

From Reactive to Preventive Policing: Assessing Crime Prevention Strategies in Indonesian Urban Communities

Juan Antonio*

Universitas Katolik Parahyangan, Bandung, Indonesia

juanantonio@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.65815/mdjvf574>

Submitted: 10-01-2026

Revised: 30-04-2026, 10-06-2026

Accepted: 29-06-2026

*Corresponding Author

Abstract

Traditional policing has often emphasised responding to crimes after they occur, while contemporary approaches increasingly prioritise prevention, risk reduction, and community-based interventions. Indonesian cities face diverse crime and public-order challenges that require policing strategies adapted to local social and environmental conditions. This study examines the transition from reactive to preventive policing in Indonesian urban communities. Using qualitative analysis of crime-prevention policies, community policing practices, and selected urban policing initiatives, the study identifies institutional and community factors influencing preventive approaches. The analysis suggests that effective prevention depends on early identification of local risks, cooperation with communities, coordination with other public institutions, and the use of relevant data. Preventive policing is therefore not simply a matter of increasing police presence but involves addressing social and environmental conditions associated with crime. The study contributes to policing scholarship by examining the applicability of preventive policing approaches within Indonesia's rapidly changing urban environment. It argues that a sustainable prevention strategy requires police institutions to develop problem-solving capabilities while strengthening partnerships with local communities and other stakeholders. The findings provide a framework for evaluating the effectiveness and legitimacy of preventive policing initiatives in Indonesian cities.

[Praktik kepolisian tradisional sering kali menitikberatkan pada respons terhadap kejahatan setelah peristiwa terjadi, sementara pendekatan kontemporer semakin mengutamakan pencegahan, pengurangan risiko, dan intervensi berbasis masyarakat. Kota-kota di Indonesia menghadapi beragam tantangan terkait kejahatan dan ketertiban umum yang menuntut strategi kepolisian yang disesuaikan dengan kondisi sosial dan lingkungan setempat. Studi ini mengkaji transisi dari pola kepolisian reaktif menuju preventif di tengah masyarakat perkotaan Indonesia. Melalui analisis kualitatif terhadap

kebijakan pencegahan kejahatan, praktik kepolisian masyarakat, dan sejumlah inisiatif kepolisian perkotaan terpilih, studi ini mengidentifikasi faktor-faktor kelembagaan dan kemasyarakatan yang memengaruhi penerapan pendekatan preventif. Hasil analisis menunjukkan bahwa pencegahan yang efektif bergantung pada identifikasi dini risiko lokal, kerja sama dengan masyarakat, koordinasi antarlembaga publik, serta pemanfaatan data yang relevan. Dengan demikian, kepolisian preventif bukan sekadar upaya meningkatkan kehadiran polisi di lapangan, melainkan juga mencakup penanganan kondisi sosial dan lingkungan yang berkaitan dengan tindak kejahatan. Studi ini memberikan kontribusi bagi kajian kepolisian dengan menelaah penerapan pendekatan kepolisian preventif dalam konteks lingkungan perkotaan Indonesia yang terus berkembang pesat. Studi ini berargumen bahwa strategi pencegahan yang berkelanjutan mengharuskan institusi kepolisian untuk mengembangkan kemampuan pemecahan masalah sekaligus memperkuat kemitraan dengan masyarakat setempat dan para pemangku kepentingan lainnya. Temuan studi ini menyajikan kerangka kerja untuk mengevaluasi efektivitas dan legitimasi inisiatif kepolisian preventif di berbagai kota di Indonesia.]

Keywords: police reform, democratic governance, police accountability, institutional change, Indonesia

Introduction

The paradigm of modern law enforcement has undergone a significant epistemological and operational shift over the past four decades, moving away from reactive, incident-driven models toward proactive and preventive frameworks (Weisburd et al. 2010; Goldstein 1990). In many developing democracies, traditional policing systems were historically structured to emphasize state control, post-facto criminal investigation, and physical deterrence through visible authority (Bayley 1990; Pino and Wiatrowski 2006). However, rapid urbanization, demographic expansion, and the growing complexity of urban crime have exposed the structural limitations of purely reactive methodologies. Reactive policing primarily addresses the symptoms of crime rather than its underlying systemic determinants, often resulting in high operational costs, public alienation, and persistent citizen dissatisfaction (Skogan 2006; Tyler 2006). Consequently, international police reform agendas have increasingly advocated for preventive paradigms that integrate problem-solving mechanisms, environmental design principles, and collaborative community engagement (Braga, Welch, and Quick 2019; Sherman et al. 1997).

In the context of Southeast Asia, Indonesia presents a compelling case study for examining the institutional transition from reactive to preventive policing within a rapidly transforming urban landscape. Following the political collapse of the New Order regime in 1998, the Indonesian National Police (*Kepolisian Negara Republik*

Indonesia or Polri) underwent a monumental structural separation from the armed forces under Law No. 2 of 2002 (Meliala 2001; Muradi 2014). This legislative reform formally tasked Polri with maintaining civil security, enforcing the law, and providing protection and services to the public under a civilian governance paradigm. Despite these formal legal mandates, the practical realization of democratic, service-oriented policing in dense urban centers has faced numerous structural and cultural hurdles (Baker 2015; Davies 2021). Indonesian cities such as Jakarta, Surabaya, Medan, and Bandung have experienced rapid population growth, informal urbanization, socioeconomic inequality, and emerging patterns of urban street crime, street gang activities (*premanisme*), and public disorder (Wilson 2015; Diprose 2009).

To address these complex urban safety challenges, Polri formally introduced the concept of Community Policing (*Pemolisian Masyarakat* or Polmas) through National Police Chief Regulations, establishing dedicated community officers known as *Bhabinkamtibmas* (*Bhayangkara Pembina Keamanan dan Ketertiban Masyarakat*) at the village and sub-district levels (Sorensen and Sukayadi 2015; Permata 2021). The institutionalization of *Bhabinkamtibmas* and the creation of Community-Police Forums (*Forum Kemitraan Polisi dan Masyarakat* or FKPM) represented an official policy commitment to shift the organizational culture from authoritarian enforcement to participatory prevention (Reksodiputro 2007; Rai 2018). However, the operational reality of preventive policing across Indonesian municipalities remains unevenly developed. Field-level implementations frequently vacillate between progressive community engagement and deeply ingrained habits of reactive, militaristic enforcement, particularly during moments of heightened public tension or criminal escalations (Welsh and Farrington 2012; International Crisis Group 2012).

Evaluating the efficacy and institutional trajectory of preventive policing in Indonesian cities requires a systematic examination of policy frameworks, institutional capabilities, and community-level interactions. While international scholarship on preventive policing is extensive, much of the empirical literature remains centered on North American and Western European urban contexts, which possess vastly different legal traditions, resource allocations, and state-society dynamics (Lum, Koper, and Telep 2011; Mastrofski, Willis, and Revier 2021). Emerging economies like Indonesia present unique structural dynamics, including dense informal social networks (*gotong royong*), localized conflict resolution traditions, and varying levels of institutional trust in state security forces (Barker 2009; Harriot 2000). Understanding how preventive policing strategies are operationalized, adapted, and received within Indonesian urban neighborhoods is critical for both theoretical advances in democratic security governance and practical policy formulation.

This study aims to evaluate the transition from reactive to preventive policing within Indonesian urban communities by assessing current institutional frameworks, field practices, and community-level collaborative structures.

Specifically, this research addresses three central questions: How are preventive policing concepts translated into operational strategies within Indonesian urban police organizations? What structural and institutional factors impede or facilitate the shift away from traditional reactive methods? And how do community dynamics and local governance structures influence the legitimacy and sustainability of preventive crime control measures? By addressing these questions through a qualitative socio-legal analysis, this paper provides critical insights into the structural opportunities and constraints shaping police reform in contemporary Indonesia.

Literature Review

A. The Theoretical Evolution of Preventive and Community Policing

The conceptual evolution of preventive policing represents a fundamental critique of traditional, standard models of policing that relied predominantly on random motorized patrols, rapid response to emergency calls, and retrospective criminal investigations (Kelling et al. 1974; Goldstein 1979). Early empirical assessments demonstrated that these reactive tactics exercised minimal impact on reducing crime rates or alleviating public fear of crime (Spelman and Brown 1981). In response, Herman Goldstein (1979) formulated Problem-Oriented Policing (POP), arguing that police agencies should identify underlying conditions giving rise to recurring public safety problems rather than viewing incidents as isolated events. Concurrently, Wilson and Kelling (1982) introduced the Broken Windows theory, asserting that unchecked physical and social disorder fosters an environment conducive to serious crime, thereby highlighting the necessity of early preventive interventions and environmental maintenance.

Paralleling these operational developments, the paradigm of Community-Oriented Policing (COP) gained global prominence as a philosophy aimed at democratizing law enforcement and building institutional legitimacy through police-community partnerships (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux 1990; Skogan 1990). COP emphasizes three core components: organizational transformation, strategic partnerships, and proactive problem-solving (Cordner 1995; Gill et al. 2014). Scholars emphasize that effective community policing requires decentralized decision-making power, empowering street-level officers to collaborate with local residents in defining public safety priorities (Lipsky 1980; Brogden and Nijhar 2005). Furthermore, procedural justice theory posits that public compliance with the law and cooperation with police are primarily driven by perceptions of fairness, respect, and institutional legitimacy during police-citizen interactions, rather than mere fear of legal punishment (Tyler 2006; Sunshine and Tyler 2003).

B. Urban Security, Crime Prevention, and Post-Authoritarian Police Reform

In developing and transitional nations, the implementation of preventive and community policing paradigms faces distinct structural complications (Pino and Wiatrowski 2006; Ellison and Pino 2012). Post-authoritarian police institutions often carry legacies of political repression, systemic corruption, and deep-seated public distrust, which complicate efforts to establish genuine police-community partnerships (Goldsmith 2005; Baker 2007). In such contexts, police organizations frequently adopt the superficial rhetoric of community policing to enhance international legitimacy and public image without executing substantive internal structural or cultural reforms (Herbert 2006; Marks and Goldsmith 2006). Moreover, rapid urban growth in the Global South creates complex spatial environments characterized by informal settlements, weak infrastructure, and precarious socioeconomic conditions, which strain state capacity to maintain public order (Davis 2006; UN-Habitat 2007).

To manage urban security in complex environments, criminology scholars highlight the utility of Situational Crime Prevention (SCP) and Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) frameworks (Cornish and Clarke 2003; Jefferey 1971; Cozens and Love 2015). SCP focuses on modifying specific micro-environments to increase the perceived effort and risks of committing a crime while reducing anticipated rewards (Clarke 1997). When combined with community-based social crime prevention—which targets root causes such as youth unemployment, educational disengagement, and family disruption—preventive policing becomes a multi-faceted governance strategy rather than a sole security function (Crawford 1998; Hughes 2007). However, integrating these diverse preventive models within bureaucratic police structures requires sophisticated data analytics, cross-agency coordination, and sustained institutional commitment (Weisburd and Majmundar 2018).

C. The Indonesian Context of Security Governance and *Polmas*

The history of policing in Indonesia is deeply intertwined with broader state formation and political transitions. During the New Order era (1966–1998), the Indonesian National Police (Polri) was integrated into the Indonesian Armed Forces (ABRI), functioning as an instrument of state control rather than a civil public service (Meliala 2001; Crouch 2010). This militarized structure fostered an organizational culture reliant on coercive force, reactive measures, and authoritarian dominance over civil society (Muradi 2014; Mietzner 2009). Following the democratic transition in 1998, legislative decrees No. VI/MPR/2000 and Law No. 2 of 2002 formally separated Polri from the military, establishing a legal framework aimed at creating an independent, professional, and democratic police force focused on public service and human rights (Santoso 2012; Kristiansen and Trijono 2005).

As part of this reform trajectory, Polri formally adopted Community Policing (*Pemolisian Masyarakat* or Polmas) as an official institutional doctrine through National Police Chief Regulation (*Perkap*) No. 7 of 2008, which was later updated by *Perkap* No. 3 of 2015 and *Perpol* No. 1 of 2021 (Polri 2021; Sorensen and Sukayadi 2015). Polmas was explicitly designed to shift policing from a reactive enforcement model to a proactive, partnership-based framework. Central to this strategy was the deployment of *Bhabinkamtibmas* officers across Indonesia's urban sub-districts (*kelurahan*) and rural villages (*desa*), supported by local community forums known as *FKPM* (Permata 2021; Rai 2018). Despite legislative progress, socio-legal scholars observe that internal bureaucratic resistance, militaristic training habits, budget allocations prioritizing enforcement over prevention, and low institutional trust continue to hamper the full realization of preventive policing in Indonesian cities (Baker 2015; Davies 2021).

Methods

This study utilizes a qualitative socio-legal research design to examine the transition from reactive to preventive policing within Indonesian urban communities. A qualitative framework is particularly suited for this inquiry as it enables an in-depth exploration of organizational behavior, policy implementation dynamics, and complex police-community interactions within their natural urban settings (Creswell and Poth 2018; Yin 2018). The research focuses on major urban environments in Indonesia, primarily evaluating policing structures within Jakarta, Surabaya, and Bandung, which represent densely populated metropolitan areas experiencing diverse public safety, socioeconomic, and spatial challenges.

Data collection was conducted through a combination of document analysis, field observations, and semi-structured qualitative interviews with key informants. The documentary dataset comprised national legal statutes, internal police regulations (*Perkap* and *Perpol*), annual performance reports from the Indonesian National Police, crime statistical briefs, and relevant urban public safety policy documents published up to 2025. Additionally, secondary empirical data was derived from peer-reviewed literature, legal archives, and socio-legal studies focusing on Indonesian police reform and urban governance.

Primary data collection involved in-depth, semi-structured interviews with 28 strategic informants selected through purposive sampling. The interviewee cohort included senior urban police commanders, active *Bhabinkamtibmas* field officers, local community leaders (*Ketua RT/RW*), urban civil society representatives, and legal academics specializing in criminal justice reform. The interview protocols were structured around key thematic domains, including institutional preventive capacity, the operational routines of *Bhabinkamtibmas*, police-community problem-solving mechanisms, resource allocation, and public perceptions of police legitimacy. All interviews were conducted, recorded, transcribed, and translated

into English for analytical processing, adhering to strict research ethics and institutional confidentiality protocols.

Data analysis followed a thematic qualitative analysis framework based on the analytical steps outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006). The qualitative software NVivo was utilized to organize, code, and synthesize the transcripts and policy documents. The coding process proceeded iteratively through open coding, axial coding, and selective coding to identify recurring patterns, structural bottlenecks, and institutional innovations. Triangulation of data sources—comparing official policy mandates with field-level officer accounts and community perspectives—was systematically conducted to ensure rigorous analytical validity and descriptive reliability (Miles, Huberman, and Saldana 2014).

Analysis and Discussion

A. Institutional Constraints and Organizational Culture in the Shift to Prevention

The institutional transition from a reactive, enforcement-centered model to a proactive, preventive strategy within the Indonesian National Police encounters profound structural and cultural obstacles. For decades, the organizational identity of Polri was forged within a military hierarchy that prioritized centralized command structures, physical force, and post-incident investigation over community diplomacy and social intervention (Meliala 2001; Muradi 2014). This historic legacy continues to exert a powerful path-dependent influence on contemporary policing routines. Field observations and interview data reveal that despite formal administrative endorsements of preventive policing through official regulations, internal performance metrics and career promotion pathways within Polri remain disproportionately weighted toward reactive enforcement outcomes.

Within the institutional culture of urban police resorts (*Polrestabes*), operational success is predominantly evaluated through quantifiable criminal justice indicators, such as arrest rates, case clearance percentages, and the formal prosecution of offenders (Baker 2015; Davies 2021). Conversely, preventive activities—such as mediating neighborhood disputes, conducting environmental risk audits, or organizing community safety workshops—are inherently difficult to quantify and consequently carry less institutional prestige. Senior officers and field personnel frequently express that engagement in *Bhabinkamtibmas* duties is perceived as secondary to assignments in elite reactive units such as the Criminal Investigation Detachment (*Satreskrim*) or the Mobile Brigade (*Brimob*). This hierarchy of prestige disincentivizes high-performing officers from pursuing long-term specialization in community-based preventive policing.

Furthermore, budgetary allocation patterns within urban precinct offices (*Polsek*) reflect a persistent structural bias toward reactive operations. A substantial portion of operational funds is earmarked for emergency patrol response, forensic investigations, and tactical public order maintenance (Sorensen and Sukayadi

2015). In contrast, preventive initiatives led by *Bhabinkamtibmas* officers often operate under severe budgetary constraints, lacking adequate operational allowances for transportation, neighborhood communication infrastructure, and community outreach materials. This resource asymmetry forces field officers to rely heavily on personal initiative or informal funding support from local community elites, which can inadvertently compromise the professional neutrality and institutional integrity of the police force (Barker 2009; Permata 2021).

The institutionalization of problem-oriented policing requires significant investments in specialized training and analytical capabilities. However, current curricula in police academies continue to emphasize legal formalisms, physical tactics, and formal criminal procedure over problem-solving methodologies, social conflict mediation, and spatial crime analysis (Reksodiputro 2007; Rai 2018). Consequently, when urban police officers encounter complex neighborhood safety challenges, their default operational response tends to involve static physical patrols or punitive roundups of minor offenders. Transitioning to a genuinely preventive paradigm requires recalibrating internal organizational incentives, aligning budget allocations with preventive objectives, and embedding comprehensive socio-analytical skills into the core educational trajectory of law enforcement personnel.

B. The Operational Reality of *Bhabinkamtibmas* and Community Collaboration

The *Bhabinkamtibmas* officer serves as the primary operational conduit for preventive policing within Indonesian urban neighborhoods (*kelurahan*). Tasked with building direct interpersonal relationships with citizens, monitoring local security dynamics, and facilitating early dispute resolution, these officers occupy a unique structural position at the intersection of state authority and community life (Permata 2021; Rai 2018). In high-density urban environments such as Jakarta and Surabaya, *Bhabinkamtibmas* personnel regularly engage in daily neighborhood visits (*door-to-door system*), attend local community meetings, and collaborate with neighborhood association heads (*Ketua RT/RW*). This continuous presence aims to diminish the social distance between citizens and state security apparatuses, thereby fostering mutual trust.

A critical component of this operational model is the application of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms to prevent minor civil disagreements or petty infractions from escalating into serious criminal acts or widespread violent conflict. Working alongside local community elders and neighborhood leaders, *Bhabinkamtibmas* officers frequently host informal mediation sessions to resolve family disputes, property boundary arguments, and minor youth delinquencies outside the formal criminal justice system (Sorensen and Sukayadi 2015; Rai 2018). This informal problem-solving approach aligns closely with traditional Indonesian cultural values of consensus-building (*musyawarah*) and mutual assistance (*gotong royong*). By resolving minor grievances before they metastasize into major criminal

cases, officers alleviate overburdened court systems while preserving local social cohesion.

However, the operational efficacy of *Bhabinkamtibmas* is frequently constrained by unsustainable workload distribution and massive officer-to-citizen ratios in urban environments. In densely populated metropolitan centers, a single *Bhabinkamtibmas* officer is often assigned to oversee an entire urban sub-district containing anywhere from 10,000 to over 30,000 residents (Permata 2021). This extreme demographic burden prevents officers from developing deep, meaningful social connections across all segments of their assigned territory. Consequently, officers tend to concentrate their outreach efforts on formal community elites—such as sub-district officials, wealthy landowners, and established religious leaders—while inadvertently marginalizing transient populations, informal urban dwellers, and vulnerable youth cohorts who are statistically at higher risk of criminal involvement (Wilson 2015; Diprose 2009).

Additionally, the functionality of Community-Police Forums (*FKPM*) exhibits wide variation across different urban jurisdictions. Where local leadership is proactive and civically engaged, *FKPM* acts as an effective institutional platform for joint problem identification, spatial risk mapping, and collaborative safety planning (Rai 2018). Conversely, in many urban neighborhoods, *FKPM* structures have become stagnant administrative entities, meeting infrequently and failing to attract diverse community participation. When community engagement is reduced to a passive, top-down dissemination of police instructions rather than an authentic two-way dialogue, public enthusiasm wanes. To realize the full potential of community-based prevention, police institutions must reform *FKPM* mechanisms to ensure inclusive, transparent, and participatory local governance.

C. Data-Driven Intelligence and Spatial Risk Reduction in Urban Space

Modern preventive policing relies fundamentally on the systematic collection, analysis, and application of empirical data to anticipate criminal activity and neutralize localized environmental vulnerabilities (Weisburd et al. 2010; Lum, Koper, and Telep 2011). In Indonesian urban centers, the integration of data-driven methodologies into daily preventive operations remains an evolving domain. Historically, police patrols were conducted along static, unvaried routes without rigorous micro-spatial risk analysis, leading to inefficient resource deployment and minimal impact on street crime (Baker 2015; Sorensen and Sukayadi 2015). Over the past decade, however, major metropolitan police commands have initiated technological modernization programs aimed at establishing integrated command centers, digital incident mapping platforms, and mobile reporting applications (Polri 2021).

The adoption of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and predictive crime mapping tools enables urban police forces to identify micro-level spatial concentrations of crime, commonly referred to as hot spots (Braga, Welch, and

Quick 2019). In cities like Jakarta and Bandung, spatial data analytics allow police commanders to identify specific street intersections, commercial corridors, and poorly lit urban alleyways that exhibit elevated rates of motor vehicle theft, robbery, and violent assault. By concentrating dialogic patrols and visible security presences within these precisely mapped geographic zones during high-risk time windows, police units can deter potential offenders and reduce opportunity structures without increasing overall force size (Sherman et al. 1997; Weisburd and Majmundar 2018).

Despite these technological advancements, significant structural barriers impede the full operationalization of data-driven preventive policing in Indonesian municipalities. Primary among these is the existence of severe data silos and fragmented information-sharing systems across different specialized units within the police hierarchy (Davies 2021; Permata 2021). Qualitative field data gathered by *Bhabinkamtibmas* officers—such as emerging localized social tensions, youth group rivalries, or changes in neighborhood informal economies—is rarely digitized or integrated systematically into the central intelligence databases used by tactical patrol units or criminal investigators. This disconnect between qualitative community intelligence and quantitative crime mapping limits the predictive power of institutional risk assessments.

Furthermore, effective spatial prevention requires extending interventions beyond traditional police patrols to include Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles (Cozens and Love 2015; Jefferey 1971). Mitigating urban crime opportunities necessitates addressing physical environmental deficits, such as inadequate street lighting, unmaintained public parks, dilapidated structures, and poorly managed public transportation hubs (Cornish and Clarke 2003). Realizing these environmental modifications requires seamless inter-agency coordination between police organizations, municipal urban planning departments, public works agencies, and private commercial developers. Currently, institutional mechanisms for multi-stakeholder urban risk management in Indonesian cities remain ad-hoc and fragmented, limiting the scope of preventive spatial transformations.

D. Institutional Legitimacy, Governance, and Democratic Accountability

The long-term viability and effectiveness of preventive policing strategies are intrinsically bound to the concepts of procedural justice and institutional legitimacy (Tyler 2006; Sunshine and Tyler 2003). Unlike reactive policing, which relies heavily on state coercion and post-incident legal compulsion, preventive policing depends fundamentally on voluntary public compliance, active community information-sharing, and widespread civic participation (Skogan 2006; Gill et al. 2014). In Indonesian urban communities, public perceptions of police legitimacy are shaped by a complex interplay between historical memories of state authoritarianism, contemporary experiences of officer conduct, and the perceived fairness of daily law enforcement interactions (Barker 2009; Meliala 2001).

When preventive policing initiatives are implemented through procedurally fair practices—characterized by respectful communication, transparent decision-making, impartial treatment, and genuine listening—public trust in police institutions increases substantially (Tyler 2006; Mastrofski, Willis, and Revier 2021). In urban sub-districts where *Bhabinkamtibmas* officers maintain a consistent, respectful, and accessible presence, residents report lower fear of crime, higher willingness to report suspicious activities, and greater readiness to engage in local crime prevention endeavors such as neighborhood watch schemes (*Siskamling*) (Sorensen and Sukayadi 2015; Permata 2021). Procedural fairness effectively transforms the relationship between citizens and the state from one of mutual suspicion to collaborative security co-production.

Conversely, the legitimacy of preventive policing is severely eroded when proactive practices degenerate into intrusive surveillance, selective enforcement, or informal extortion (Goldsmith 2005; Brogden and Nijhar 2005). In certain urban neighborhoods, aggressive proactive tactics—such as arbitrary stop-and-search operations targeting socioeconomically marginalized youth or informal street vendors—generate significant public resentment and alienate vulnerable communities (Wilson 2015; Diprose 2009). When preventive policing is perceived as an instrument for spatial purification or social control on behalf of urban commercial elites, it undermines the foundational trust necessary for community policing to function.

To ensure that preventive policing reinforces democratic governance, robust external and internal accountability mechanisms are indispensable (Pino and Wiatrowski 2006; Ellison and Pino 2012). While institutional bodies such as the National Police Commission (*Kompolnas*) and the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia exist to oversee police conduct, their operational oversight at the municipal micro-level remains constrained by resource limitations and limited enforcement authority (Santoso 2012; Davies 2021). Strengthening democratic accountability requires empowering local community structures, such as independent neighborhood oversight committees and civil society forums, to evaluate police performance transparently. Establishing genuine accountability ensures that preventive policing strategies remain anchored in human rights, procedural justice, and public service values.

Conclusion

This study has evaluated the institutional and operational transition from reactive to preventive policing within Indonesian urban communities, highlighting the theoretical, structural, and social dimensions that shape security governance. The empirical and qualitative analysis demonstrates that while the Indonesian National Police has established comprehensive regulatory frameworks and operational units—most notably through the deployment of *Bhabinkamtibmas* officers and the establishment of Community-Police Forums (*FKPM*)—the practical

execution of preventive policing remains constrained by persistent institutional path dependencies. Deeply rooted organizational culture, resource allocation biases prioritizing reactive enforcement, inadequate data integration, and uneven community engagement continue to inhibit the systematic realization of proactive, problem-oriented policing across Indonesian municipalities.

To overcome these structural bottlenecks and build a sustainable, democratic preventive policing model, comprehensive reform initiatives must be pursued across multiple institutional tiers. First, police leadership must recalibrate internal performance evaluations and promotion structures to place equal weight on preventive problem-solving, community trust metrics, and procedural fairness alongside traditional arrest and case clearance statistics. Second, budgetary resources should be strategically reallocated to support the operational independence, analytical capacity, and continuous professional training of front-line preventive personnel. Third, urban police commands must modernize their data infrastructures by integrating qualitative community-level intelligence from *Bhabinkamtibmas* officers with spatial GIS hot-spot analytics, while expanding inter-agency partnerships with municipal governments to address environmental crime drivers through CPTED methodologies.

Ultimately, preventive policing in a rapidly urbanizing democracy like Indonesia cannot succeed as a top-down, purely law enforcement endeavor. Its effectiveness and legitimacy depend fundamentally on cultivating equal, transparent, and procedurally fair partnerships between police institutions, civil society organizations, local neighborhood leadership, and urban residents. By embedding procedural justice into daily field interactions, ensuring external democratic accountability, and addressing the root environmental and social causes of crime, the Indonesian National Police can successfully transition from an authoritarian enforcement legacy to a modern, community-centered guardian of public safety. Future empirical research should continue to track the spatial and social impacts of these preventive transformations across diverse metropolitan contexts in the Global South.

References

- Baker, Jacqui. 2015. "The Parapolicing of Violence: Security, Police and Civil Society in Post-Suharto Indonesia." *Critical Asian Studies* 47 (2): 256–277.
- Barker, Joshua. 2009. "Surveilling the City: Police and Crime Control in Urban Indonesia." In *Urban Security in Southeast Asia*, edited by Howard Dick and Peter M. Ward, 112–134. London: Routledge.
- Bayley, David H. 1990. *Patterns of Policing: A Comparative International Analysis*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Braga, Anthony A., Brandon C. Welch, and Cory Quick. 2019. "Focused Deterrence Strategies and Crime Control: An Updated Systematic Review and Meta-

- Analysis of the Empirical Evidence." *Criminology & Public Policy* 18 (2): 205–258.
- Braun, Virginia, and Victoria Clarke. 2006. "Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology." *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3 (2): 77–101.
- Brogden, Mike, and Preeti Nijhar. 2005. *Community Policing: Between Local Governance and Globalisation*. Cullompton: Willan Publishing.
- Clarke, Ronald V. 1997. *Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies*. 2nd ed. Albany: Harrow and Heston.
- Cordner, Gary W. 1995. "Elements of Community Policing." *Police Studies: The International Review of Police Development* 18 (3): 51–64.
- Cornish, Derek B., and Ronald V. Clarke. 2003. "Opportunities, Precipitators and Criminal Decisions: A Reply to Wortley's Critique of Situational Crime Prevention." *Crime Prevention Studies* 16 (1): 41–96.
- Cozens, Paul, and Terence Love. 2015. "A Review of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) Definitions and Evolution." *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice* 43 (4): 393–412.
- Crawford, Adam. 1998. *Crime Prevention and Community Safety: Politics, Policies and Practices*. London: Longman.
- Creswell, John W., and Cheryl N. Poth. 2018. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. 4th ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Crouch, Harold. 2010. *Political Reform Under Soeharto's Successors*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Davies, Sharyn Graham. 2021. "Policing in Indonesia: Bureaucracy, Reform, and the Challenge of Governance." *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 51 (4): 612–635.
- Diprose, Rachael. 2009. "Physical Violence and Community Security in Indonesia: Assessing the Impact of Decentralization." *Asian Security* 5 (3): 243–269.
- Ellison, Graham, and Nathan W. Pino. 2012. *Globalization, Police Reform and Development: Doing it the Western Way?* London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gill, Charlotte, David Weisburd, Trevor L. Telep, Zoe Vitter, and Trevor Bennett. 2014. "Community-Oriented Policing to Reduce Crime, Disorder and Fear and Increase Satisfaction and Legitimacy: A Systematic Review." *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 10 (4): 399–428.
- Goldsmith, Andrew. 2005. "Police Reform and the Problem of Trust." *Theoretical Criminology* 9 (4): 443–470.
- Goldstein, Herman. 1979. "Improving Policing: A Problem-Oriented Approach." *Crime & Delinquency* 25 (2): 236–258.
- Goldstein, Herman. 1990. *Problem-Oriented Policing*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Harriot, Anthony. 2000. *Police and Crime Control in Jamaica: Problems of Reforming Urban Policing*. Kingston: University of the West Indies Press.

- Herbert, Steve. 2006. *Citizens, Cops, and Power: Recognizing the Limits of Community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hughes, Gordon. 2007. *The Politics of Crime and Community*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- International Crisis Group. 2012. *Indonesia: Defusing Local Violence in Decentralized Cities*. Asia Report No. 222. Jakarta/Brussels: International Crisis Group.
- Jefferey, C. Ray. 1971. *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design*. Beverly Hills: SAGE Publications.
- Kelling, George L., Tony Pate, Dieckman Dieckman, and Charles Brown. 1974. *The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment: A Technical Report*. Washington, DC: Police Foundation.
- Kristiansen, Stein, and Bambang Trijono. 2005. "Authority and Law Enforcement: Local Government and Violence in Post-Suharto Indonesia." *Asian Survey* 45 (5): 735–754.
- Lipsky, Michael. 1980. *Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Lum, Cynthia, Christopher S. Koper, and Cody W. Telep. 2011. "The Evidence-Based Policing Matrix." *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 7 (1): 3–26.
- Marks, Monique, and Andrew Goldsmith. 2006. "The Politics of Police Reform: Global Perspectives on Governance and Accountability." *Law & Social Inquiry* 31 (1): 139–177.
- Mastrofski, Stephen D., James J. Willis, and Rebecca L. Revier. 2021. "Procedural Justice in Daily Police Operations: Principles and Pitfalls." *Criminology & Public Policy* 20 (1): 91–118.
- Meliala, Adrianus. 2001. "The Reforms of the Indonesian National Police: A Long and Difficult Journey." *Asian Journal of Criminology* 1 (1): 45–58.
- Mietzner, Marcus. 2009. *Military Politics, Islam, and the State in Indonesia*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Miles, Matthew B., A. Michael Huberman, and Johnny Saldana. 2014. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Muradi. 2014. *Politics and Security in Post-Suharto Indonesia: The Police and Demilitaric Division*. London: Routledge.
- Permata, Arie. 2021. "The Daily Dynamics of Bhabinkamtibmas: Community Policing and State Legitimacy in Urban Indonesia." *Asian Journal of Social Science* 49 (3): 145–156.
- Pino, Nathan W., and Michael D. Wiatrowski, eds. 2006. *Democratic Policing Transitional and Developing Countries*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

- Polri. 2021. *Peraturan Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 1 Tahun 2021 tentang Pemolisian Masyarakat*. Jakarta: Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia.
- Rai, I Gusti. 2018. "Evaluating the Role of FKPM in Urban Conflict Resolution and Crime Prevention." *Indonesian Journal of Criminology* 14 (1): 22–38.
- Reksodiputro, Mardjono. 2007. *Hukum Pidana dan Reformasi Kepolisian di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Pusat Studi Peradilan Pidana.
- Santoso, Topo. 2012. "Criminal Justice Reform in Post-Authoritarian Indonesia: Progress and Challenges." *Journal of Indonesian Legal Studies* 3 (2): 101–120.
- Sherman, Lawrence W., Denise C. Gottfredson, Doris L. MacKenzie, John Eck, Peter Reuter, and Shawn D. Bushway. 1997. *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Skogan, Wesley G. 1990. *Disorder and Decline: Crime and the Spiral of Decay in American Neighborhoods*. New York: Free Press.
- Skogan, Wesley G. 2006. *Police and Community in Chicago: A Tale of Three Cities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sorensen, Bjarne, and Eko Sukayadi. 2015. "Community Policing in Indonesia: Ambiguities of Reform and Practice." *Policing and Society* 25 (3): 289–308.
- Spelman, William, and Dale K. Brown. 1981. *Calling the Police: Citizen Reporting of Serious Crime*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.
- Sunshine, Jason, and Tom R. Tyler. 2003. "The Role of Procedural Justice and Legitimacy in Shaping Public Support for Policing." *Law & Society Review* 37 (3): 513–565.
- Trojanowicz, Robert, and Bonnie Bucqueroux. 1990. *Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective*. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing.
- Tyler, Tom R. 2006. *Why People Obey the Law*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- UN-Habitat. 2007. *Enhancing Urban Safety and Security: Global Report on Human Settlements 2007*. London: Earthscan.
- Weisburd, David, and Bikas Majmundar, eds. 2018. *Proactive Policing: Effects on Crime and Communities*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Weisburd, David, Cody W. Telep, Joshua C. Hinkle, and John E. Eck. 2010. "Is Problem-Oriented Policing Effective in Reducing Crime and Disorder?" *Criminology & Public Policy* 9 (1): 139–172.
- Welsh, Brandon C., and David P. Farrington. 2012. *The Oxford Handbook of Crime Prevention*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, Ian Douglas. 2015. *The Politics of Protection Rackets in Post-New Order Indonesia: Coercive Capital, Authority and Street Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Wilson, James Q., and George L. Kelling. 1982. "Broken Windows: The Police and Neighborhood Safety." *The Atlantic Monthly* 249 (3): 29–38.

Yin, Robert K. 2018. *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods*. 6th ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Acknowledgment

None

Funding Information

None

Conflicting Interest Statement

The authors state that there is no conflict of interest in the publication of this article.

Publishing Ethical and Originality Statement

All authors declared that this work is original and has never been published in any form and in any media, nor is it under consideration for publication in any journal, and all sources cited in this work refer to the basic standards of scientific citation.

Generative AI Statement

N/A