

STAKEHOLDER COLLABORATION IN ENHANCING THE QUALITY OF PUBLIC SERVICES THROUGH COMMUNITY POLICING: A CASE STUDY OF THE PURWAKARTA DISTRICT POLICE

Lilik Ardhiansyah¹, Suryadi², Sarwono³, Tri Yumarni⁴

¹Doctoral Program, Faculty of Administrative Sciences, Universitas Brawijaya Malang, 65145, Indonesia

²³⁴Faculty of Administrative Sciences, Universitas Brawijaya Malang, 65145, Indonesia

¹lilikardhiansyahfiaub@gmail.com

²suryadi_fia@ub.ac.id,

³sarwono@ub.ac.id,

⁴triyumarni@ub.ac.id

Abstract

This study aims to evaluate the implementation of Community Policing (Polmas) as a strategy to improve the quality of public services in the areas of public safety and order, using a case study of the Purwakarta District Police. The research is motivated by the rising crime rates in Indonesia, which call for a policing approach based on partnerships between law enforcement agencies and the community. Through the establishment of the Police–Community Partnership Forum (Forum Kemitraan Polisi dan Masyarakat/FKPM), the Purwakarta District Police seeks to adopt a collaborative governance model that emphasizes active stakeholder participation. This study employs a qualitative approach using the collaborative governance framework developed by Ansell and Gash as the analytical lens. The findings reveal that the success of community policing implementation is significantly influenced by the initial conditions of collaboration, facilitative leadership, institutional design, and collaborative processes involving face-to-face dialogue and the development of shared understanding. Nonetheless, several challenges—such as limited personnel competencies, low levels of public trust, and inadequate policy and infrastructure support—serve as critical barriers. This research contributes to the development of collaborative governance theory in public service delivery and offers strategic recommendations to strengthen community policing as a sustainable model of participatory law enforcement.

Keywords: Community Policing, Collaborative Governance, District Police, Public Service, Public Safety

1. Introduction

Public safety and order are fundamental prerequisites for supporting the continuity of national development. Within the framework of good governance, a secure and orderly social environment serves as the foundation for political, economic, and socio-cultural stability. Conversely, high levels of crime and social disorder create an uncondusive environment and erode public trust in the state's capacity to perform its public service functions, particularly in safeguarding citizens' security.

Statistical data indicate a significant increase in crime rates in Indonesia in recent years. According to the Central Statistics Agency (2024), the number of criminal cases rose from 372,965 in 2022 to 584,991 in 2023. This increase is evident not only in terms of quantity but also in intensity, as the average time interval between crimes decreased from 1 minute and 24 seconds to just 53 seconds. The Global Organized Crime Index (2023) ranks Indonesia as the country with the second-highest crime rate in the ASEAN region, underscoring the urgent need for preventive and collaborative interventions in public security management.

Institutionally, the Indonesian National Police (Polri) holds a constitutional mandate, as stipulated in Law No. 2 of 2002 on the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia, to carry out functions of law enforcement, maintenance of public order and safety, and the provision of services and protection to citizens. However, a purely repressive approach is no longer sufficient to address the complexity of social issues that give rise to crime. Therefore, a paradigm shift toward community-based and participatory security services has become

imperative. One such emerging approach is Community Policing (Polmas), a policing strategy that emphasizes partnerships between law enforcement and communities to jointly identify, analyze, and resolve security-related issues.

Community Policing has been institutionalized as part of national policy through the Chief of Police Decree No. Pol.Skep/737/X/2005 and reinforced by Police Regulation No. 1 of 2021. At the local level, a notable example of this policy implementation can be observed in the jurisdiction of the Purwakarta District Police (Polres Purwakarta). Here, Community Policing is operationalized through the establishment of the Police–Community Partnership Forum (Forum Kemitraan Polisi dan Masyarakat/FKPM), which serves as a collaborative platform for early detection, identification, and resolution of community security issues. The FKPM involves various stakeholders, including police officers, local security units, representatives from local government, and community leaders.

Despite these efforts, the implementation of Community Policing in Purwakarta continues to face several challenges. Key issues include limited human resource capacity, both among Polmas officers and community participants; lack of institutional support and program sustainability; as well as low levels of legal awareness and public trust in the police. These conditions indicate that the success of Community Policing is not merely determined by formal policy or the establishment of forums, but rather by the quality of collaboration among stakeholders involved.

To this end, a conceptual approach is needed to comprehensively explain the dynamics of collaboration in the implementation of Community Policing. One relevant framework is the model of collaborative governance as developed by Ansell and Gash (2008). This model highlights five key dimensions of collaborative processes: starting conditions, facilitative leadership, institutional design, collaborative process, and intermediate outcomes. Applying this framework allows for an analysis of Community Policing not only from the perspective of structure and actors but also in terms of the processes and quality of stakeholder interactions that influence the effectiveness of participatory public security policies.

Previous studies have explored Community Policing from various perspectives, such as enhancing public trust in the police (Aston et al., 2023), the failure of implementation in Kenya due to weak partnership foundations (Diphooorn & Stapele, 2021), and comparative analyses of citizen participation in South Korea and the United Kingdom (Choi & Lee, 2021). However, studies that specifically examine Community Policing within the framework of collaborative governance in the Indonesian local context—particularly in its connection to improving the quality of public security services—remain limited.

Accordingly, this study seeks to fill this gap by evaluating the implementation of Community Policing in the Purwakarta District Police through the lens of collaborative governance. The main objectives of this study are threefold: (1) to examine how collaborative processes among stakeholders are carried out in the implementation of Community Policing; (2) to identify the enabling and constraining factors in these processes; and (3) to formulate an ideal model of collaborative governance to enhance the effectiveness of Community Policing at the local level. Theoretically, this research aims to enrich the literature on participatory and responsive public service governance. Practically, the findings are expected to offer strategic recommendations to the Indonesian National Police, particularly the Purwakarta District Police, to improve partnership systems and collaboration with the community as co-producers of security services. A collaboration-based approach is believed to foster sustainable public safety and build public trust in law enforcement agencies.

2. Literature Review

Research on Community Policing (Polmas) within the framework of collaborative governance is rooted in a diverse body of theoretical work drawn from public administration literature,

collaborative governance theory, public service management, and participatory security policy studies. This review seeks to bridge participatory policing approaches with the collaborative governance paradigm to enhance the effectiveness of public service delivery in the domain of public safety and order.

2.1. Community Policing and Public Service

Community Policing is a strategic approach to law enforcement that emphasizes partnerships between the police and the community to jointly identify and resolve social issues that may disrupt public order and security. This approach views community members not merely as passive recipients of security services but as active agents or co-producers in the creation of public safety (Pramono, 2011). Accordingly, Community Policing goes beyond a purely repressive law enforcement orientation, emphasizing prevention through community engagement and empowerment.

In the context of public service delivery, Community Policing reflects the participatory principles enshrined in Law No. 25 of 2009 on Public Services. Article 4 of this law establishes participation as one of the core principles guiding public service implementation. By involving the public in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of security services, Community Policing opens up space for citizen contribution to improving the quality of public services, particularly in the area of community security.

2.2. Co-Production Theory in Public Service Management

The concept of co-production is fundamental to understanding community involvement in public services within the Community Policing framework. According to Loeffler and Bovaird (2020), co-production is an approach that entails long-term collaboration between service providers and users, in which both parties contribute resources to achieve shared goals. The model comprises four dimensions: *co-commissioning* (joint planning), *co-design* (joint service design), *co-delivery* (joint service delivery), and *co-assessment* (joint evaluation).

In the context of Community Policing, these four dimensions are operationalized through the Police–Community Partnership Forum (Forum Kemitraan Polisi dan Masyarakat/FKPM), which brings together police representatives and community members to jointly formulate local security strategies. Therefore, the co-production approach serves as a relevant analytical lens for assessing the effectiveness of Community Policing as a form of collaborative public service.

2.3. Collaborative Governance

Collaborative governance theory serves as the primary analytical framework for this study. Ansell and Gash (2008) define collaborative governance as a process of collective decision-making involving both state and non-state actors who participate directly in a formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative forum. This process is intended for the design and implementation of public policy as well as the management of public programs or assets.

The Ansell and Gash model of collaborative governance consists of five key elements:

1. **Starting Conditions:** including the history of inter-actor relationships, power and resource imbalances, and initial levels of trust.
2. **Facilitative Leadership:** the crucial role of leaders in managing deliberative processes and building trust.
3. **Institutional Design:** formal structures and ground rules that promote equal and inclusive participation.
4. **Collaborative Process:** direct interaction through face-to-face dialogue, aimed at fostering mutual understanding and shared commitment.
5. **Intermediate Outcomes:** such as the development of trust, preliminary policy results, and progress toward shared goals.

These five elements are particularly relevant for analyzing the implementation of Community Policing in the Purwakarta District Police, especially in evaluating the extent to which

collaboration between police officers and community members is inclusive, deliberative, and sustainable.

2.4. Contributions from Previous Studies

Previous studies have highlighted key aspects of Community Policing implementation across different national contexts. Aston et al. (2023) argue that the success of Community Policing strongly depends on the quality of communication and information exchange between the police and the community, which is crucial for building public trust. Meanwhile, Diphoorn and Stapele (2021) identify the failure of Community Policing in Kenya due to its top-down implementation, which lacked a genuine partnership foundation. This study underscores that Community Policing is only effective when implemented in a spirit of equality and participation.

Choi and Lee (2021), in their comparative study of South Korea and the United Kingdom, found differing motivations for community participation in Community Policing. In the UK, participation tends to be individualistic and instrumental, whereas in South Korea, it is driven by collective commitment to the community. These findings reinforce the importance of social and cultural context in the implementation of Community Policing.

Additionally, research by Mangai et al. (2022) in Johannesburg demonstrates that police–community partnerships can bridge the gap between law enforcement and citizens, fostering shared responsibility in ensuring public safety. This aligns with collaborative governance theory, which emphasizes the distribution of collective responsibilities among stakeholders.

2.5. Conceptual Framework

Based on the aforementioned literature, a conceptual framework is constructed that integrates the Community Policing approach with collaborative governance theory to assess the implementation of public security services. Community Policing is positioned as a form of co-produced public service, while the collaborative governance model is employed to analyze stakeholder interactions, roles, and institutional structures in police–community security partnerships.

Thus, this study does not solely focus on the effectiveness of Community Policing policy in terms of output, but also pays attention to the dynamics of collaborative processes, the enabling and constraining factors, and the potential for formulating a collaborative governance model that can be adapted to other local contexts.

3. Research Methodology

This study employs a qualitative approach with a case study strategy to gain an in-depth understanding of how Community Policing (Polmas) is implemented within the framework of collaborative governance in the Purwakarta District Police (Polres Purwakarta). A qualitative approach is deemed appropriate given the complex, dynamic, and context-dependent nature of the phenomenon under investigation, involving multiple social actors with varying roles and interests. Accordingly, this study focuses on gaining deep insight into social processes rather than relying solely on statistical measurement (Creswell, 2018; Denzin & Lincoln, 2011).

3.1. Research Approach and Design

This study is descriptive-analytical in nature and adopts an intrinsic case study design (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2018). The case study design allows the researcher to explore the Community Policing phenomenon in the jurisdiction of Polres Purwakarta in a contextual and holistic manner. Through this design, the study examines the interplay between institutional police structures, partnership mechanisms with the community, and stakeholder collaboration dynamics in managing public security.

This research also adopts a social constructivist paradigm, viewing reality as a social construct shaped through interaction and shared meaning. Therefore, the perceptions and experiences of actors—police officers, community leaders, and members of the Police–Community Partnership Forum (FKPM)—are considered valid sources of knowledge.

3.2. Research Site and Focus

The study was conducted in the jurisdiction of the Purwakarta District Police, West Java Province. The location was purposively selected as Polres Purwakarta has been a pioneer in implementing area-based Community Policing through the establishment of FKPMs in various villages and subdistricts. This region also exhibits diverse social characteristics—encompassing industrial, agricultural, and residential areas—resulting in complex socio-security dynamics.

The research focuses on:

1. The collaborative process between police and community members in the implementation of Polmas;
2. The role of facilitative leadership and institutional design in supporting collaboration;
3. The enabling and inhibiting factors in the implementation of collaborative governance; and
4. The conceptual governance model for improving the effectiveness of public security services.

3.3. Informants and Data Sources

Primary data were collected through in-depth interviews, participant observation, and document analysis. Informants were selected using purposive sampling, including:

- Police officials at Polres Purwakarta (Head of Community Development Unit, precinct chiefs, community police officers);
- FKPM leaders and members across subdistricts;
- Community and religious leaders;
- Local government representatives; and
- Civil society organizations (CSOs) engaged in security issues.

Snowball sampling was also employed to identify additional informants based on recommendations from initial interviewees. A total of 20 key informants were interviewed over a three-month period.

3.4. Data Collection Techniques

a. In-Depth Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were conducted using open-ended guidelines to explore informants' perceptions, experiences, and perspectives on the effectiveness of Polmas. This approach allowed for flexibility in probing emerging themes during the interaction.

b. Participant Observation

Observation was carried out during FKPM activities, community patrols, and security deliberation forums. The researcher documented collaborative behavior, communication patterns, and decision-making processes.

c. Document Analysis

Institutional documents were analyzed, including Police Regulation No. 1 of 2021 on Community Policing, FKPM activity reports, meeting minutes, and crime statistics from Polres Purwakarta. Secondary data were used to validate and supplement findings from interviews and observations.

3.5. Data Analysis Techniques

The data were analyzed using thematic analysis as proposed by Braun and Clarke (2006), which involved six phases:

1. Transcription and familiarization with the data;

2. Initial coding;
3. Identification of key themes;
4. Organization of sub-themes;
5. Analysis of thematic relationships using the collaborative governance framework; and
6. Drawing interpretive conclusions.

The analysis was conducted both deductively—guided by the collaborative governance model of Ansell and Gash (2008)—and inductively, to allow the emergence of new insights from field data. NVivo 12 software was employed to facilitate theme categorization and data triangulation.

3.6. Validity and Reliability

The credibility of the data was assessed using Lincoln and Guba's (1985) four criteria:

- **Credibility** through data triangulation (sources, methods, timing);
- **Transferability** via rich contextual description;
- **Dependability** through audit trails and detailed research documentation;
- **Confirmability** by ensuring that findings are grounded in empirical data rather than researcher assumptions.

3.7. Theoretical Framework and Operationalization of Variables

This study is grounded in the collaborative governance theory developed by Ansell & Gash (2008), which includes five main dimensions:

1. **Starting Conditions** – historical relationships, resource balance, and initial trust among actors;
2. **Facilitative Leadership** – the leader's capacity to manage communication and encourage participation;
3. **Institutional Design** – formal structures and rules of engagement;
4. **Collaborative Process** – face-to-face dialogue, mutual understanding, and shared commitment;
5. **Intermediate Outcomes** – trust-building and early policy outcomes.

This framework is integrated with the concept of participatory public service (co-production theory, Loeffler & Bovaird, 2020), which emphasizes active partnerships between service providers (the police) and service users (the community).

3.8. Operational Framework Table

Concept Variable /	Dimensions / Indicators	Data Collection Techniques	Primary Data Sources
Collaborative Governance	Starting conditions, facilitative leadership, institutional design, collaborative process, intermediate outcomes	Interviews, observation, documentation	Police, FKPM, community members
Community Policing (Polmas)	Partnerships, two-way communication, citizen participation, service responsiveness	Observation, interviews	Community members and police personnel
Quality of Public Service	Response speed, transparency, citizen satisfaction	Interviews, secondary data	Community leaders, Polres activity reports

Table 1. Operational Framework of Research Variables

3.9. Research Framework Diagram



Conceptual Framework Diagram of Community Policing (Polmas)

Source: Collaborative Governance Model by Ansell & Gash (2008).

3.10. Research Ethics

This study adheres to core ethical principles in academic research, including informed consent, respondent anonymity, data confidentiality, and the prohibition of interference in police or community activities. All procedures comply with the ethical guidelines of the Institute for Research and Community Service (LPPM).

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Community Policing Implementation through the Lens of Collaborative Governance

The implementation of Community Policing (Polmas) within the jurisdiction of the Purwakarta District Police demonstrates active community involvement through structured partnerships between law enforcement and citizens. Findings from interviews and field observations indicate that this form of collaboration is driven by the need to foster a sense of security not solely through repressive measures, but also through preventive and participatory approaches. Drawing on the collaborative governance framework by Ansell and Gash (2008), effective collaboration relies on five core elements: starting conditions, facilitative leadership, institutional design, collaborative process, and intermediate outcomes. In the case of Polres Purwakarta, several of these elements are present, although not yet fully optimized across all dimensions.

4.2. Starting Conditions: Disparities in Capacity and Social Capital

A key finding reveals a noticeable disparity in capacity between the police and the community. While the police possess formal authority and greater resources, communities often lack the organizational capacity to engage in independent social control. This condition aligns with the concept of *starting conditions*, where collaboration becomes more difficult in the presence of power imbalances and low initial levels of mutual trust.

Nevertheless, social capital—manifested through the presence of local leaders and neighborhood (RT/RW) structures—serves as a valuable asset for fostering collaboration. The

Police–Community Partnership Forum (Forum Kemitraan Polisi dan Masyarakat/FKPM) acts as a bridging platform to mediate these disparities and enhance cooperation.

4.3. Facilitative Leadership: Promoting Inclusivity

Leadership has proven to be a critical factor in sustaining collaborative efforts in the implementation of Polmas. Several precinct chiefs (*Kapolsek*) and community policing officers (*Bhabinkamtibmas*) actively initiate community-oriented activities such as neighborhood discussions, legal education, and joint patrols. These practices reflect the principle of *facilitative leadership*, characterized by leadership styles that foster dialogue, build trust, and manage conflict in a participatory manner.

In areas where police leadership is proactive and communicative, citizen participation in FKPMs tends to be higher, and there is a corresponding increase in the reporting of security-related issues.

4.4. Institutional Design and the Collaborative Process

The institutionalization of FKPMs represents a formal embodiment of collaborative governance. However, their effectiveness varies. In villages with strong community bonds, FKPMs function effectively as spaces for mediation, consensus-building, and conflict resolution. Conversely, in areas with low levels of social participation, FKPMs often operate as mere formalities, lacking substantive dialogue.

An ideal collaborative process requires face-to-face dialogue, mutual understanding, and long-term commitment. Observational data show that regular meetings between community leaders and police officers have cultivated a more open social ecosystem for resolving issues such as juvenile delinquency, neighborhood disturbances, and social conflict.

4.5. Intermediate Outcomes: Increased Trust and Responsiveness

Partnership-based Community Policing has demonstrably enhanced public trust in law enforcement agencies. Collaborative resolution of social problems—such as street racing prevention, the handling of individuals exposed to radical ideologies, and domestic violence cases—provides tangible evidence of the model’s functionality.

According to the theory of *intermediate outcomes*, trust developed through collaborative processes serves as a critical foundation for sustainable long-term cooperation. In the Purwakarta case, the trust built between stakeholders has had a direct positive impact on the effectiveness of local security management.

4.6. Integration with Co-Production Theory in Public Service

Beyond the collaborative governance framework, the findings also indicate the presence of co-production practices, where citizens are actively involved in the delivery of public services. Citizens are not merely recipients of security services but play a direct role in producing public safety.

Co-production theory, as articulated by Loeffler and Bovaird (2020), emphasizes that quality public services require collaboration between service providers (government or police) and service users (community). In the context of Polmas, the FKPM, neighborhood meetings, and the involvement of religious leaders serve as concrete manifestations of this approach.

Table 1. Empirical Findings Based on Collaborative Governance Dimensions

Dimension	Field Findings
Starting Conditions	Disparities in capacity; low initial trust from the community
Facilitative Leadership	Active roles of <i>Kapolsek</i> and <i>Bhabinkamtibmas</i> as facilitators of community engagement
Institutional Design	Active FKPMs in some villages; weak structures and governance in others

Collaborative Process	Regular dialogue, deliberation forums, and community patrols in several districts
Intermediate Outcomes	Increased reporting, reduced social conflicts, and growing public trust

This evidence-based analysis reaffirms the importance of collaborative structures and participatory leadership in the successful implementation of Community Policing. The integration of collaborative governance and co-production theories provides a comprehensive framework for evaluating the dynamics of public service delivery in the security sector. The findings underscore that effective and sustainable security governance is not merely a matter of policy design, but also of inclusive interaction, community empowerment, and mutual trust-building.

Recommendations

Based on the research findings, it is recommended that the implementation of Community Policing in the Purwakarta District Police be strengthened through the institutional enhancement of the Police–Community Partnership Forum (FKPM), ensuring it is more adaptive and participatory. Internal policies within the Indonesian National Police (Polri) should systematically support FKPM structures through dedicated budget allocations, operational guidelines, and a monitoring and evaluation system based on collaborative performance indicators.

Police leadership at the local level should also be equipped with training in facilitative leadership to foster deliberative processes and create inclusive spaces for equitable participation. Local governments and civil society organizations are advised to take a more proactive role as strategic partners in supporting Community Policing initiatives, particularly by integrating them with village development programs and community capacity-building efforts.

Moving forward, this model of collaboration is expected not only to serve as an instrument for security governance but also as a foundational pillar for strengthening democratic local governance that is responsive to community needs.

Reference

- Afrizal. (2016). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif*. Depok: PT Raja Grafindo Persada
- Alford, J. (2014). The multiple facets of co-production: Building on the work of Elinor Ostrom. *Public Management Review*, 16(3), 299-316
- Angraeni, N., Bunga, D., Citranu, C., & Aris, A. (2024). *Hukum Pidana: Teori Komprehensif*. PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia.
- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543–571. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032>
- Aston, E. V., O'Neill, M., Hail, Y., & Wooff, A. (2023). Information sharing in *Community policing* in Europe: Building public confidence. *European Journal of Criminology*, 20(4), 1349-1368.
- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2024). *Statistik Kriminal 2024*, Volume 15 2024. Jakarta.
- Boydston, J. E., & Sherry, M. E. (1975). San Diego community profile: Final report. *Washington, DC: Police Foundation*, 2, 1-7.
- Brandsen, T., Steen, T., & Verschuere, B. (2018). *Co-production and co-creation: Engaging citizens in public services* (p. 322). Taylor & Francis.

- Choi, K., & Lee, J. L. (2021). Citizen participation in community safety: a comparative study of community policing in South Korea and the UK. In *The Rise of Comparative Policing* (pp. 52-72). Routledge.
- Chryshnanda. (2005) dikutip dari <https://tribratanews.kepri.polri.go.id/2019/01/18/kerangka-teoritis-polisi-sipil-bag-2/>
- Diphooorn, T., & van Stapele, N. (2021). What Is *Community Policing*?: Divergent Agendas, Practices, and Experiences of Transforming the Police in Kenya. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 15(1), 399-411.
- Eck, J. (2003). Police problems: The complexity of problem theory, research and evaluation. *Crime prevention studies*, 15, 79-114
- Fathoni, Abdurrahmat. (2011). *Metodologi Penelitian & Teknik Penyusunan*, PT Rineka Cipta, Jakarta
- Greene, J. R. (2000). Community Policing in America: Changing the. *Criminal justice 2000: Policies, processes, and decisions of the criminal justice system*, 3.
- Gunawan, Imam. (2013). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif, Teori Dan Praktik*, Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Henton, D. (2005). *Collaborative Governance: A Guide for Grantmakers [online]*. Menlo Park: William and Flora Hewlett Foundation.
- Héra, G. (2024). The Japanese koban community policing system. *Belügyi Szemle*, 72(1), 153-170
- Irsan, K. (1997). Peningkatan Peran Kepolisian Dalam Pemeliharaan Dan Pembinaan Keamanan Dalam Negeri. *Jurnal Ketahanan Nasional*, 2(2), 33-56
- Irsan, Koesparmono, (1997). Peningkatan Peran Kepolisian Dalam Pemeliharaan dan Pembinaan Keamanan Dalam Negeri, *Jurnal Ketahanan Nasional* Vol. 2, No 2, Agustus
- Jo, S., & Nabatchi, T. (2018). Co-production, co-creation, and citizen empowerment. In *Co-production and co-creation* (pp. 231-239). Routledge
- Kawamura, N., & Shirakawa, Y. (2008). Current *Developments Affecting the Japanese Koban System of Community Policing. The Handbook of Knowledge-Based Policing: Current Conceptions and Future Directions*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 157-174
- Keast, R., & Myrna Mandell. (2014). The collaborative push: moving beyond rhetoric and gaining evidence. *Journal of Management & Governance*, 18(1), 9-28.
- Lembaga Pendidikan Polri. (2022). "Perpolisian Masyarakat Akademi Kepolisian." Jakarta
- Lihawa, Rony. (2006). "Polmas: Pengertian dan Prinsip", *Jurnal Studi Kepolisian* Edisi 068-Juni
- Lincoln dan Guba. (1985). *Qualitative Research*. Singapore: Mc. Graw Hill. Book Co.
- Loeffler, E. (2015). Co-production of public services and outcomes. In *Public management and governance* (pp. 319-336). Routledge
- Loeffler, E., & Bovaird, T. (2020). Assessing the impact of co-production on pathways to outcomes in public services: The case of policing and criminal justice. *International Public Management Journal*, 23(2), 205-223
- Mangai, Mary S., et al. (2022) "The importance of a police-Community partnership (co-production): A study of the City of Johannesburg." *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change* 16.1 : 924-939
- Miles, Matthew B. (1992). *Analisis Data Kualitatif: Buku Sumber Tentang Metode-Metode Baru, Terjemahan. Penerjemah Tjejep Rohendi Rohidi*. Jakarta: Penerbit Universitas Indonesia
- Moleong, Lexy. (2014). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif Edisi Revisi*. Jakarta: Remaja. Rosda Karya

- Muhammad, Farouk, Wahyurudhanto, Evodia A. Iswandi, & Andrea H. Poeloengan. (2022). *Bahan Ajar Mata Kuliah Pemolisian Masyarakat Kontemporer. Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Kepolisian* – PTIK: Jakarta
- Noor, Muhammad dkk. (2022). *Collaborative Governance: Suatu Tinjauan Teoritis dan Praktik*. Yogyakarta: Bildung Nusantara. 2022
- Pau, Angaela Ivania Kana. (2025). "Indonesia Urutan ke-2 Angka Kriminalitas Tertinggi di ASEAN" diakses dari <https://rri.co.id/hukum/1434993/indonesia-urutan-ke-2-angka-kriminalitas-tertinggi-di-asean> pada 7 April 2025
- Peraturan Kapolri Nomor 1 Tahun 2021 Tentang Pemolisian Masyarakat
- Pramono, A. (2011). Quo Vadis Perpolisian Komunitas?(Community Policing). *Masalah-Masalah Hukum*, 40(4), 393-399
- Rinawati, Evi Maryani. (2018). "Pembinaan Keamanan dan Ketertiban Masyarakat (Kamtibmas) di Kelurahan Pangkalan Kerinci Barat". JOM FISIP vol 5, Edisi II, Juli-Desember 2018
- Sanders, Carrie B., and Debra Langan. (2021)"Collaboration consequences: New public management and police-academic partnerships." *Journal of Applied Social Science* 15.2 : 241-257
- Sher-Hadar, N., Lihi Lahat, & Itzhak Galnoor. (2020). *Collaborative Governance: Theory and Lessons from Israel*. Cham: Springer International Publishing AG
- Sugiyono. 2019 *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif Dan R&D*. Bandung; Alfabeta, 122-123
- Surat Keputusan Kapolres Purwakarta Nomor : SKEP / / XI / HUK.6.6. / 2020 Tanggal : November 2020
- Tatriwarsi. (2017). "Analisis Faktor Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Peran Serta masyarakat Kelurahan Tahunan dalam Tugas Kamtibmas Polri Di Wilayah Polsek Umbulharjo Yogyakarta", *Jurnal Eca Cida* Vol. 2, Edisi 1, Maret 2017.
- U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Police Practices and Civil Rights in New York City, Chapter 3 Police-Community Relations. Diakses dari <https://www.usccr.gov/files/pubs/nypolice/ch3.htm> pada 4 Mei 2025.
- Undang – Undang No 2 Tahun 2002 Tentang Kepolisian Republik Indonesia
- Undang-Undang Nomor 25 Tahun 2009 tentang Pelayanan Publik
- White, Michael D., *et al.* (2021) "Moving beyond Narcan: A police, social service, and researcher collaborative response to the opioid crisis." *American journal of criminal justice* 46 (2021): 626-643
- Young, A. (2022). Architecture as affective law enforcement: Theorising the Japanese Koban. *Crime, media, culture*, 18(2), 183-202