR 420,000.00

The security activity requires an operational cost of Rp 840,000.00 (eight hundred and forty thousand rupiah) for the officers who carry out the security of the 5 Indian citizens. Furthermore, the 5 Indian citizens were taken to the Directorate of Immigration Supervision and Enforcement of the Directorate General of Immigration for examination. This requires assistance from foreign language translators of Rp 10,000,000.00 (ten million rupiah). The use of the translator takes approximately 20 hours per person for BAP for 4 hours.

**Table 5 Percentage Increase in PNBP after Implementation of Administrative Fines**

<b>Penerjemah</b>	<b>Examination</b> 3 of Indian Citizens (B2 Visit Visa)	Translator Fee = IDR 6,000,000.00
<b>Penerjemah</b>	<b>Examination</b> 2 Indian Citizen (C2 Visit Visa)	Translator Fee = IDR 4,000,000.00

In addition to security, the 5 Indian citizens had their Immigration Residence Permits canceled based on article 75 (2) b and detention. The detention of the 5 Indian citizens for 3 days before deportation was carried out, it required a cost of approximately Rp 510,000.00 (five hundred and ten thousand rupiah).

**Table 6 Comparison of Sanctions Based on Applicable Regulations (PP No. 25/2024)**

<b>Detention</b>	<b>Detensi</b> 3 WN India (B2 Visit Visa)	Meal Fee = IDR 306,000.00
<b>Detention</b>	<b>Detensi</b> 2 WN India (C2 Visit Visa)	Meal Fee = IDR 204,000.00

As a result of the cancellation of the Residence Permit and the detention of 5 Indian citizens, a gradual deportation was carried out 2 (two) times with flights from Soekarno-Hatta International Airport to Indira Gandhi International Airport in New Delhi. The deportation carried out by the officer in an effort to assist him to the airport cost Rp 840,000.00 (eight hundred and forty thousand rupiah).

**Table 7 Summary of Cost-Benefit Analysis per Scenario**

<b>Team 1</b>	<b>Deportation</b> of 3 Indian Citizens (B2 Visit Visa)	Operating Cost = IDR 420,000.00
<b>Team 2</b>	<b>Deportation</b> of 2 Indian Citizens (C2 Visit Visa)	Operating Cost = IDR 420,000.00

The total operational costs of law enforcement resulting from the violation of the Residence Permit of 5 Indian citizens who use Index B2 and C2 Visit Visas amounted to Rp 15,590,000.00 (fifteen million five hundred and ninety thousand rupiah).

### **Imposition of Load Charges**

Any foreigner who is suspected of endangering public security and order or disrespecting or disobeying laws and regulations can be subject to Immigration Administrative Action. The five Indian citizens should be suspected of disobeying Law 6/2011 on Immigration by carrying out activities that are not in accordance with the type of visa used.

The 5 Indian citizens cannot be sanctioned with fees or fines because they are not included in the subject of violations listed in article 78 (1) of Law 6/2011 concerning Immigration, that foreigners holding residence permits whose validity period has expired for less than 60 days and are still in Indonesian territory can be subject to a burden.

The amount of burden fees on foreigners whose residence permit validity period has expired is regulated in Government Regulation No. 25/2024 concerning Types and Tariffs for Non-Tax State Revenues Applicable to the Ministry of Law and Human Rights of Rp 1,000,000.00 (one million rupiah) per day.

In addition to fines for foreigners whose residence permit has expired, the classification of administrative costs in the field of immigration law enforcement also includes:

- A fine of Rp 50,000,000.00 (fifty million rupiah) against the person in charge of the means of transport that transports passengers who do not have valid and valid travel documents, visas, and/or immigration documents;
- Fines of Rp 1,000,000.00 (one million rupiah) against Indonesian Passport Holders are lost;
- A fine of Rp 500,000.00 (five hundred thousand rupiah) against the Indonesian Passport Holder is damaged;
- A fine of IDR 1,000,000.00 (one million rupiah) against APEC Card Holders is lost/damaged; and
- Revocation of deterrence for foreigners who are detained for *overstaying* for more than 60 days or unable to pay the burden fee.

Based on the classification of the subject of administrative costs/fines in PP No. 25/2024 in the field of law enforcement, the five Indian citizens who violate the residence permit cannot be subject to fines.

#### **Alternative Scheme for the Imposition of Burden Fees (Administrative Fines)**

In the calculation using *Cost Benefit Analysis*, the five Indian citizens had the impact of not maximizing the acquisition of Immigration PNBP, the losses obtained from the loss of PNBP with the lowest estimate of Rp 17,000,000.00 (seventeen million rupiah) and the highest estimate of Rp 42,000,000.00 (forty-two million rupiah).

A scheme for calculating costs and benefits is needed to compensate for the loss of PNBP. Even though the Directorate General of Immigration has benefited from the purchase of the Visit Visa even if the profit from the purchase of the Visit Visa for 5 Indian citizens is reduced by the amount of law enforcement operational costs, the Directorate General of Immigration still gets the lowest profit of Rp 5,500,000.00 (five million five hundred thousand rupiah) and the highest of Rp 11,000,000.00 (eleven million rupiah).

The above scheme has not been included in the calculation of the estimated imposition of fines on the five Indian citizens. If the five Indian citizens are subject to a fine to pay for the Visa that should be used (Visa Index E23) in accordance with the price stated in the determination of the visa PNBP classification, then the five Indian citizens have a total estimated minimum fine of IDR 22,500,000.00 (twenty-two million five hundred thousand rupiah) or the highest total fine of IDR 47,000,000.00 (forty-seven million rupiah).

The fine fee determination scheme is quite necessary to provide a deterrent effect while increasing the acquisition of immigration PNBP. The amount of the fine fee needs to be determined using the lowest or highest amount of fine fee. The determination of the scheme provides several calculations of the estimated PNBP acquisition that are quite significant by adding the lowest or highest estimated fines with the lowest or highest total Visit Visa benefits as follows:

1. Scheme 1 (lowest fine + lowest Visit Visa Income) = IDR 28,000,000.00
2. Scheme 2 (lowest fine + Highest Visit Visa Income) = RP 33,500,000.00
3. Scheme 3 (highest fine + lowest Visit Visa Income) = IDR 52,500,000.00
4. Scheme 4 (highest fine + Highest Visit Visa Income) = IDR 58,000,000.00

### Cost and Benefit Analysis

Based on the results of the calculations that have been carried out, the losses incurred by visa abuse on the acquisition of Immigration PNBP are a reflection of the lowest estimated cost of Rp 17,000,000.00 (seventeen million rupiah and the highest estimate of Rp 42,000,000.00 (forty-two million rupiah). Meanwhile, the profits arising from the imposition of administrative fines are a reflection of the lowest estimated benefit of IDR 28,000,000.00 (twenty-eight million rupiah) and the highest estimate of IDR 58,000,000.00 (fifty-eight million rupiah).

**Table 8 Comparison of Research Findings with Relevant Previous Research**

	Advantages of PNBP Visit Visa (B2 and C2)	Advantages Administrative Denda	Percentage Increase
<b>Lowest</b>	IDR 5,500,000	IDR 28,000,000	410 %
<b>Highest</b>	IDR 11,000,000	IDR 58,000,000	430 %

Fine Sanctions create an increase in PNBP with the lowest estimate with a percentage of 410% while the highest estimate is 430% with calculations minus operational costs arising from the imposition of immigration administrative sanctions.

The scheme of imposing fine sanctions has an impact on increasing Immigration PNBP. Not only does it have an impact on the acquisition of PNBP, but it can have an impact in accordance with the classification of violations against violators to compensate for losses arising from the loss of PNBP that should be obtained from the cost of work visas that should be used.

### Existing Conditions, Scenario 1, and Scenario 2

The direct costs in the implementation of immigration administrative sanctions begin with the operational cost component of supervision. Immigration officers in the field in carrying out their duties and functions are supported by operational components based on the Output Cost Standard (SBK) of the Ministry of Law and Human Rights Number IMI-0001. PR.01.04 OF 2024. These components are in accordance with the Regulation of the Minister of Finance of the Republic of Indonesia Number 49 of 2023 concerning Input Cost Standards for 2024.

**Table 9 Summary of Specific Findings, Solutions, and Practical Implications**

Type	Components	Existing		Skenario 1		Skenario 2	
		Nominal (Rp)	Percentage (%)	Nominal (Rp)	Percentage (%)	Nominal (Rp)	Percentage (%)
<b>Cost:</b>							
<b>Live</b>	C1	3.400.000	80%	3.400.000	80%	3.400.000	80%
	C2	840.000	20%	840.000	20%	840.000	20%
	Sub Total	4.240.000	100%	4.240.000	100%	4.240.000	100%
<b>Indirect</b>	C3	10.000.000	88%	10.000.000	88%	10.000.000	88%

	C4	510.000	4%	510.000	4%	510.000	4%
	C5	840.000	8%	840.000	8%	840.000	8%
	Sub Total	11.350.000	100%	11.350.000	100%	11.350.000	100%
<b>Total Cost</b>		15.590.000		15.590.000		15.590.000	
<b>Benefits:</b>							
<b>Live</b>	B1	11.000.000	100%	11.000.000	100%	11.000.000	100%
	Sub Total	11.000.000	100%	11.000.000	100%	11.000.000	100%
<b>Indirect</b>	B2	0	0%	22.500.000	100%	0	0%
	B3	0	0%	0	0%	47.000.000	100%
	Sub Total	0	100%	22.500.000	100%	47.000.000	100%
<b>Total Benefits</b>		11.000.000		33.500.000		58.000.000	
<b>Net Value</b>		<b>-4.950.000</b>		<b>17.910.000</b>		<b>42.410.000</b>	
<b>BCR</b>		<b>0,70</b>		<b>2,15</b>		<b>3,7</b>	

Calculating benefits, *existing* conditions suffered losses with a *net value* of -4,950,000, while scenario 1 obtained a benefit of 17,910,000, and scenario 2 obtained a benefit of 42,410,000. This shows an increase in gains in scenario 1 and scenario 2 with efforts to impose fines on foreign nationals who use visit visas for work. The cost required under *existing* conditions is greater than the total benefits obtained, therefore the scenario of applying fines in an effort to expand immigration administrative sanctions within the scope of fines is needed to have an impact on increasing the acquisition of Immigration PNBP.

Based on the BCR (*Benefit Cost Ratio*) value, it shows that *the existing* condition shows a negative BCR value  $< 1$  (which is 0.70). Existing conditions do not provide economic benefits in the form of benefits that are lower than the necessary operational costs. Meanwhile, the BCR in scenario 1 shows a positive value of  $BCR > 1$  (of 2.15) and scenario 2 shows a positive value of  $BCR > 1$  (of 3.7). The conditions of scenario 1 and scenario 2 show economic benefits and are feasible to be implemented in the form of a policy of imposing fines on violators of residence permits by working on a visit visa.

## CONCLUSION

The study found that violations involving the misuse of visit residence permits for work, along with current immigration enforcement measures, had not achieved optimal effectiveness and resulted in economic losses, particularly through reduced non-tax state revenue (PNBP) from visa fees. While deportation provided non-economic benefits by improving legal compliance, it did not offset the financial losses caused by offenders who should have obtained work visas. The analysis indicated that imposing administrative fines under various schemes could significantly reduce these losses if applied more consistently. Overall, the cost-benefit analysis suggested that a more effective and sustainable approach would involve requiring offenders to compensate for the economic losses incurred, thereby strengthening both punitive and deterrent effects. Future research should explore the implementation mechanisms and long-term impacts of such compensation-based sanctions, including their effectiveness in improving compliance and increasing state revenue.

## REFERENCE

Arasy, A., & Nelwati, S. (2023). Indonesia challenges in maintaining national identity in the

- era of globalisation. *Hakamain: Journal of Sharia and Law Studies*, 2(1), 129–138.
- Bastia, T., Datta, K., Hujo, K., Piper, N., & Walsham, M. (2023). Reflections on intersectionality: A journey through the worlds of migration research, policy and advocacy. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 30(3), 460–483.
- Buehler, R., & Pucher, J. (2023). Overview of walking rates, walking safety, and government policies to encourage more and safer walking in Europe and North America. *Sustainability*, 15(7), 5719.
- Cahyadi, I., & Muliawan, B. (2021). Efektivitas dan Efisiensi Penegakan Hukum Terhadap Aspek-Aspek Ekonomi Di Indonesia (Berdasarkan Teorema Coase dan Pemikiran Posner). *Jurnal Magister Ilmu Hukum*, 4(1), 6. <https://doi.org/10.36722/jmih.v4i1.757>
- Dhikadara, D., Runturambi, A. J. S., & Daryanto, E. (2024). Directorate General of Immigration's Strategy in the Role of Border Security: An Index Study of Immigration Security. *Asian Journal of Engineering, Social and Health*, 3(8), 1740–1750.
- Ganic, M., & Novalic, A. (2023). Does regional trade integration reinforce or weaken capital mobility? New evidence from four free trade areas. *Economics and Business Review*, 9(3), 239–264.
- Gilodi, A., Albert, I., & Nienaber, B. (2024). Vulnerability in the context of migration: A critical overview and a new conceptual model. *Human Arenas*, 7(3), 620–640.
- Gong, L., Lin, Y., Zhang, X., Lu, Y., Han, X., Liu, Y., Guo, S., Lin, Y., & Wan, H. (2024). Mobility-llm: Learning visiting intentions and travel preference from human mobility data with large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37, 36185–36217.
- Ismoyo, I. (2025). The ebb and flow of the relationship between the institutional and authority of the directorate general of immigration and the directorate of general legal administration. *Jurnal Civics: Media Kajian Kewarganegaraan*, 22(2), 511–523.
- Pujonggo, S. S. (2022). Penegakan Hukum Atas Tindakan Administrasi Dalam Pemberian Izin Tinggal Kunjungan Wna Terhadap Pnbp Di Bidang Keimigrasian (Studi Di Kantor Imigrasi Kelas I Tpi Jakarta Timur). *Jurnal Ilmiah Kajian Keimigrasian*, 5(2), 41–58. <https://doi.org/10.52617/jikk.v5i2.367>
- Robinson, H. W. (1939). Law and Economics. *The Modern Law Review*, 2(4), 257–265. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2230.1938.tb00412.x>
- Sudarmo, S., Febrianty, Y., Putri, V. S., Muhtar, M. H., & Salahuddin, S. (2025). Critical study of the implementation of the right of self-determination in protecting Indonesia's environmental and economic sovereignty. *E3S Web of Conferences*, 611, 5002.
- Syadzili, A. M. S. A., Daryanto, E., & Riyanta, S. (2025). The Role of Immigration Intelligence of the Directorate General of Immigration in Preventing the Entry of Foreigners Who Have the Potential to Threaten the Sovereignty of the State. *Eduvest-Journal of Universal Studies*, 5(8), 9504–9516.
- Syahrin, M. A. (2021). Aspek Hukum Laboratorium Forensik Keimigrasian: Studi Kasus Pemeriksaan Paspor Palsu Kebangsaan Inggris Atas Nama Abbas Tauqeer. *Jurnal Akta Yudisia*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.35334/ay.v3i1.985>
- Syahrin M. Alvi. (2019). Polarisasi Penegakan Hukum Keimigrasian Kontemporer: Aksiologi Normatif - Empiris. *Majalah Hukum Nasional*, 59–89.
- Trihatmoko, R. A., & Susilo, Y. S. (2023). Conditions, Challenges and Prospects of State-Owned Enterprises in Indonesia: The Governance Perspective Based on Economic Constitution. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 18(5), 2459–2484.
- Trisnanti, I. L., Amelia, M., & Sushanty, V. R. (2025). The Role of Globalization in Legal Reform in Indonesia. *IUS POSITUM: Journal of Law Theory and Law Enforcement*, 62–75.
- Yakubu, K., Shanthosh, J., Adebayo, K. O., Peiris, D., & Joshi, R. (2023). Scope of health

worker migration governance and its impact on emigration intentions among skilled health workers in Nigeria. *PLOS Global Public Health*, 3(1), e0000717.