

Interaction Patterns in the Regional Intelligence Community Forum in Preventing Potential Conflicts in Central Java Province

Sulaiman¹, Muh. Akmal Ibrahim¹, Ansar Arifin², Sukri³

¹Public Administration Doctoral Program, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Hasanuddin University, Makassar

²Anthropology, Hasanuddin University, Indonesia

³Political Science, Hsanuddin University, Indonesia

* Corresponding Author:

Citation: Sulaiman, Ibrahim, M. A., Arifin, A., & Sukri. (2025). Interaction patterns in the Regional Intelligence Community Forum in preventing potential conflicts in Central Java Province. *Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management*, 10(50s), 30348.

<https://doi.org/10.55267/iadt.07.15197>

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Received: 26 Dec 2024

Revised: 14 Feb 2025

Accepted: 22 Feb 2025

This study aims to examine the interaction patterns between actors in the Regional Intelligence Community Forum (Kominda) of Central Java Province in an effort to prevent potential conflicts. The approach used is qualitative with data collection techniques through observation, in-depth interviews, focus group discussions (FGD), and documentation studies. The results of the study indicate that the interaction patterns between actors in Kominda are carried out formally through routine and incidental meetings and informally through interpersonal communication outside the official forum. Formal interactions are carried out based on applicable regulations, while informal interactions are considered effective in accelerating the handling of issues and conflicts. The main actors who interact most intensely are the Regional Intelligence Agency (BINDA), the TNI, and the Regional Police. This study emphasizes the importance of institutionalizing network governance and the need to strengthen informal coordination to increase the effectiveness of conflict prevention in the region.

Keywords: Interaction Patterns, Kominda, Regional Intelligence, Conflict Prevention, Governance Network, Institutional Networks.

INTRODUCTION

Public administration studies are developing very rapidly not only in developed countries but also in developing countries. The focus of public administration studies consisting of public policy studies, Governance studies, and public studies is expected to be able to position public administration as a branch of science that has a clear direction (Dwiyanto, 2018). As a governance study, the demands of the government as the leading sector in managing public affairs are expected to be able to create good governance and also open up opportunities for institutions to work together and interact with each other to solve public problems.

The involvement of multiple actors in development is marked by a paradigm shift in governance that has shifted from a paradigm that is all about the state to a paradigm that emphasizes the principle of empowerment and community involvement in solving public problems. The governance process is seen as the operationalization of a network of complex actors and organizations that interact with each other, with the characteristics of interrelationships between various actors with different goals but interdependence and exchange of resources (Rhodes: Klijn, 1997).

According to Lindblom (2014), in understanding the public policy process, it is necessary to understand the actors involved in the public policy-making process, both official and unofficial actors. Discussion on who is involved in policy formulation, according to Anderson, Lindblom and several other scientists (2014), the classification of actors in policy consists of: Official Actors; 1) Government agents (bureaucracy); 2) Executive leaders; 3) Legislative; 4) Judiciary; and Unofficial Actors; 1) Interest groups; 2) Political parties; and 3) Individual citizens.

Actors in the policy basically determine the pattern and distribution of policies in the process of interaction and interrelation tend to be conflictive compared to harmonious (Madani, 2011:37). The interactions that occur are

generally in the form of cooperation and even conflict or conflict (competition) (Madani, 2011:49). Interaction is a social process carried out between actors in the policy. Gillin and Gillin in Soekanto (2001:77-78) state the classification of social processes that arise from social interaction. Interaction between actors is often included in the concept of a network in governance which is usually called a governance network.

Approach governance network focuses on interaction and negotiation to resolve conflicts, and governance strategies to bridge differences between actors in the resolution of public policies, programs and public services. The concept of governance network sees conflict as a sequence of interactions between several actors that aim to influence the process of solving public problems and public services, which involve various competing interests, perceptions, and values (Sorensen and Torfing 2007; Klijn and Koppenjan 2016: 19). This shows that the interaction process occurs between individual actors, groups, or (groups) of organizations from the community, semi-public, and / or private sector that have the ability to act: to autonomously participate in the interaction process. They depend on each other to achieve their goals because resources (eg money, manpower, information, skills, and authority) are not concentrated in the hands of one actor, but are spread across various actors (Scharpf 1997; Mandell, 2001: 29).

Networks in governance networks are considered successful when the interaction process between actors or actors adapt to each other and generate strategies to arrive at a joint solution that can meet the requirements in terms of game-theoretical as a win-win solution situation. This solution implies improvements for all parties involved compared to the previous situation (Susskind 1987; Fisher et al 1997; Dukes 2004; van Bueren et al 2003; Klijn & Koppenjan, 2016:19).

The involvement of relevant influential groups and organizations in the governance network helps overcome the problems of fragmentation in society and resistance to policy change, so that the governance process tends to be more effective (Mayntz 1993:10). At the same time, the participation of a number of stakeholders in the decision-making process tends to increase the democratic legitimacy of the public in governance (Scharpf 1997; Klijn & Koppenjan, 2016:19).

The process of interaction between actors in government activities is also often intense between fellow government elements from various sectors. One of them is also intertwined in the conflict prevention process which of course involves various government elements across sectors. Social conflict refers to a form of social interaction that is between two or more people / groups, where each party tries to defeat or even eliminate the other party. As a form of negative social interaction, social conflict can be understood as a result of imperfect social contact and social communication that occurs between the conflicting parties. Thus, a social interaction can be a collaboration or conflict, theoretically it can be predicted from whether the social contact and communication between the two interacting parties are positive or negative. As one form of social interaction between individuals and diverse groups, social conflict is one of the natural essences of social interaction itself. Social conflict cannot be eliminated, what can be done is an effort to manage and maintain conflict at a level that does not destroy the togetherness that is imagined and desired together (Ubbe, 2015).

The existence of potential conflict in the community is an activity that must be monitored beforehand, where the role of intelligence is highly expected to identify potential conflicts early on. Intelligence also produces products obtained from a series of processes, including, collection, arrangement, evaluation, analysis, integration, and interpretation of all information that has been obtained related to national security issues and regional stability (Irawan et.al, 2017).

The existence of intelligence is certainly very necessary to always provide information and analysis on potential, symptoms and current events and predictions in the future, as Irawan Sukarno said that intelligence efforts are to provide input in the context of outlining policies or securing policies that have been taken but are faced with Threats, Challenges, Obstacles, and Disturbances (ATHG) from within and outside the country (Sukarno, 2011).

The government issued a policy on the formation of the Regional Intelligence Community (KOMINDA) both at the provincial and district/city levels throughout Indonesia, the formation of KOMINDA as an organizer of early detection of threats to national stability in the regions. KOMINDA which is supported by intelligence officers is a communication and coordination forum for intelligence elements and regional leadership elements in the province. KOMINDA's duties are to plan, search, collect,

The regional intelligence community is a forum formed in all provinces in Indonesia, one of which is in Central Java

Province. KOMINDA Central Java Province was formed through Central Java Governor Regulation Number 16 of 2007. The membership of KOMINDA as referred to in the governor's regulation consists of government elements, namely the governor and deputy governor and intelligence elements in the region. The existence of KOMINDA in Central Java Province as a combination of various intelligence agency elements, is a combined institution of various elements in conflict prevention in Central Java Province.

Of course, in the interaction activities in KOMINDA in Central Java Province in handling potential conflicts, there are still some shortcomings, including the need for a common perception between the actors involved and the need for the intensity of interaction between the actors to resolve issues that are specifically related to the stability of the state in the region. In addition, in KOMINDA in Central Java Province, standard rules are also needed that become shared values and understandings to be a reference for the actors involved to be used as a basis for formulating and implementing activities.

The phenomenon that then emerged and also became homework for KOMINDA Central Java was that there were still sectoral egos of the actors representing their respective institutions. Sectoral egos in this case are related to the authority of the institution. The institution maintains the good name and image of its institution so that the institution is not too open in providing information. In addition, the results of the investigation were not fully disclosed because there were stakeholder interests in each actor so that each actor in KOMINDA tried to maintain the name of the unit and also the lower ranks between agencies did not know the development of the problem. Something that also deserves attention in the activities of KOMINDA Central Java is the still high level of physical, economic and political conflicts (interests) that occur in the community.

Interaction between actors in the perspective of public administration can be categorized as a form of network governance that involves not only individuals but also the involvement of state institutions. Several relevant concepts in explaining interactions between institutions lead to the concept of inter-institutional networks. Institutional network theory agrees that networks gradually emerge as actors begin to interact. This also means that, when networks exist for a longer period, institutional characteristics such as interaction patterns, perception patterns, and rules emerge that will be the focus of attention in viewing interactions between them (Klijn & Koppenjan, 2016).

The emergence of Conflict in governance networks supported by cultural, social and political differences between autonomous actors prevents Governance Networks from transforming into stable political institutions. However, the institutionalization of governance networks facilitates and limits the interaction, coordination and negotiation process between the actors involved. This is the basis for using institutional theory to understand the dynamics of governance networks by paying attention to the reciprocal relationship between the interactions of actors in the network and the rules, norms and procedures developed in the action process. Institutional theory is also very necessary to understand the function and development of governance networks because institutional theory can help understand the complex interaction process between political agencies and structures that emerge from the interactions of actors in the network.

Negotiation interactions between network actors do not take place in an institutional vacuum. Instead, they proceed within a relatively institutionalized framework, which is more than a sum of parts, but is not a homogeneous and fully integrated whole (March & Olsen 1995: 27; Scharpf 1997: 47). The institutionalized framework is a mixture of continuously articulated ideas, conceptions and rules. Thus, a conceptual order is needed that elaborates the instruments to regulate the combination of network governance patterns with conceptions in shared institutions. In their discussion, Klijn and Koppenjan (2016) call it inter-institutional network theory. In policy making and service delivery in networks also have an institutional side. Policy games are always related to problems that do not run in a vacuum, but in an institutional context where enduring rules, interaction patterns, and stable perception patterns can influence the interactions between the parties involved.

METHODOLOGY

This study uses a qualitative approach. Qualitative research in this study places theories in research that can appear at the beginning and can be modified or adjusted in such a way based on the views of the participants. (Cresweel, 2010). The location of the study is in Central Java Province, where the selection of this location was carried out purposively with the consideration that Central Java Province is one of several provinces in Indonesia that has a

diverse community situation and has a city district with a fairly large population that is very likely to cause conflict in it, so that it requires special attention to overcome it. In addition, there is still a need to strengthen network-based institutions in seeing the interaction of actors involved in the regional intelligence community forum, especially in overcoming potential conflicts in Central Java Province. The informants in this study were actors involved in the interaction process of the Regional Intelligence Community Forum (Kominda) in preventing conflict in Central Java Province, where researchers determined key informants based on information obtained including stakeholders who were directly involved.

The data obtained include primary data and secondary data. Primary data is data obtained directly from the original source (not through intermediary media) which can be in the form of individual or group opinions of subjects (people), results of observations of an object (physical), events or activities and test results. While secondary data is data obtained in a finished form or in the form of published data. Primary data in this study are the results of interviews and the results of focus group discussions (FGD) of researchers with informants directly and observations related to institutions or actors involved in the Kominda Forum in preventing potential conflicts, while secondary data consists of data related to potential conflicts in Central Java Province from the internet, books, journals and previous research. In this study, the main data collection techniques are observation, in-depth interviews, focus group discussions (FGD) and documentation studies. The data analysis technique in this study uses the interactive model data analysis technique from Miles and Huberman (2014) which includes data collection, data reduction, data presentation and drawing conclusions and verification.

DISCUSSION

The literature shows that many networks have a sectoral character (Wamsley 1985; Laumann and Knoke 1987; Rhodes 1988; Marsh and Rhodes 1992). Therefore, networks for service providers have a much higher density of interactions than most networks in decision-making: the former have been allocated resources, while the latter have not.

The pattern of interaction in preventing potential conflicts in the Regional Intelligence Community Forum in Central Java Province can be seen from the intensity of interaction and to determine which actors have the most contact with each other and what forms or methods are used in interacting by the actors in efforts to prevent potential conflicts in Central Java Province.

The Central Java Provincial Government collaborates and coordinates with several regional intelligence institutions and one of the efforts made to create synergy between institutions in preventing potential conflicts in Central Java is to form a forum such as the Regional Intelligence Community Forum (Kominda).

With the existence of dependency and repetition of interactions in the network, the interaction patterns that are created will be stable. These patterns are often quite logical in the sense that actors who often interact with each other also depend on one other person's resources to achieve their goals (Klijn and Koppenjan, 2016). This is illustrated in the Regional Intelligence Community Forum (Kominda) in preventing potential conflicts in Central Java Province which was held to discuss the intelligence process for further and deeper investigations to find and overcome potential threats coordinated by the Regional Intelligence Agency by involving intelligence staff from the Regional Military Commander, Regional Police and related institutions. All forms of information, reports, and final conclusions at the Kominda Forum will also be notified to the leaders of each actor institution in the Kominda Forum which is used as a joint decision.

The Regional Intelligence Community Forum (Kominda) in preventing potential conflicts in Central Java Province shows that the forum is *ad hoc* or a network of institutions that have special tasks. As Ya Raykers, et al (2023) stated that *ad hoc* is an autonomous arrangement with a special task mandate that is set in a short time for a certain or limited period. This has also been shown by the Kominda Forum which will hold meetings to discuss a potential conflict with an indeterminate period of time based on the conflict to be handled. So each potential conflict discussed at the Kominda meeting will require a different time and form of handling. For example, at the Kominda Forum in discussing one of the conflicts related to the Bener Dam National Strategic Project or better known as the Wadas Conflict, the intensity of the Kominda meeting was carried out at the Kominda meeting for 7 meetings.

The form of communication carried out in the Regional Intelligence Community Forum (Kominda) in preventing

potential conflicts in Central Java Province is formal communication. The interaction of the Regional Intelligence Community Forum (Kominda) occurs during meeting activities, where the intensity of interaction to discuss an issue, conflict and problem is scheduled once a month as a form of formal interaction where all of these coordination mechanisms have been regulated in the Regulation of the Head of the National Intelligence Agency Number 1 of 2014 concerning the Central Intelligence Community and Regional Intelligence Community. Kominda meeting activities in preventing potential conflicts in Central Java Province are also carried out outside the routine schedule or are carried out more than once a month due to urgent issues, conflicts and problems that require faster action. In this case, it is a form of incidental meeting activity.

The meeting held by the Kominda Forum was coordinated by the Central Java Provincial Intelligence Agency as the main actor as regulated in the Regulation of the Head of BIN Number 01 of 2014 Article 1 that the State Intelligence Agency, hereinafter referred to as BIN, is the coordinator of state intelligence organizers so that the Central Java Provincial Intelligence Agency dominated the meeting. In addition, interactions in the Kominda Forum in preventing potential conflicts are also carried out in the form of non-formal communication.

So the form of communication carried out in the institutional network of the Regional Intelligence Community Forum (Kominda) in handling the prevention of potential conflicts in Central Java Province is by holding meetings and coordination. Although the discussion of the conflict discussed at the Kominda Forum is different at each meeting, the pattern of interaction in preventing potential conflicts is always by holding meetings, providing information to each other and coordinating. And after the meeting is over, the division of tasks is given to each actor involved.

Regarding the actors or institutions that are most connected and interact with each other in the Regional Intelligence Community Forum (Kominda) in efforts to prevent potential conflict in Central Java Province, it was found that the Regional Intelligence Agency, TNI and Central Java Regional Police are the actors or institutions that most intensely and frequently interact with each other in efforts to prevent potential conflict in Central Java Province as the three institutions cover and oversee all themes, issue areas, conflicts and problems discussed during meetings. Other institutions do not interact very often and will convey information if the issues, conflicts and problems discussed during the forum are in accordance with the themes and fields of their institutions and the Kominda Forum will involve institutions outside members to discuss a particular thematic issue, conflict and problem. This is in line with Aldrich and Whetten, 1981; Scott, 1991 (in Klijn and Koppenjan, 2016) which states that the intensity and variation of interaction provide information about which actors are central and which are outside the network.

Discussions at the Kominda Forum meeting are *based on case* or based on certain potential conflict issues discussed so that they will involve *stakeholders* or institutions that are appropriate and authorized in handling the conflict, for example in the discussion of the Bener Dam National Strategic Project (PSN) Development or the Wadas Conflict. The Kominda meeting activities involved many institutional actors outside of permanent members, including: the ESDM Service, the Environmental Service, the PUSTADARU Service, the Serayu Opak River Basin Center, the PJN Center, and the Central Java Provincial BPTD as well as private parties or companies related to the Bener Dam National Strategic Development (PSN).

From this, it can be seen that the Kominda Forum was formed to be open to other institutions, especially non-intelligence institutions, which will be involved if the institution has the authority to resolve the conflict, as Klijn and Koppenjan (2016) stated that there is ease for actors to communicate with other actors in the institutional network.

From the description of the dimensions of the interaction pattern, it can be concluded that the Intelligence Community Forum has followed the rules of interaction through formal meetings once a month or more when it is considered urgent to discuss a conflict as the intensity of the interaction has been regulated in the Regulation of the Head of BIN Number 01 of 2014, as Hurlock and Elizabeth (2002) stated that regulations are patterns that are set for behavior. Then Warjiyati (2018) explained that the rules have very ideal, realistic, and positive goals and intentions. This shows that the interaction pattern in the Regional Intelligence Community Forum (Kominda) has been quite ideal where the rule of meeting once a month has been carried out and in preventing potential conflicts in Central Java Province, the benchmark for the success of an interaction is when solutions and ways out can be obtained from the results of joint decisions to prevent and resolve the conflict.

Klijn and Koppenjan (2016) suggest that networks for service providers have a much higher density of interactions

than most networks in decision-making: the former has been allocated resources, while the latter has not. Meanwhile, the Regional Intelligence Community Forum is included in the second category, namely networks in decision-making for preventing potential conflicts in Central Java Province.

However, the interaction in the Kominda Forum in an effort to prevent potential conflicts in Central Java Province is considered still insufficient where formal interactions in meetings have a limited scope so that they require an informal coordination space that has no boundaries and can move freely. As Ulfiyah, et al. (2023) stated that informal networks and interpersonal relationships are very important because they have the potential to be more influential than formal relationships or official relationships represented in the organization. In this case, informal communication is a meeting held outside the routine schedule to exchange information and coordinate so that action on issues, conflicts and problems can be taken faster and as early as possible.

CONCLUSION

The interaction pattern in the Regional Intelligence Community Forum in an effort to prevent potential conflicts is carried out through formal and non-formal communication. Formal coordination meetings are routinely held once a month and incidental coordination meetings are held if there is an urgent issue, problem or conflict while non-formal interactions are carried out outside of meeting activities. Actors who interact more frequently in the Kominda Forum in preventing potential conflicts are BINDA, TNI and Polri where the three institutional actors oversee all issues of problems and conflicts.

REFERENCES

- [1] Dwiyanto, A. (2018). *Administrasi Publik: Desentralisasi Kelembagaan Dan Aparatur Sipil Negara*. UGM PRESS.
- [2] Klijn, E. H. (1997). Policy networks: an overview. *Managing complex networks: Strategies for the public sector*, 15-34.
- [3] Klijn, E. H., & Koppenjan, J. (2016). The impact of contract characteristics on the performance of public-private partnerships (PPPs). *Public Money & Management*, 36(6), 455-462.
- [4] Klijn, E. H., & Koppenjan, J. (2016). The impact of contract characteristics on the performance of public-private partnerships (PPPs). *Public Money & Management*, 36(6), 455-462.
- [5] Madani, M. (2010). *Interaksi Pemerintah Daerah Dan Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah Dalam Penyusunan Kebijakan Anggaran Di Kota Makassar*. Disertasi Universitas Negeri Makassar.
- [6] Mandell, M. (2001). *Getting results through collaboration: Networks and network structures for public policy and management*. Bloomsbury Publishing USA.
- [7] Mayntz, R. (1993). *Policy-netzwerke und die logik von verhandlungssystemen* (pp. 39-56). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- [8] Scharpf, F. W. (1997). Economic integration, democracy and the welfare state. *Journal of European public policy*, 4(1), 18-36.
- [9] Soekanto, S. (2001). *Sosiologi sebagai pengantar*. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo
- [10] Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2007). Theoretical approaches to democratic network governance. In *Theories of democratic network governance* (pp. 233-246). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.