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Abstract

Collaborative governance refers to an orientation in making policies, goals, and collaboration processes to achieve a degree of consensus among relevant stakeholders. Policies made to answer community needs are in line with the concept of collaborative governance. Can public administration, public policy, and collaborative governance influence democratic policing? This research method used a quantitative approach. The predictive quantitative approach in this research was that each research variable was a latent variable, measured through a series of indicators. Data in this research were collected using a questionnaire survey. Data were analyzed using SEM-PLS (Partial Least Square) to predict the relationship between variables. The research results are as follows. Public Administration positively influenced Democratic policing. Public Administration positively influenced Collaborative Governance. Public Policy positively influenced Democratic policing. Public Policy positively influenced Collaborative Governance. Collaborative Governance provided a positive influence on Democratic policing. Collaborative Governance mediated Public Administration towards Democratic policing. Collaborative Governance mediated Public Policy towards Democratic policing.
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INTRODUCTION

The effectiveness of the policies in force in Norway adheres to the Nordic regulatory system. The study examines the scope and robustness of administrative cooperation in the Nordic area, focusing on the viewpoints of civil servants in the Norwegian government. The results suggest that this collaboration in the Nordics is distinctly integrated, encompassing a broad spectrum and displaying diverse internal structural characteristics. Nordic collaboration has more influence on national policy design while taking into account the structural conditions of the country's government (Per Lægreid dan Lise H. Rykkja, 2020).

Integration as the main strategy for implementing policies covers the policy and governance sectors. Institutional capacity is an important step to understanding the progress of the institution. The study reveals significant variations in four key factors: (1) the level of political dedication to institutions and the necessity of implementing policy integration; (2) the convergence of policy objectives and beliefs among policy makers; (3) the influence of opportunity structure on the formulation of innovative policies and entrepreneurship policies; and (4) the significance of coordination and consultation mechanisms. Both Barroso and Juncker exhibited traits of both bottom-up and top-down leadership styles throughout their respective presidencies. Researchers did not find any leadership style better than others in increasing institutional capacity (Katharina Rietig dan Claire Dupont, 2021).

The integration of innovation within the public sector is inherently intertwined with various dimensions, including politics as a whole administration, technological advances, and the evolutionary trajectory of the public administration system. The emergence of collaborative innovations within the public sector poses
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significant issues pertaining to the formulation and execution of policies. The presence of public governance difficulties necessitates alterations in the operating principles of public sector organizations, hence fostering a demand for innovation. Collaborative innovation, which encompasses networking, creativity, and resource pooling, serves as a catalyst for the transformation of hierarchical innovation. Inter-organizational trust, knowledge sharing, and informal leadership are crucial factors for achieving effective collaborative innovation. The successful implementation of collaborative innovation necessitates the ability to adapt to evolving power dynamics and the alteration of conventional roles held by personnel in the public sector (Adomas Vincas Rakšnys, et al., 2020).

The concept of policy integration has experienced significant growth in recent decades. However, there are still numerous gaps in our comprehension of the consequences for policy making and the execution of difficulties related to integrated policy design. After conducting a thorough examination of the execution of European Union (EU) development policy in Scotland, the government of the country has implemented a set of development regulations that enable the substitution of sectoral policies with a holistic strategic integration. The primary objective of governance regulatory policies is to enhance administrative capacity, primarily relying on public administration strategies and policies within the relevant political domains. (Ekaterina Domorenok, Paolo Graziano, dan Laura Polverari, 2021).

There exist further studies that assess proactive policing strategies within local police agencies in the United States. The survey was administered to a representative sample of American national police departments comprising over 100 officers in order to get comprehensive data regarding the nature of proactive activity. The study revealed that the majority of respondents had only recognized a certain degree of proactivity, without providing an estimation of the amount of time officers are required to work. The scope of measurable proactivity is predominantly confined to acts such as traffic stops, inspections, and some types of general preventative patrols. Numerous agencies lack explicit procedures to establish and direct proactive initiatives, and they also fail to conduct comprehensive evaluations of officers' effectiveness in preventive measures. The research findings offer insights and suggestions regarding the disparity between practical implementation and policy (Christopher S. Koper, et al., 2020).

In order to effectively promote the welfare of the general public, collaborative governance necessitates the achievement of social justice. If the principles of social justice for all Indonesian people can be maximally fulfilled, it will ensure that collaboration between various elements of the nation and stakeholders can form more effective and efficient policies that are in line with the principles of good governance. Collaboration is an effective form of activity because it is able to unite two or more agencies that work together to increase "public value" rather than working separately. There is a discrepancy between police regulations and implementation in the field and the events that led the making of police regulations, so it is important to understand the mechanism the National Police should implement in making regulations (Sudarmo, 2015).

Policies made to answer community needs are in line with the concept of collaborative governance. Collaboration is a concept used to explain the interconnectedness of cooperative relationships between various parties by combining ideas based on certain considerations (Puspaningtyas, 2022). Policy is the focus of collaborative governance regarding public issues, where an institution has a major orientation in making policies, goals and collaborative processes to achieve a degree of consensus among relevant stakeholders (Astuti, et al., 2020).

The impact of Public Service on Job Competency, specifically in relation to the Performance Accountability System, is notably favorable. The concepts of leadership and service can be classified into various thematic categories that offer valuable insights for enhancing policy and practice. The impact of user satisfaction on organizational performance is both positive and statistically significant. The impact of transformational leadership on innovative work behavior is mediated by an innovative climate, while the influence of information technology on innovative work behavior is mediated by workplace spirituality. (Priyambodo, Wijaya, Wike, Suajarwoto, & Riyadi, 2023a, 2023b; Purbiyantari, Zaahir, Suryadi, Hermawan, & Riyadi, 2023b, 2023a; Sinulingga et al., 2023; Susilo, Astuti, Arifin, Mawardi, & Riyadi, 2023; Syahruddin, Wijaya, Suryono, & Riyadi, 2023; Tjahjono, Suryono, Riyanto, Amin, & Riyadi, 2023; Toruan, Gusti, & Riyadi, 2023). The extent of the
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Conflict of interest, which frequently results in resolutions, is determined by political negotiations, misuse of authority, and personal interests. It is imperative for the state to maintain its authority in managing Indonesia's copious natural resources (Hermanto & Riyadi, 2020; B. S. Riyadi, 2017, 2020b, 2020a; B. S. Riyadi, Atmorejo, & Sukisno, 2020; B. S. Riyadi, Wibowo, & Susanti, 2020).

There is a study examines white-collar crime in Indonesia during the reform period, focusing on state officials, parliament, and political parties, found that white-collar crime has reached alarming levels, potentially forming state organized (Chandra & Riyadi, 2024; Purboyo, Riyadi, Irawan, & Inkiriwang, 2024; B. Sl. Riyadi, 2024a, 2024b).

The Republic of Indonesia is the 6th largest country in Asia. It has more than 17,000 islands divided into 34 provinces (Septiani, 2023). Indonesia has the 1945 Constitution as the highest law in the constitutional system which is a reference in determining state and government policies (Asshiddiqie, 2007). The National Police of the Republic of Indonesia (Polri) is a governmental organization entrusted with the responsibility of ensuring the protection and preservation of the rights and responsibilities of all individuals, in accordance with the provisions outlined in Law number 2 of 2002, which pertains to the State Police of the Republic of Indonesia (Polri).

The National Police has the duties and functions of maintaining security and order, enforcing the law, providing protection or guidance to the community. The National Police has succeeded in increasing the trust of the public, which stood at 63.2 percent in 2016 and increased to 70.2 percent in 2018, reaching 82.8 percent in 2018 (Setiawan, 2018). This is because there is good collaboration within the National Police. The National Police has a functional organizational structure that is equipped with a policy-making mechanism. Several police policies include the Promoter Policy (which stands for "Professional, Modern and Trusted") in 2016, and the Precision Policy (which stands for Organizational transformation, operational transformation, organizational transformation and operational transformation) in 2021.

The concept of police policy reform encompasses three primary orientations: democracy, the rule of law, and human rights. Democratic Oversight is a principle that mandates the police to adhere to transparency, accountability, responsiveness, control of democratic institutions, representation of the public interest, and openness to broader community participation while performing their duties and functions (Prasatya dan Hermawan, 2018).

Based on the previous descriptions, it is imperative to develop a comprehensive strategy that can effectively address a wide range of events and conditions. Furthermore, the future is unpredictable. There is a pressing need for reform in the policy making process within the National Police, as the existing methods fail to adequately address the aforementioned factors. The execution of the policy is not just the responsibility of the national police. An integral component of policy determination is the establishment of a centralized police structure that supervises regional police forces across Indonesia. The formulated policy should possess the capacity to address all issues that arise from this situation, including ethnic disparities that lead to variations in customs, as well as customs that impact public acceptance of the presence and execution of police duties in the field as a means of implementing National Police policies. Similarly, the geographical location presents a potential challenge when executing duties in the field.

This is a research gap, the police institution is caught between two different situations. On one hand, the police is a state institution that is mandated by law to provide security and order, but in other hand, there are many policies that the National Police will have to deal with. Polri has a history of policy variations caused by social environmental conditions and Polri also has policy variations due to leadership succession from time to time. The National Police must also be responsive to conditions that are always changing at any time, carry out difficult tasks and are required to work to support the government, collaborating with stakeholders for the sake of the State and society. The challenge for National Police is to make future policies with policies that are right on target, based on the rules for the formation of police regulations, and made by involving components and all existing potentials so that they can create security and public order.
The problem in this research is that the policies and regulations made cannot be implemented optimally by all stakeholders because of the complexity of state governance which includes geographical areas, existing socio-political and, cultural conditions even though policy making must not be contrary to the principles of social justice. Based on the aforementioned description, a research question was formulated: What is the process of forming police policies and regulations from a Collaborative Governance perspective to improve Democratic Policing? Next, the research question is detailed as follows: can public administration, public policy, and collaborative governance influence democratic policing?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Public Administration

Public administration is considered to be a combined discipline of the theory of organization, the science of management and the concept of the public interest. For this reason, a special paradigm is needed in this discipline as a sketch in an effort to show that the idea of public administration as a unique field of synthesis. According to Henry (1975), there are five phases of the public administration paradigm to be described below. The paradigm in public administration as explained by Nicholas Henry indicates that there is a journey that is not easy for public administration to be able to have its own autonomous identity, both academically and practically at the institutional level.

Paradigm 1: Politics/Administration Dichotomy (1900-1926). The Paradigm 1 period's benchmark was established based on the publishing of works authored by Frank J. Goodnow and Leonard D. From their perspective, inside the realm of government, Politics and Administration serve two separate purposes. According to Goodnow, politics pertains to the formulation of policies or the manifestation of the state's desires, whereas administration focuses on the execution of these policies. The principle of separation of powers is established by the distinction between the legislative and judicial branches. The legislative branch is responsible for developing policies, while the executive branch is tasked with impartially and apolitically managing these policies. Paradigm 1 focuses on the specific location where public administration should be situated in a distinct and unambiguous manner (Henry, 1975).

Paradigm 2: Principles of Administration (1927-1937). In 1927, a book entitled "Principles of Public Administration", written by F.W. Willough was published. This book is the forerunner of Paradigm 2 which also serves as a reference in the field. Paradigm 2 views that there needs to be a new encouragement from public administration regarding certain scientific principles in administrative activities that administrators will become experts in their work if they learn how to apply existing principles. Therefore, the locus of public administration in Paradigm 2 is the enforcement of principles in administration itself in accordance with the "principles of administration", which are the basis for investigation in all academic fields related to it (Henry, 1975).

Paradigm 3: Public Administration as Political Science (1950-1970). In the current phase of Paradigm 3, public administration remains dedicated to its integration inside the political science department. Consequently, there has been a reevaluation of the conceptualization of government bureaucracy, but with a lack of adequate emphasis in its practical implementation. Essentially, this third phase of definition primarily aims to restore the connection between public administration and political science. The outcome of Paradigm 3 is to establish a clear definition of the field of public administration, particularly in relation to the analytical emphasis of its fundamental skill (Henry, 1975).

Paradigm 4: Administrative Science of Public Administration (1956-1970). Paradigm 4 emerged as a result of the "contempt" shown by a number of political science fields, which forced public administration to start looking for alternatives. Even though Paradigm 4 emerged at the same time as Paradigm 3, which was never widely supported by the field of political science, public administration is increasingly developing by expanding its analytical focus based on organization theory and management science as another alternative in public administration. However, public administration does yet fully have its own identity and uniqueness as it still provides focus, rather than clarity of place or position. So Paradigm 4 views the importance of special expertise and specialization in the field of public administration, for example, in what institutional settings that expertise must be applied and should be clearly defined (Henry, 1975).
Paradigm 5: Towards Curricular Autonomy. Equipped with the fundamental principles of organization theory and management science, as well as the central focus on public affairs, public administration has evolved into a distinct field that is intellectually prepared to establish its own independent educational curriculum. This curriculum aims to cultivate a distinctive epistemological approach within the field. During the year of 1970-1971, there was a notable growth of 36 percent in undergraduate enrollment in the subject of public administration. This trend continued in 1971-1972, with the enrollment reaching 50 percent. Another notable tendency is distinguished by the active participation of public administration within institutions. The Public Administration Program was once affiliated with the Political Science Department, but underwent a transformation in 1971-1973, resulting in its establishment as an independent department. Over the course of time, there was a significant increase in the establishment of public administration or public affairs schools, with the percentage rising from 12 percent in 1971 to 25 percent in 1972. Between the years 1970 and 1972, the distinct field of study known as public administration constituted 23 percent of the 101 graduate programs that were included in the survey. Nevertheless, until to the 1980s, the precise definition of public administration remained elusive, particularly in relation to the inquiries surrounding its purpose and the specific institutions within which it operates. Henry asserts that it is imperative to prevent the decline of intellectual development, as the area of public administration is increasingly demonstrating its independent identity that makes significant contributions to society, economy, and politics (Henry, 1975).

Denhardt (2004) views the need for a special perspective in relation to the existing paradigm in public administration and divides three perspectives in public administration into namely; "Old Public Administration (OPA), New Public Administration/Management (NPM), and New Public Service (NPS)."

Old Public Administration or the classical model of state administration emerged as a result of three paradigms, namely; "political-administrative dichotomy paradigm, Herbert Simon's rational model, and public choice theory." The characteristics of OPA according to Denhardt (2004) include the following: Focusing on the provision of public services in an organizational context or official government agency; Understanding state administration and public policy as structuring and implementing policies that focus on the best method, both of which are considered political goals; Public administrators have a limited role in formulating public policy and government, where they only have the duty and responsibility to implement public policy; and administrators are responsible to political leaders (elected political leaders) who have been elected democratically.

New Public Administration/Management. This perspective initially emerged as a form of criticism of several public sector organizations, which gave rise to a movement to carry out management reform in the public sector. New Public Management has influenced the process of comprehensive organizational change in almost all public sectors in the world, where it emphasizes decentralization, devolution, and modernization of public service delivery.

New Public Service. Denhardt (2004) introduced the New Public Service perspective as a response to Osborne and Gaebler's view that government organizations are like ships, with the government's role limited to that of a captain who drives the ship, not one who rows it. The management of the matters is handed over to organizations outside the government, such as civil society and private organizations, reducing the government's domestication function. Denhardt's (2004) New Public Service perspective emphasizes the importance of the government's obligation to provide services and empowerment to the community or citizens, who are considered the 'master' or 'ship owner', rather than focusing solely on who is considered the 'ship owner'.

Public Administration encompasses multiple meanings, as stated by professionals. Herbert A. Simon defines Administration as the collaborative activities of a group working together to achieve shared objectives. Leonard D. White asserts that administration is a ubiquitous procedure that applies to all endeavors, regardless of whether they are public or private, civil or military. Public Administration, as defined by Marshall E. Dimock, Gladys O. Dimock, and Louis W. Koenig, refers to the activities undertaken by the government to exercise its political power. Public Administration, as defined by Dwight Waldo, encompasses the administration and coordination of individuals and resources in order to accomplish governmental objectives. Edward H. Litchfield defines Public Administration as the examination of the organization, staffing, financing, and
management of different government institutions. According to George J. Gordon, the concept of Public Administration encompasses the various activities undertaken by both organizations and individuals in relation to the enforcement and execution of laws and regulations promulgated by the executive, legislative, and judicial branches (Meutia, 2017).

Public administration reform is a deliberate and planned effort to change all aspects of state administration, with the goal of achieving rational objectives (Meutia, 2017). There are at least four factors that influence administrative reform in developing countries, namely: Dissatisfaction with the government; The emergence of new economic theories; Globalization and free trade; and technological developments. Public administration reform is a planned effort to change the implementation of the role of the ruling elite such as the military, bureaucracy, political parties and others, in achieving state goals. Reforms carried out in developing countries should be programmatic in nature. Reforms will be effective if they are designed by considering and involving the environment in which the reforms are implemented. The changes that occur in the bureaucracy and how it works are the result of changes that occur in other systems. There are 6 indicators of public administration reforms, namely: (1) administrative efficiency, (2) eliminating weaknesses in state administration, (3) promoting the merit system, (4) adapting the state administration system to increasing public complaints, (5) changing the division of labor between administrative systems state and political system, as well as (6) changing the relationship between the administrative system and the population (Meutia, 2017).

Public Policy

In terminology, there are many definitions of public policy depending on the angle from which it is interpreted. Wahab (2016) proposed a definition of public policy as a series of decisions taken by a political actor regarding the chosen goals and the means to achieve them in a situation within the limits of the actor’s authority, according to W.I. Jenkins. Another opinion expressed by Chief J.O. Udoji that defines public policy as actions that lead to certain goals that are interrelated and affect the majority of society. Public policy studies aim to carefully describe, analyze, and explain the various causes and consequences of government actions. Public policy studies describe public policy efforts, assessment of the impact of forces originating from the environment on the content of public policy, analysis of the impact of various institutional statements and political processes on public policy. This includes examining the impact of public policy on society, both expected and unexpected (Wahab, 2016).

According to Wahab (2016), there exist multiple justifications for the significance of studying public policy, specifically: (1) The study of public policy is driven by scientific rationales, as it seeks to acquire comprehensive understanding of its origins, developmental trajectory, and societal ramifications. Policy might be considered as either a dependent or independent variable in this scenario. When policy is considered as a dependent variable, the emphasis will be placed on political and environmental elements that contribute to the formulation of policy or are believed to impact the substance of public policy. Conversely, when policy is considered as an autonomous factor, the emphasis is placed on the influence of policy on the political system and the surrounding conditions that shape public policy. The primary objective of public policy studies is to generate scientific knowledge within the realm of public policy, with the aim of addressing prevalent societal issues in a practical manner. Furthermore, the study of public policy is primarily motivated by political considerations, since it aims to empower the government in implementing suitable policies to effectively accomplish its objective.

The making of public policy requires a complex process. Several experts who study public policy divide the processes of formulating public policy into several stages to make it easier. According to William Dunn, as quoted by Winarno (2008), public policy progresses through several stages. The first stage is agenda preparation, during which elected and appointed officials identify issues to be addressed. These issues compete to be included in the policy agenda, and ultimately, a select few are chosen by policy formulators. At this stage, some issues may not be addressed while others may be identified as the main focus of discussion. Additionally, certain problems may be postponed for various reasons. The second step involves the formulation of policies. Policy makers engage in deliberations over issues that have been included in the policy agenda. The issues are delineated, followed by the pursuit of an optimal resolution. The problem at hand can be addressed by considering a range of existing alternatives or policy options. During the process of policy formulation, each available option vies for selection as the policy implemented to address the problem. During this phase, every
player will engage in competition and endeavor to present the most optimal solution to the problem. The third step is the stage of policy adoption. One policy alternative is finally accepted through the support of the parliamentary majority, consensus among agency directors, or a judicial decision, among the multiple policy alternatives provided by policy formulators. The fourth stage pertains to the execution of policies. The classification of a policy initiative as elite records is contingent upon its implementation by administrative bodies or government agents operating at lower levels. The implementation of policies is carried out by administrative units that mobilize both financial and human resources. During the implementation phase, it is possible for various interests to develop conflicts with each other. In certain instances, policy implementations may garner endorsement from implementers, whilst others may encounter resistance. The fifth step involves the review of policies. During this phase, an assessment or evaluation will be conducted on the implemented policies to determine the degree to which they have effectively addressed the societal challenges and achieved the intended outcomes. Hence, the establishment of metrics or criteria serves as the foundation for evaluating the extent to which the implemented public policy has successfully attained its intended impact or objective.

As stated by Wahab (2016), the distinctive attributes that are inherent in public policy stem from the process of policy formulation. The characteristics of public policy encompass the notion that it mostly entails deliberate actions aimed at achieving certain objectives, rather than being characterized by random or fortuitous behaviors or actions. Public policies in the contemporary political system encompass deliberate and strategic measures. Policy is fundamentally comprised of interconnected and structured activities that are undertaken by government officials with the aim of achieving specific objectives, rather than being an autonomous decision. Policy encompasses more than just the formulation of laws in certain domains; it also encompasses the subsequent decisions pertaining to the execution and enforcement of these policies. Policy pertains to the tangible actions undertaken by the government within a specific domain. (4) Public policy can have both positive and bad implications, such as government officials choosing not to act or refraining from taking action in situations where government intervention is necessary.

Wahab (2016) conveys that public policy can be classified into two categories: substantive policy and procedural policy. Substantive policy pertains to the actions and decisions undertaken by the government. Procedural policy pertains to the implementation of substantive policies. The comparison between distributive policy, regulatory policy, and redistributive policy. Distributational policy pertains to the allocation of services or benefits to both society as a whole and individual members thereof. Regulatory policy refers to the imposition of limitations or prohibitions on the conduct of individuals or collectives within a given society. Redistributive policy governs the distribution of money, income, ownership, or rights among different societal groups. (3) Comparison between material policy and symbolic policy. Material policy extends comprehensive resource advantages to the intended demographic. In contrast, symbolic policy confers symbolic advantages upon the designated demographic. This section pertains to policies concerning public goods and private goods. The regulation of public goods policy pertains to the manner in which public goods or services are provided. In the context of the free market, private goods policy governs the allocation of commodities or services. Wahab (2016) suggests there are 5 public policy indicators: (1) Policy demands, which refer to demands or pressures made on government officials by other actors, including both the private sector and the government itself in the political system, to take certain actions or, refrain from taking action on a certain problem. These demands can vary, ranging from general demands for the government to do something to proposals to take certain concrete actions regarding a problem that occurs in society; (2) Policy decisions, which refer to decisions made by government officials that are intended to provide direction for the implementation of public policy. In this case, this includes decisions to create statutes (basic provisions), decrees, or make interpretations of laws; (3) Policy statements, which refer to official statement or explanation regarding a particular public policy. For example; MPR decisions, Presidential Decrees, judicial decisions, statements or speeches by government officials that that reflect the government's objectives, goals, and actions taken to achieve them; (4) Policy outputs, which refer the most visible and tangible form of public policy, as it involves the actualization of decisions and policy statements.. In short, this policy output concerns what the government wants to do; the last is (5) Policy outcomes, which refer to the consequences or impacts that are actually experienced by society,
whether expected or unexpected as a consequence of government action or inaction in certain areas or problems in society.

The policy reform process involves two main objectives, namely making changes to legislation and regulatory decisions and enhancing the development partners' institutional capability to efficiently execute the supplementary structure. The existence of a public policy reform process can have an impact on the development of a country's performance, which has a direct impact on Target Sectoral/Industrial Instruments and macroeconomic policies. Policy effectiveness can be improved based on an integrated and coordinated sequence or stages. This begins with an assessment of policy opportunities, also known as the diagnosis or problem definition stage. Next, consideration of tasks involving the search for alternatives (policy reform), the design of policy solutions, how to change policy rules, and implementation mechanisms are carried out with the following stage process (USAID, 2007); conducting analysis of opportunities to improve economic outcomes, increasing institutional capacity, assessing possible obstacles to policy reform; and formulating viable policy innovations. After the above stages have been carried out, the next step is the implementation process. From the innovations developed in the policy reform program design stage, there is a final stage that needs to be carried out, namely related to monitoring and evaluating the results of the reform process. There is a process that is ongoing in a coordinated manner and is facilitated or managed by stakeholders from various regulatory parties who consistently maintain continuous and constructive dialogue regarding the process and its form of implementation.

Public policy reform aims to make decisions based on the results of an evaluation. The evaluation determines whether the policy should be updated or replaced with a new one, and if it needs improvement to become more effective. Public policy reform has a significant role in determining more effective and efficient policy formulation. With this level of effectiveness, the implementation of public policy can target policies more accurately and align them with the intended objectives. After the policy evaluation is carried out, there are stages of policy reform that need to be taken as one of a series of policies that cannot be forgotten (Hayat, et al., 2018).

Collaborative Governance

According to Ansell and Gash (2007), collaborative governance can be defined as the theoretical framework of government administration that emphasizes collaborative efforts and relies on the establishment of mutual consent. Collaborative governance refers to a kind of governance wherein both public and private entities engage in coordinated efforts, employing distinct methodologies, to construct legal frameworks and regulations pertaining to the delivery of public goods. This notion emphasizes the significance of a scenario in which public and private entities, encompassing both corporate and private sectors, collaborate through certain methodologies and procedures to generate legal regulations and policies that are more suitable for the betterment of society. Collaboration within the context of collaborative governance is characterized by the alignment of parties' vision, goals, strategies, and activities, while simultaneously granting them autonomy to make autonomous decisions and oversee the organization, subject to mutual agreement (Dwiyanto, 2015). Collaborative governance refers to a procedural framework wherein multiple agencies are engaged in the pursuit of shared objectives. The provided description lacks a comprehensive explanation about the specific types of organizations that are engaged in the process. Organizational collaboration can result in the achievement of shared objectives by harnessing the capabilities of each party involved. Collaborative Governance places emphasis on six criteria, as outlined by Ansell and Gash (2007). These criteria include the initiation of the forum by either a public or private institution, the inclusion of private actors as participants, direct involvement of participants in decision-making rather than mere provision of services by public agencies, the organization of the forum, the objective of reaching decisions through consensus, and the central focus of collaboration on public policy and public management.

According to Ansell and Gash (2007), collaborative governance is necessary for all relevant stakeholders, as it allows for the connection of their interests in a consensus-oriented decision-making process (mutual agreement). This includes both public and private entities, who can collectively participate in a forum or public body. Furthermore, in the literature-based meta-analytic study they conducted, they analyzed the effects of bureaucratic governance based on the way of collaboration between interest actors. They aimed to elaborate a
collaborative governance contingency model that has been theoretically and practically proven to be effective in achieving goals with collaborative government cooperation. Collaborative governance typically arises either naturally or deliberately due to the intricate and interconnected nature of institutions. Conflicts between interest groups are often hidden and challenging to suppress. Additionally, there is a need to explore innovative approaches to attain political legitimacy. Collaborative governance is implemented by organizations to bring about social change. In the current era of societal reform, structures can spread throughout the sphere due to the information phase. The government cannot efficiently manage the problems it faces today by relying on only one organization. A unique and adaptable system is required by the government. A collaborative effort was established among diverse sectors in order to address and resolve challenges.

There exist eight significant indicators that serve as benchmarks for evaluating the effectiveness of collaborative governance. These indicators include: (1) Two models can be used to classify the type of networked structure: In the context of self-governance, stakeholders engage in networks devoid of administrative bodies. The lead organization model involves the utilization of administrative entities and managers to operate networks as service providers. On the other hand, the network administrative organization model is distinguished by the presence of an administrative entity specifically established to oversee the program, rather than serving as a service provider. In this model, managers receive compensation for their services. (2) Dedication to a shared objective. The existence of a network is necessitated by the presence of attention and commitment towards the attainment of favorable objectives. (3) Mutual trust among the parties. In order for collaboration to be successful, it is necessary to have trust and respect. Effective communication and trust play a vital role in creating and sustaining efficient relationships among the groups involved. (4) Governance. It encompasses the establishment of mutual trust among the participants, the establishment of explicit and mutually accepted guidelines, and the autonomy to select the manner in which the cooperation is executed. There are restrictions on the individuals who can participate, and subjective assessments should be avoided unless explicitly indicated as such. (5) Authority access (power access). The presence of well-defined standard measures and procedural requirements is crucial. (6) Distributive accountability/responsibility, or the splitting of responsiveness and accountability. In the context of governance, encompassing organizational, managerial, and stakeholder collaboration, it is imperative that all individuals involved in decision-making processes are held accountable. (7) The act of sharing knowledge. It manifests as enhanced accessibility for members, safeguarding of privacy (the preservation of personal identification confidentially), and restricted entry for non-members, provided that it is mutually agreeable. (8) Availability of resources (access to resources). The attainment of objectives necessitates the presence of financial, technical, and human resources (Goldsmith dan Kettl, 2009).

**Democratic Policing**

The concept of collaboration within the realm of public policy aligns with the fundamental tenets of democratic policing, which prioritizes the values of democracy derived by, by, and for the populace. The fundamental underpinning of democratic policing is in the role of law enforcement agencies and civil institutions within society. The police, in their capacity as law enforcement personnel, exhibit attributes such as legal authority. Their situations typically exhibit repressive characteristics and are grounded in positive legal philosophy. Furthermore, their function is therapeutic. In this categorization, law enforcement agencies strive to bolster their capabilities by augmenting their staff and equipment in order to successfully regulate society. The utilization of law is given precedence, with the police acting as the catalyst. Furthermore, the police strive to distribute the duty of law enforcement among community members by establishing partnerships that are marked by community control (self-help). Humanistic police scenarios are characterized by their foundation in the philosophy of compassion. Moreover, their function is that of a conciliator. In this scenario, the police have the intention of restricting their ability to exert control over the community and promoting self-reliance and self-restraint among community members. Within the framework of democratic policing, there are five interconnected pillars: a) internal control of the relevant security institution (police); b) control by the government/executive; c) supervision by Parliament; d) review by the judiciary; and e) oversight by civil society (Sandiya & Basir, 2021; Setyabudi, Mayastinasari, Lubis, & Dwilaksana, 2020).

Democratic policing refers to a comprehensive police accountability system that encompasses several stakeholders, including executive, legislative, judicial, independent formal commissions, media, and civil society
organizations. This system serves as a supplementary component to the internal police process. The concept of Democratic Policing encompasses the integration of internal control, state control, and social control. A Democratic Policing System refers to a system in which law enforcement officers are chosen by and answerable to the general public or society. Democratic policing refers to law enforcement that upholds civil rights, adheres to democratic principles and good governance and practices democratic policing. The police must at least fulfill the following elements: (1) Submit to the rule of law by embodying the values of respecting human rights, rather than solely fulfilling the wishes of leaders or rulers; (2) Intervene in people's lives only in limited and controlled circumstances; (3) Take responsibility openly (Sandiya & Basir, 2021; Setyabudi et al., 2020). These three elements must be attached to the police system and organization in a democratic world.

There are 12 quality indicators of democratic policing principles that must be met (Sandiya & Basir, 2021; Setyabudi et al., 2020): (1) Exhibit responsibility. The police must acknowledge the inherent characteristics and extent of their subjective power and must consistently be answerable to the public (society) and legal statutes. The police should strive for maximum transparency in their decision-making process; (2) Collaboration. The police should possess the capability to engage in collaborative efforts with community members and other organizations in order to effectively address any issue. Hence, it is imperative for law enforcement agencies to carefully select the policing technique they implement. The police department implements this collaborative method by utilizing tiered leadership techniques at every level. Consequently, police leaders are required to attentively listen to the grievances of every member and work together with them to identify and address issues; (3) Proficient and skilled. Everyone joining the police force is required to commence their professional journey with a comprehensive and advanced education in the fields of science and humanities. The training program should encompass comprehensive and demanding courses within an adult learning environment, aimed at imparting the ethical principles and competencies associated with Democratic Policing; (4) Efficient and strategic. An exemplary police institution is distinguished by its members' persistent endeavors to address police issues efficiently and impartially, with a focus on crime prevention and upholding tranquility in society. Hence, the police can utilize the findings of study and practical expertise, employing a problem-solving methodology to accomplish objectives; (5) Be truthful. Integrity and sound moral principles are indispensable. The pursuit of these attributes in each law enforcement officer commences with the initial selection procedure and persists throughout their professional trajectory. Hence, the selection process is limited to police officers who have exhibited commendable decision-making abilities; (6) Citizen role-model. A police officer must possess not only exceptional policing skills, but also a strong sense of civic responsibility, as they are integral members of society. Therefore, it is crucial that law enforcement agents exemplify the ideals and characteristics associated with good citizenship, both in their professional and personal spheres; (7) Peacekeeper and protector. The primary function of the police is to serve as peacekeepers within society. They serve not only as law enforcement officers and law enforcement agents. Hence, it is crucial that all endeavors pertaining to labor, education, and training are focused on the advancement of peace throughout society. The police force serves as the primary guardians of the criminal justice system, assuming the responsibility of safeguarding human rights and upholding the principles outlined in the constitution; (8) Assistant. Every individual within the police force must possess a demographic composition that accurately reflects the neighborhood they are responsible for. Representatives within the established community system are tasked with the responsibility of effectively representing a police force in order to accomplish their objectives; (9) Respect. It is imperative that all individuals within the police force exhibit unwavering decency and respect towards all others. They must demonstrate a willingness to attentively listen to individuals, particularly those who lack social standing. This principle is equally applicable to police commanders, who are expected to exhibit courtesy and uphold the rights of their members in the workplace; (10) Controlled. When deliberating the use of force, the police should give priority to upholding tranquil circumstances and ensuring public safety. Police officers are required to undergo specialized training in order to effectively and accurately employ their force in a regulated manner. Lethal force should be employed just as a final option and solely in circumstances that are serious and urgent; (11) Servant leader. Every police officer, irrespective of their rank, is required to possess strong leadership skills and demonstrate a servant-like attitude towards both the public and the police organization. Servant leaders leverage their power and sway to enhance the welfare of others; (12) Comprehend. While acknowledging the inherent bias in human behavior, it is imperative for a police officer to recognize their capacity and obligation to
Developing Policy And Regulation Using Collaborative Governance To Enhance Democratic Policing

impartially address all grievances and issues of individuals, irrespective of their race, ethnicity, gender, socio-economic circumstances, nationality, citizenship status, or sexual orientation. This obligation is firmly established in universal human rights principles.

Hypotheses Development

The conceptual framework of this research was based on a model of police policy making that departs from the state policy system. The concept of government is implemented, indicating a balanced relationship between the state or government and its citizen in social and political context. The people are no longer solely positioned only as objects, but also as subjects, creating open relations. Policy making by the government is a form of consensus between the government and its people. The same principle applies to the police institution, which plays a crucial role maintaining security and public order. The process of making police policies should also not be limited to the institution itself, but also should involve input from stakeholders outside the police circle. Formulation of police policies and regulations is as the basis for police institutional policies. Changes in the formation of police regulations are based on the principle of collaborative governance. The conceptual framework built based on the theory used in this research is mapped in Figure 1 below

![Conceptual Model](image)

**Figure 1. Conceptual Model**

H1 Public Administration positively influences Democratic policing

H2 Public Administration positively influences Collaborative Governance

H3 Public Policy positively influences Democratic policing

H4 Public Policy positively influences Collaborative Governance

H5 Collaborative Governance positively influences on Democratic policing

H6 Collaborative Governance mediates Public Administration towards Democratic policing

H7 Collaborative Governance mediates Public Policy towards Democratic policing

METHOD

This research used a predictive quantitative approach. The research was located at the Police Station in Indonesia. The population consisted of all leaders in Regional Police in Indonesia. The research sample
comprised 100 police leaders selected through a purposive sampling method to represent all police stations in Indonesia, from the central to the regional level. There were two data type used, primary and secondary data. Primary data was a type of data obtained directly from respondents. Secondary data was a type of data obtained from pre-existing sources, such as literature reviews or reviews of printed or electronic documents, including official government documents, police regulations, laws, and scientific journals related to the problem being studied. Each research variable was a latent variable, measured through a series of indicators. The Public Administration variable consisted of 6 indicators, the Public Policy variable consisted of 5 indicators, the Collaborative Governance variable consisted of 8 indicators, and the Democratic Policing variable consisted of 12 indicators. As presented in Figure 2, each indicator was assessed using a Likert scale, from points 1 to 5, with a value of 1 being Strongly Disagree and 5 being Strongly Agree.

Data this research was collected using a questionnaire survey which had been prepared following the indicators in the research variables. The questionnaire contained a list of closed statements measured using a 5 point Likert scale, with a score of 1 for Strongly Disagree and a score of 5 for Strongly Agree.

The link between factors was predicted by analyzing the data using SEM-PLS (Partial Least Square). The path analysis model comprised three distinct relationships: 1) the outer model, which delineates the association between latent variables and indicators or manifest variables; 2) the inner model, which represents the relationship between latent variables (referred to as the structural model); and 3) the weight relationship, which evaluates latent variables for estimation purposes. The external model, also known as the measuring model, refers to the association between variables and their corresponding indicators. The evaluation of the outer model is conducted by executing the PLS Algorithm menu in order to evaluate the validity and reliability. Convergent validity and discriminant validity are the two validity tests employed in this study. The assessment of reliability is conducted using Cronbach’s alpha, composite reliability, and Average Variance Extracted (AVE). The inner model, also known as the structural model, refers to the interrelationship among the variables.
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examined in this study. The evaluation of the inner model is conducted by executing the PLS Bootstrapping menu in order to evaluate the predictive relevance. The Stone Geisjer test was employed to evaluate predictive relevance by calculating the Q square (Q2). The assessment of Goodness of Fit can be conducted by evaluating the predictive significance of Q-Square (Ringle, Wende, & Will, 2015).

If every variable and indicator has been deemed reliable and genuine, and the model's Goodness of Fit satisfies the criterion for predictive relevance, then the next step is to test the hypothesis. In hypothesis testing, the t-statistic value and probability value will be seen. To test the hypothesis, the t-statistic value is 1.96 and the probability or alpha value is 5%. The criterion for accepting the hypothesis is when the t-statistic value is > 1.96 and the p value is < 0.05 (Ringle et al., 2015). To assess the mediation test for the mediator variable (intervening variable), compare the direct effect with the indirect effect to determine which is stronger (Ringle et al., 2015).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Outer model evaluation consisted of convergent validity, discriminant validity, and reliability. Convergent validity testing to test significant indicators and reflect construct or latent variables was carried out by looking at the outer loading value of each indicator on the construct.

Figure 3. Measurement Model Algorithm Results
Source: SmartPLS Data Processing Results

An indicator is considered valid if its outer loading value is higher than 0.7. If the value is below 0.7, then it should be removed from the model to create a revised model. Based on the calculations, the results showed that the indicators ADM1, ADM2, COL6, COL8, POL01, POL03, POL04, and POL12 were removed from the model to create a revised model. Based on the calculations, the results showed that all indicators had an outer loading value of > 0.7, so that the model met the requirements for convergent validity, meaning that all
indicators were valid in measuring the construct. The statistical results of the convergent validity test of the measurement model can be seen in the following figure 4.

Figure 4. Results of the Measurement Model Revision Algorithm
Source: SmartPLS Data Processing Results

Discriminant validity testing aims to ensure that each latent variable or construct is different from other variables. The discriminant validity test is conducted by examining the values and it is satisfied. Discriminant validity testing is carried out by referring to AVE (Average Variance Extracted). The construct meets discriminant validity if its AVE value is greater than 0.5. The following are the results of the discriminant validity analysis in this study based on Average Variance Extracted (AVE). Based on the results of the AVE values shown in Table 1, it can be concluded that all variables have met the requirements for discriminant validity.

Reliability testing is carried out to determine the level of internal consistency of indicators in measuring certain latent constructs or variables. A questionnaire is considered a reliable and consistent research tool if its Cronbach’s Alpha value and Composite Reliability value are both above 0.70. Table 1 shows that all variables have a Cronbach’s Alpha value higher than 0.7 and a Composite Reliability value higher than 0.7, so it can be concluded that all variables or constructs have met the required reliability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>Average Variance Extracted (AVE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>0.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Governance</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>0.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Policing</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td>0.653</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SmartPLS Data Processing Results
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The evaluation of the inner model involves assessing the structural model and determining the significance level of the path coefficient. Structural model evaluation aims to ensure the robustness and accuracy of the built model. This is achieved by examining various values, including model suitability tests such as the R-Square coefficient of determination (R2) and Q-Square predictive relevance (Q2), as well as the significance level of the path coefficient used for hypothesis testing, which predicts the relationship between latent variables. The coefficient of determination R Square (R2) indicates the extent to which the exogenous variable explains the endogenous variable. The R2 value is zero to one. If the R value in R2 is getting closer to one, then the independent variables provide all the information needed to predict variations in the endogenous variables. Conversely, as the R2 value approaches 0, the ability of the independent variables to explain variations in endogenous variables becomes increasingly limited. The R2 values were classified as substantial (R2 > 0.75), moderate (R2 > 0.50), and weak (R2 > 0.25). The results of the coefficient of determination R2 for this research are in table 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exogen</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>R Square Adjusted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Governance</td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td>0.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Policing</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>0.594</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SmartPLS Data Processing Results

Q-Square Predictive Relevance (Q2) in PLS (Partial Least Square) analysis shows the predictive power of the model. The Q2 value can be used to test the Good of Fit Model, where if the Q2 value of the model is higher than 0, it shows that the model has good predictive relevance or a good model fit. In contrast, if the Q² value is lower than 0, it shows that the model has less predictive relevance or a poor model fit. The statistical value of Q2 was 0.909, meaning it had a good predictive relevance value. The calculation results showed that the predicted relevance value (Q2) was higher than 0, so it had a relevant predicted value or the model considered fit or feasible for hypothesis testing (Ringle et al., 2015).

The bootstrapping technique was employed to conduct an analysis of the significance level of path coefficients in Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM). The objective was to ascertain both the direction and the significance of the association between exogenous latent variables and endogenous latent variables. The evaluation of the correlation between external latent variables and internal latent variables is conducted by examining the t-statistic value or p-value. The present study employed hypothesis testing at a significance level of 5%. In the context of hypothesis decision making, the acceptance of the hypothesis or the existence of a positive impact of the exogenous variable on the endogenous variable is established based on a t-statistic value exceeding 1.96 with a standard error of 5% or a corresponding p value below 0.05, and conversely, as determined by the bootstrapping test.

Mediation can occur when a construct intervenes in two other related constructs. In this research, an indirect effect assessment was needed because there were intermediary or mediating variables. Using SmartPLS, we conducted bootstrapping, followed by looking at the value of the specific indirect effect. The values seen were the t-statistic and p-value. If the t-statistic is >1.96 and the p-value <0.05, then the mediating variable is considered statistically significant. The following are the results of structural model testing or hypothesis testing for this research:

Based on Table 3, the following hypothesis testing results were found. Public Administration has a positive and significant influence on Democratic policing (H1 was supported). Public Administration had a positive and significant influence on Collaborative Governance (H2 was supported). Public Policy had a positive and significant influence on Democratic policing (H3 was supported). Public Policy had a positive and significant influence on Collaborative Governance (H4 was supported). Collaborative Governance had a positive and significant influence on Democratic policing (H5 was supported). Collaborative Governance mediated Public
Administration against Democratic policing (H6 was supported). Collaborative Governance mediated Public Policy towards Democratic policing (H7 was supported).

According to Law number 2 of 2002 regulating the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia, the police possess the jurisdiction to formulate policies. Within the confines of its administrative jurisdiction, the National Police often possesses the power to promulgate police rules. Furthermore, the National Police formulates derivative rules that encompass policies applicable both internally and externally, drawing upon the National Police Chief Regulation No. 2 of 2018, which pertains to the establishment of police regulations. The aforementioned police rules pertain to the establishment and development of policies within the National Police organization, spanning from the central to the regional police level, and are applicable to all operational
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domains. In accordance with statutory laws, the National Police is responsible for formulating Police laws for external purposes. These regulations serve the objective of upholding order and safeguarding public security.

The National Police Chief’s regulations state that Community Policing or Polmas is an activity to engage the community through a partnership between members of the National Police and the community. Some democratic policing activities in community policing that can be carried out are: (1) Increasing Community Participation in Democratic Policing. One of the main elements in Democratic Policing is public participation. Participation is emphasized because the community in the framework of Democratic Policing is not merely the object of the police, but is a subject that can be used as a partner; (2) Community Involvement in Community Policing. Effective and sincere community participation is important to reduce social conflict, reduce and prevent crime, and most importantly, gain the trust of the community; (3) Partnership. A reciprocal, mutually beneficial cooperative relationship is established based on concern, equality, and synergistic togetherness among the government, society, and the business world in the development of social welfare.

CONCLUSION


The condition of policing in democracy continues to develop. The increasing development of the democratic system has encouraged the need and necessity for police institutions to carry out their duties in accordance with the demands of a democratic society. The existence of culture and political changes that are so dynamic make it a challenge in itself to encourage internal change in police institutions. Additionally, police agencies must take into account humanitarian factors when determining policies. Many policies must consider the impacts and risks of so-called sensitivities in political security situations.
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