

Police Crisis Communication Strategy in Public Opinion Management Based on Digital Transparency and Institutional Accountability in the Era of Information Disruption

Widya Bhakti Dira*, Syafruddin, Kif Aminanto

Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Kepolisian, South Jakarta, Indonesia ; bhakti.dira10@gmail.com
Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Kepolisian, South Jakarta, Indonesia ; syafruddin@stik-ptik.ac.id
Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Kepolisian, South Jakarta, Indonesia ; kif.92pw@gmail.com

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.47134/jcl.v3i3.2.6309>

*Correspondence: Widya Bhakti Dira

Email: bhakti.dira10@gmail.com

Received: 08/08/2026

Accepted: 24/08/2026

Published: 31/08/2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike (CC BY-SA) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>).

Abstract: This study aims to analyze the legal issues of police crisis communication strategies in managing public opinion in the era of information disruption and formulate legal reforms based on digital transparency and institutional accountability to strengthen public trust in law enforcement institutions. The study employs a normative juridical method with a statutory and conceptual approach through an analysis of Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police, the Law on Public Information Disclosure, the Law on Information and Electronic Transactions, Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services, as well as various public communication regulations and police professional codes of ethics. The study discovers that police crisis communication strategies in Indonesia continue to exhibit both normative and empirical weaknesses, including slow responses to viral issues, inconsistent information among officials, limited digital transparency, suboptimal media monitoring and digital intelligence, and the lack of comprehensive regulations governing law enforcement digital crisis communication. These conditions have led to increased disinformation, trial by social media, and a decline in the legitimacy of police institutions in the community. Therefore, legal reform is needed through the development of an integrated digital crisis governance model, including the establishment of a National Police Crisis Command Center, the implementation of

artificial intelligence sentiment analysis, an early warning system, a rapid digital clarification mechanism, and the standardization of national crisis communications based on digital transparency, human rights protection, and due process of law. These legal reforms are expected to create a police public communications system that is adaptive, accountable, humanistic, and responsive to developments in information technology, in order to strengthen public trust, institutional legitimacy, and the effectiveness of law enforcement in Indonesia's digital democracy.

Keywords: police crisis communications, digital transparency, institutional accountability, public opinion.

Introduction

The development of information and communication technology has given rise to an era of information disruption that has shifted the pattern of public opinion formation from conventional communication systems to digital communication that is fast, real-time, massive, and without national jurisdictional boundaries. The presence of digital platforms such as Instagram, TikTok, X, and YouTube has changed people's behavior in obtaining,

disseminating, and shaping perceptions of legal events and the actions of state officials (Detya Wiryany, Selina Natasha, 2022). In such conditions, public opinion is no longer entirely formed through official government information, but rather through the virality of content, digital media framing, platform algorithms, influencers, political buzzers, and the flow of disinformation that moves simultaneously and is difficult to control (Sarihati, T., Luthfie, M., & Kurniadi, 2022). The post-truth phenomenon causes public emotions to dominate over legal facts, while information overload makes it difficult for people to distinguish between valid and manipulative information. This situation is exacerbated by the formation of echo chambers that create segregated social perceptions and trials by social media that often judge a case before the legal process has been carried out objectively (Purba & Sitorus, 2023). From the perspective of constitutional law and public administration, this situation poses a serious threat to the legitimacy of law enforcement institutions, as public trust can be eroded by a single viral video clip or digital narrative without adequate verification. This is even though Article 28F of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia guarantees the public's right to obtain information, while Article 3 of Law Number 14 of 2008 concerning Public Information Disclosure affirms that information disclosure aims to guarantee citizens' right to know the public policy-making process (Nababan, 2020). Therefore, transforming digital communication practices necessitates updating the legal framework for state institutional communications to keep pace with a digitally driven society that is highly sensitive to public perception.

Within the Indonesian constitutional system, the Indonesian National Police (Polri) holds a strategic position as a state instrument responsible for maintaining public security and order, enforcing the law, and providing protection, guidance, and services to the public, as stipulated in Articles 2 and 13 of Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police. This situation places the police not only as a law enforcement institution but also as a representative of the state, whose social legitimacy is largely determined by the level of public trust (I Ketut Windia, 2020). In the concept of democratic policing, modern policing must be built on the principles of transparency, accountability, respect for human rights, and openness to public information as part of good governance. Therefore, public communication can no longer be viewed as a complementary administrative function of public relations, but rather as a strategic instrument in maintaining social stability, institutional legitimacy, and the effectiveness of law enforcement. This is in line with Article 28D paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution, which guarantees fair legal certainty, because without good public communication, the public will lose trust in the legal process carried out by the state (Ramadani, 2019). In a modern state based on the rule of law, the legitimacy of law enforcement is determined not only by the legality of the apparatus' actions but also by the institution's ability to explain the legal process transparently, proportionally, and accountably to the public. Thus, the police's crisis communication strategy is an integral part of the law enforcement system and the protection of substantive democracy in the digital era. However, the proliferation of social media has also given rise to a reputational crisis and a decline in public trust in the police due to weak public communication management in dealing with viral issues.

Various cases involving police officers have generated public controversy in situations where official clarification was perceived as slower than the circulation of

information in digital media. However, because this study employs a normative juridical method, the discussion does not seek to establish the empirical frequency or statistical magnitude of delayed clarification, inconsistent statements, or declining public trust. These phenomena are instead treated as contextual issues identified in relevant academic studies, institutional reports, and publicly documented cases, which illustrate the potential mismatch between the speed of digital information circulation and the existing legal and institutional mechanisms for police communication. From a normative perspective, this mismatch becomes legally significant because Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services requires public service providers to implement principles of transparency, responsiveness, and accountability, while Law Number 14 of 2008 concerning Public Information Disclosure recognizes the public's right to obtain accurate and non-misleading information. Therefore, the central legal issue examined in this study is not the empirical measurement of public distrust, but whether the existing legal framework provides an adequate institutional mechanism for timely, accurate, accountable, and legally controlled crisis communication.

These problems are further complicated by the fact that Indonesia's police crisis communication system still relies on conventional bureaucratic methods that are incompatible with the aggressive, real-time dynamics of digital media. Nowadays, there has been no nationally integrated standardization of crisis communication within the police force, whether related to rapid response mechanisms, information delivery patterns, coordination between officials, or the use of digital technology to mitigate public issues. In practice, disharmony in statements between central and regional officials often occurs, leading to information confusion among the public. Furthermore, the lack of digital literacy among officers and the suboptimal use of media monitoring systems, digital intelligence, and sentiment analysis often result in the police being late in detecting escalations in public opinion (Hanifah & Maharani, 2025). Article 14 paragraph (1) letter c of the Police Law authorizes the National Police to foster community development to increase public participation and legal awareness. In the digital context, this community development function should be realized through modern, open, and information technology-based public communication. Weaknesses in crisis communication also result in a weak counter-disinformation system against hoaxes, video manipulation, and digital propaganda that attack the credibility of law enforcement institutions. As a result, the police often find themselves in a reactive rather than a preventive position in managing digital public opinion (Ananda et al., 2025). The situation demonstrates the urgent need to reconstruct the police crisis communications system to align with the principles of adaptive governance and digital-era governance in a modern rule of law.

On the other hand, the proliferation of digital disinformation and trials by social media has posed a serious threat to the principle of due process of law and the presumption of innocence in the Indonesian criminal justice system. The spread of hoaxes, narrative manipulation, cyber propaganda, and even digital vigilantism often shape public judgment before a case is objectively processed by law enforcement. The phenomenon of social media justice has caused digital public opinion to seemingly replace the function of the judiciary, potentially undermining the independence of investigations and national security stability. From a criminal law and human rights perspective, this situation contradicts the principle

of fair trial as guaranteed in Article 8 of Law Number 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Power, which affirms the presumption of innocence. Furthermore, Article 28G of the 1945 Constitution also guarantees the protection of every citizen's sense of security and self-protection from the threat of fear. However, in digital practice, the spread of viral opinions often forces police to take populist measures to mitigate public pressure. This is dangerous because it can shift the orientation of law enforcement from due process of law to trial by public opinion (Iwansyah & Hoesein, 2025). Therefore, police crisis communication can no longer be understood merely as an institutional image strategy, but must be positioned as an instrument of legal protection and safeguarding the stability of digital democracy.

Based on these various issues, the normative weakness of Indonesian police crisis communication law can be identified through the fragmentation of the existing regulatory framework. First, Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police establishes the general functions and authority of the police, including the maintenance of public security, law enforcement, public protection, and community development, but does not provide specific standards concerning digital crisis communication, spokesperson authority, crisis classification, or clarification deadlines. Second, Law Number 14 of 2008 concerning Public Information Disclosure establishes the public's right to obtain information and the obligation of public bodies to provide public information, yet it does not specifically regulate how law-enforcement institutions should balance proactive digital disclosure with investigative confidentiality, the presumption of innocence, and the protection of personal data during rapidly developing cases. Third, Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services emphasizes transparency, responsiveness, accountability, and service standards, but does not establish measurable communication standards for institutional crisis situations. Fourth, the Information and Electronic Transactions Law primarily regulates electronic information, electronic transactions, and unlawful conduct in cyberspace, but does not provide a governance framework for AI-assisted monitoring, sentiment analysis, digital public-opinion mapping, or automated crisis detection by law-enforcement institutions. Finally, internal police public-relations regulations regulate institutional communication functions, but the existing framework has not yet integrated these functions into a unified national crisis command structure with clear vertical coordination between the national, regional, and district levels. The resulting legal problem is therefore not the complete absence of regulation, but a combination of regulatory gaps, functional overlaps, and insufficient coordination between general police authority, public information obligations, public service principles, digital governance, and internal institutional communication.

Methodology

This paper employs a normative juridical legal research method that focuses on the study of legal norms, legal principles, legal theories, and the synchronization of laws and regulations related to police crisis communication strategies in managing public opinion in the era of information disruption. The approaches used include a statute approach and a conceptual approach. The statutory approach is carried out by examining various relevant regulations, including the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police, the Law on Public Information Disclosure,

the Law on Information and Electronic Transactions, Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services, Law Number 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Power, as well as various internal regulations on public relations and the police professional code of ethics to find weaknesses in legal norms related to digital crisis communication of law enforcement institutions. Meanwhile, a conceptual approach is used to analyze various legal concepts and doctrines that have developed in legal science and communication science, such as the concept of the rule of law, good governance, democratic policing, public transparency, institutional accountability, crisis communication, digital governance, post-truth, digital disinformation, and trial by social media as a basis for formulating legal updates for police crisis communication strategies that are adaptive to developments in information technology. The study employs primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials, analyzed qualitatively using prescriptive-analytical methods, to develop legal arguments, ideal concepts, and proposals for reconstructing police crisis communication law in Indonesia based on digital transparency and institutional accountability.

Result and Discussion

Legal Issues of Police Crisis Communication Strategies in Managing Public Opinion in the Era of Information Disruption

The development of digital technology has fundamentally changed public communication patterns and the formation of public opinion in modern democratic systems. The transformation of communication from conventional patterns to social media-based digital communication systems allows information to spread in real time, without geographical boundaries, and is difficult for state institutions to control. The presence of digital platforms such as Instagram, TikTok, X, and YouTube has created a new public space that significantly influences public perception of the policies and actions of law enforcement officers. In the era of information disruption, public opinion is shaped more by the virality of content, digital media framing, influencers, buzzers, and social media algorithms than by official clarifications from state institutions. The post-truth phenomenon has made public emotions more dominant than legal facts, while information overload makes it difficult for the public to distinguish between valid and manipulative information. This case has given rise to the practice of trial by social media, which may consider individuals and institutions before the legal process has been conducted objectively. Constitutionally, Article 28F of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia guarantees the right of every person to obtain, possess, store, process, and convey information through various available channels. However, on the other hand, freedom of information that is not balanced by a strong public communications system can actually threaten the legitimacy of state institutions, particularly the police, as a law enforcement agency that relies heavily on public trust (Hasan, K., Husna, A., Muchlis, M., Fitri, D., & Zulfadli, 2023).

From the perspective of the Indonesian constitutional system, the Indonesian National Police (Polri) has a strategic function as a state instrument that maintains public security and order, enforces the law, and provides protection, guidance, and services to the public, as stipulated in Articles 2 and 13 of Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police. This position positions the police not merely as a repressive law

enforcement institution, but also as a democratic institution that must maintain social legitimacy through transparency and public accountability. Within the concept of democratic policing, police legitimacy is largely determined by the institution's ability to establish open, rapid, and accurate communication with the public. However, the development of digital media has shown that police communication strategies in Indonesia remain bureaucratic, slow, and defensive, unable to keep pace with the rapid flow of digital information. In many cases, delays in providing official clarifications have led to the public being filled with wild narratives, hoaxes, and negative assumptions that foster public distrust of law enforcement officers. This situation contradicts the principles of good governance and the principle of public information transparency, as stipulated in Article 3 of Law Number 14 of 2008 concerning Public Information Transparency, which emphasizes that information transparency aims to guarantee the public's right to know the public policy-making process and increase public participation in oversight of state administration (Ranofika & Susi, 2023).

The legal challenges of police crisis communication strategies become increasingly apparent when police institutions face cases that attract widespread public attention on social media. In practice, disharmony in statements between police officials often occurs, creating uncertainty about information within the community. Furthermore, a defensive and closed communication pattern often creates the perception that the police institution is not transparent and is attempting to protect problematic officers. This phenomenon demonstrates that the police's public communication system lacks a nationally integrated crisis communication standard. In fact, Article 14, paragraph (1), letter c of the Police Law authorizes the National Police to provide community development services to increase public participation and citizen legal awareness. In the context of the digital era, this community development function should be realized through a modern public communications system that is responsive to developments in digital public opinion. Furthermore, Article 7 of Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services also emphasizes the obligation of public service providers to provide fast, easy, affordable, and transparent services to the public. However, in reality, police communication patterns are often administrative in nature and have not yet positioned public opinion management as an integral part of a modern public service and law enforcement system (Indrayani, 2022).

In the era of social media, weak police crisis communication has also led to the increased spread of digital disinformation, social media propaganda, and negative framing of the law enforcement process. Hoaxes, manipulated videos, incomplete footage, and provocative narratives often shape public judgment before the legal process is performed objectively. Under the social media phenomenon, the trial has the potential to disrupt the principle of presumption of innocence and the independence of investigations in the Indonesian criminal justice system. It is despite Article 8 paragraph (1) of Law Number 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Power stating that anyone suspected, arrested, detained, charged, or brought before a court must be presumed innocent until a final and binding court decision is issued. In digital practice, pressure from public opinion often drives law enforcement officers to take populist measures to quell public anger on social media. It is

dangerous because it can shift the orientation of law enforcement from due process of law to pressure from popular opinion. Furthermore, Article 28G paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution also guarantees protection of every citizen's sense of security and self-protection from the threat of fear (Yogie Alwaton, 2023). Therefore, the weakness of the police's crisis communication strategy is not merely a technical public relations issue, but also a constitutional one related to the protection of human rights and legal certainty in a democratic state.

Another issue that demonstrates the weakness of the police's crisis communication strategy is the suboptimal use of digital technology to detect and control escalating public opinion. To date, the media monitoring, digital intelligence, sentiment analysis, and early warning systems within the police force have not been fully integrated. As a result, the police often detect viral issues developing in the community late, resulting in a reactive rather than preventative response. Yet, developments in artificial intelligence technology enable state institutions to rapidly map public opinion to prevent the spread of disinformation that could potentially disrupt security and stability. From a state administrative law perspective, this situation demonstrates the suboptimal implementation of the principles of accuracy and professionalism in governance, as stipulated in Article 10 of Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning State Administration. Likewise, Article 4, letter h of Law Number 14 of 2008 concerning Public Information Disclosure grants the public the right to obtain true, accurate, and non-misleading information. However, the weakness of the police's digital communication system has actually caused the public sphere to be filled with speculation more quickly than official explanations from state institutions. This situation demonstrates that the development of information technology has not been matched by updates to public communication governance that are adaptive to the era of digital disruption (Muhyiddin, 2022).

Based on these various issues, it is clear that the legal challenges facing police crisis communication strategies in the era of information disruption are not only caused by technical institutional factors, but also by weaknesses in the legal system that does not comprehensively regulate the crisis communication model for law enforcement institutions in the digital space. Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police does not specifically regulate digital crisis communication standards, real-time transparency obligations, rapid clarification mechanisms, or disinformation mitigation systems for law enforcement institutions. Meanwhile, the Information and Electronic Transactions Law focuses more on regulating cybercrime than on public communication governance for state institutions. The National Police's internal public relations regulations are still administrative in nature and have not yet integrated a modern digital governance approach. Yet, in a democratic state governed by the rule of law, transparent and accountable public communication is essential for protecting the public's right to information and legal certainty. Therefore, legal reforms are needed to improve police crisis communication strategies based on digital transparency, institutional accountability, and the use of information technology to strengthen institutional legitimacy, maintain social stability, and increase public trust in Indonesia's law enforcement system.

Weaknesses in Police Crisis Communication Law and Policy from the Perspective of Digital Transparency and Institutional Accountability

Legal regulations regarding public communication and police crisis communication in Indonesia are still essentially partial, sectoral, and unable to address the challenges of the era of information disruption that is developing rapidly in the digital space. Normatively, the Indonesian National Police (Polri) is indeed given the authority to maintain public security and order, enforce the law, and provide protection and services to the public, as stipulated in Article 13 of Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police. However, this law does not specifically regulate digital crisis communication systems, real-time information disclosure standards, or public communication mechanisms when the institution faces a reputation crisis on social media. Provisions regarding the public relations function within the police force remain administrative in nature and have not been positioned as a strategic instrument for law enforcement and strengthening institutional legitimacy. As a result, in empirical practice, there is often a lack of communication response when viral cases involving police officers emerge. Many cases demonstrate that delays in official clarification actually escalate public opinion and accelerate the spread of negative narratives about the police institution. This situation demonstrates a mismatch between the development of information technology and the conventional and bureaucratic legal framework for police public communications.

Weaknesses in legal regulations are also evident in the implementation of the Law on Public Information Disclosure, which has failed to create an effective digital transparency mechanism within the police force. Article 7, paragraph (1) of Law Number 14 of 2008 requires public bodies to provide, give, and/or publish public information under their authority to information requesters. Furthermore, Article 28F of the 1945 Constitution guarantees the public's right to obtain and convey information through various available channels. However, empirically, the implementation of information disclosure within the police force still faces various obstacles, such as a closed bureaucratic culture, centralization of information, slow clarification processes, and institutional fears of data disclosure. In many viral cases on social media, the public obtains information from anonymous accounts, influencers, or digital media rather than from official police explanations. It has fueled speculation and public distrust of law enforcement. In fact, discrepancies in information between police officials are not uncommon, further deteriorating public perceptions of the institution's professionalism. These empirical conditions indicate that the principle of public transparency mandated by law has not been optimally implemented in police crisis communications governance in the digital era.

On the other hand, the Electronic Information and Transactions Law also fails to provide comprehensive regulations regarding the mitigation of digital disinformation against state institutions and the protection mechanisms for police public communications. Law Number 11 of 2008, as amended by Law Number 19 of 2016, focuses more on regulating cybercrime and unlawful acts in the electronic space than on developing a crisis communications system for state institutions. Yet, the development of social media demonstrates that hoaxes, video manipulation, cyber propaganda, and digital framing can

significantly impact security stability and the legitimacy of law enforcement. In empirical practice, video clips of arrests or officer actions often go viral without full context, sparking public outrage before an objective investigation can be conducted. The absence of a legal mechanism governing rapid digital clarification often results in police institutions being late in responding to the rapidly evolving flow of disinformation. Moreover, no regulations currently govern the use of artificial intelligence, digital sentiment analysis, or media monitoring systems within law enforcement crisis communication strategies. As a result, the police tend to be reactive rather than preventive in dealing with the escalation of digital public opinion.

The weaknesses in police crisis communication regulations also relate to the protection of the presumption of innocence and due process of law amidst the pressure of digital public opinion. Article 8, paragraph (1) of Law Number 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Power stipulates that every person must be presumed innocent until a final and binding court decision is issued. This principle is a fundamental part of the rule of law and the protection of human rights. However, the development of social media has created the phenomenon of trial by social media, where individuals and institutions can be preemptively judged by public opinion before the legal process is complete. In such circumstances, police institutions are often under immense pressure to immediately take populist legal action to quell public anger on social media. Empirically, this digital pressure can impact the independence of investigations and the objectivity of law enforcement. Ironically, the legal system for police public communication lacks clear guidelines regarding the boundary between public information disclosure and the protection of the presumption of innocence in criminal cases. This lack of clarity often leads to public communication by officers reinforcing social stigma against certain parties before a court decision is issued. It reveals a lack of legal norms regarding digital communication ethics within the Indonesian law enforcement system.

Beyond normative issues, the weaknesses of police crisis communication policies are also influenced by a conventional bureaucratic culture that has not yet adapted to the dynamics of the digital era. Internal regulations within the Indonesian National Police (Polri) public relations generally still position public communication as an administrative and ceremonial function, rather than as part of the institutional risk management system. In practice, the police's public communication response remains heavily reliant on a lengthy bureaucratic hierarchy, often resulting in delays in responding to viral issues that develop within minutes on social media. The lack of digital literacy among officers, weak coordination between officials, and the absence of a national crisis command center often result in institutional communication patterns being disjointed. This situation contradicts the principles of public service as stipulated in Article 4 of Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services, which emphasizes openness, timeliness, professionalism, and accountability in the provision of public services. In a digital context, public information services should be delivered quickly, adaptively, and responsive to public needs. However, empirically, rigid bureaucratic communication patterns actually cause the police institution

to lose momentum in shaping public narratives, allowing the digital space to be more quickly dominated by wild opinions and disinformation.

Based on these various issues, it is clear that the weakness of police crisis communication, legal regulations, and policies lies fundamentally in the absence of legal reformulation capable of integrating the principles of digital transparency, institutional accountability, human rights protection, and the use of information technology into the police public communication system. Existing regulations are still scattered across various sectoral regulations and have not yet established a comprehensive digital crisis communication legal system. Yet, the era of information disruption demands that law enforcement institutions have fast, adaptive, measurable, and digital technology-based communication mechanisms to maintain institutional legitimacy and social stability. Therefore, legal reform is needed through the establishment of national crisis communication standards, a rapid digital response mechanism, a real-time clarification requirement, a disinformation mitigation system, and the integration of media monitoring and artificial intelligence sentiment analysis into police communication governance. This policy reformulation is crucial to ensure that police public communication functions not only as a tool for institutional image building but also as an instrument of legal protection, strengthening digital democracy, and increasing public trust in the law enforcement system in Indonesia.

Legal Updates to Police Crisis Communication Strategies Based on Digital Transparency and Institutional Accountability to Strengthen Public Trust

Legal updates to police crisis communication strategies in the era of information disruption must be directed at developing a public communication system based on digital transparency, institutional accountability, and a legally controlled rapid response to the dynamics of public opinion. A reformulation of Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police should therefore introduce specific norms concerning digital crisis communication governance, including crisis classification, spokesperson authority, clarification procedures, and differentiated response deadlines. The obligation of rapid clarification should not be interpreted as an obligation to immediately disclose unverified investigative information. Instead, the response mechanism should operate in stages. For a viral incident with a high potential for public escalation, an initial official acknowledgment confirming that the matter is being verified should be issued within a predetermined maximum period, while substantive clarification should only be provided after the relevant facts have undergone an appropriate verification process. The exact response period should therefore be determined according to the level of crisis, the potential impact on public order, the urgency of public safety, and the complexity of the verification process. In this manner, speed functions as an obligation to prevent an information vacuum, whereas substantive disclosure remains subject to the principles of accuracy, evidentiary integrity, confidentiality, due process of law, and the presumption of innocence.

Legal reform must also be realized through the development of an integrated digital crisis governance model through the establishment of a National Police Crisis Command Center as a functional coordination unit within the existing organizational structure of the

Indonesian National Police. The proposed Command Center should not replace the existing public-relations structure at the national, regional, and district levels. Instead, it should function as a national coordination, monitoring, standard-setting, and escalation mechanism under the authority of the relevant national police leadership, while operational communication at the regional and district levels remains within the responsibility of the respective authorized police communication units. The Command Center should establish a clear vertical coordination structure: national-level strategic cases may be coordinated centrally, regional cases may be managed by the relevant Polda, and local cases may initially be handled by Polres subject to escalation when predefined crisis indicators are met. Its authority should therefore be limited to coordination, verification support, crisis classification, communication standardization, and information escalation rather than intervention in the substantive independence of criminal investigators.

The proposed use of artificial intelligence should likewise be limited to supporting, rather than replacing, human institutional judgment. AI-assisted monitoring may process publicly available information from digital news sources, official social-media platforms, public online discussions, verified institutional reports, and other lawfully accessible digital sources for the purpose of identifying patterns of information escalation. Private communications, restricted personal data, and information obtained without a lawful basis should not be included in automated monitoring. The system should operate according to principles of purpose limitation, data minimization, restricted access, defined retention periods, auditability, and human review in order to prevent unlawful profiling, algorithmic bias, or misuse. Importantly, automated systems should distinguish between legitimate public criticism, negative sentiment, potentially misleading information, demonstrably false information, and coordinated digital manipulation. Negative sentiment or criticism alone must not constitute a basis for surveillance or intervention. The classification of misinformation or coordinated manipulation should require transparent indicators, contextual verification, and human assessment before any institutional response is taken.

In addition to strengthening digital technology, legal reform must also establish a legally differentiated model of digital transparency. Public disclosure should be limited to information that is necessary to explain the institutional handling of a case without prejudicing the rights of suspects, victims, witnesses, or other parties. Information that may be disclosed should include the procedural status of a case, the responsible institutional unit, general investigative stages, legally relevant institutional actions, and information necessary to protect public safety. Conversely, information containing personal data, the identity of protected victims or witnesses, confidential investigative strategies, evidence that has not yet been lawfully disclosed, information capable of prejudicing an ongoing investigation, and information that may undermine the presumption of innocence should remain confidential. The proposed public dashboard should therefore function as a procedural transparency mechanism rather than a platform for publishing investigative narratives or assessing the guilt of individuals. Information should be presented in standardized and neutral language, without speculative descriptions, accusatory labels, or commentary that may stigmatize suspects or victims. Updates should focus on verified

procedural developments, and any inaccurate institutional statement should be corrected through a formally documented correction mechanism. Access, publication authority, and information updates should remain subject to supervisory review to prevent interference with investigators and the independence of judicial proceedings.

In order to uphold the principles of due process of law and the protection of human rights, the reform of the police crisis communication law must also regulate the ethical boundaries of public communication in handling criminal cases. The growing phenomenon of trial by social media in the digital era often results in individuals being judged first by public opinion before a final and binding court decision is issued. Therefore, a national standard for criminal case communication is needed that prohibits officers from conveying information that is judgmental or creates a social stigma against an individual before the judicial process is completed. This reformulation must be aligned with Article 8 paragraph (1) of Law Number 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Power regarding the principle of presumption of innocence and Article 28G of the 1945 Constitution concerning the protection of the right to a sense of security. As a concrete step, it is necessary to establish a code of ethics for police digital communication that regulates the procedures for conveying case information, the use of social media by officers, the protection of the privacy of related parties, and a prohibition on the distribution of content that has the potential to give rise to public judgment. In addition, every police public communication officer needs to undergo mandatory training on digital ethics, crisis communication, and human rights-based communication so that the delivery of information continues to respect the principles of human rights and legal certainty.

Legal reforms to police crisis communication strategies must also be directed at developing an institutional culture that adapts to developments in information technology and digital democracy. Hierarchical, bureaucratic communication patterns have slowed institutional responses and made it incapable of keeping up with the fast-moving pace of social media. Therefore, institutional reform must be implemented by strengthening human resource capacity in digital communication and public opinion management. Specifically, the police need to establish a Digital Public Communication Academy as a center for digital communication education and certification for police officers throughout Indonesia. The curriculum should include media intelligence, crisis communication strategy, digital forensic communication, social media management, and cyber psychology. Furthermore, recruitment of professionals in data analytics, artificial intelligence, media strategy, and digital communication is necessary to support the modernization of the police communication system. This step is crucial to ensure that police public communication is no longer dominated by formalistic and defensive patterns, but instead develops into a humanistic, dialogical, and participatory communication system, as stipulated in Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services.

Institutional reform must be implemented by strengthening human resource capacity in digital communication and public opinion management. The proposed Digital Public Communication Academy should function as a national education and competency-development mechanism rather than merely as a training institution. Its curriculum should

establish minimum competencies in crisis communication, legal principles of public information disclosure, human rights and privacy protection, verification of digital information, ethical use of social-media monitoring, correction of inaccurate institutional statements, media intelligence, and communication during ongoing criminal proceedings. Certification should be based on measurable indicators, including the ability to distinguish verified information from unverified claims, apply confidentiality and presumption-of-innocence principles, classify crisis levels, conduct proportionate public clarification, identify misinformation without suppressing legitimate criticism, and respond to simulated digital communication crises. Performance evaluation should not be limited to attendance or completion of training, but should include periodic competency testing, simulation-based assessment, compliance with communication protocols, accuracy of public statements, timeliness of authorized responses, and the number and outcome of substantiated complaints concerning misleading or unauthorized communication. Certification should therefore be subject to periodic renewal and continuing professional development.

To strengthen the normative dimension of the proposed reconstruction, the future regulatory framework should contain specific provisions concerning at least eight core elements. First, crisis classification should distinguish between ordinary public communication, developing issues, strategic crises, and national-level digital crises based on objective indicators of public impact, urgency, misinformation risk, and potential threats to public order. Second, spokesperson authority should be determined according to the level of crisis and institutional jurisdiction, with clear rules governing communication by national, regional, and district police units. Third, clarification procedures should establish differentiated response deadlines consisting of an initial acknowledgment, factual verification, substantive clarification, and, where necessary, a formal correction. Fourth, AI-assisted monitoring should be limited to lawfully accessible data and subject to purpose limitation, data minimization, human review, retention limits, audit trails, and periodic evaluation for algorithmic bias. Fifth, digital transparency should distinguish between procedural information that may be publicly disclosed and protected information that must remain confidential. Sixth, every inaccurate or misleading institutional statement should be subject to a documented correction mechanism through the same or equivalent communication channel. Seventh, an external or institutionally independent oversight mechanism should be available to review serious complaints concerning misleading communication, unlawful disclosure, discriminatory treatment, or the suppression of legitimate public criticism. Finally, unauthorized disclosure, deliberate dissemination of misleading information, manipulation of official communication, or serious violations of established crisis communication procedures should result in administrative, disciplinary, and, where applicable, legal sanctions.

Conclusion

The Indonesian police crisis communication strategy in the era of information disruption still faces various normative and empirical issues that have resulted in declining

institutional legitimacy and public trust in law enforcement. The development of social media and the transformation of digital communication have changed the pattern of public opinion formation, which is now more influenced by the virality of information, digital media framing, influencers, buzzers, and the phenomenon of trial by social media than by official clarifications from state institutions. In such conditions, the police communication system, which is still bureaucratic, slow, defensive, and unintegrated, has proven unable to keep up with the speed of digital information flow. Furthermore, regulatory weaknesses in Law Number 2 of 2002 concerning the Indonesian National Police, the Law on Public Information Disclosure, the Law on Information and Electronic Transactions, and internal police public relations regulations indicate the absence of comprehensive regulations regarding digital crisis communication, real-time information transparency, disinformation mitigation, and protection of the presumption of innocence amidst the pressure of digital public opinion. These normative limitations create institutional conditions in which delays in clarification, inconsistencies in public communication, information vacuums, and reactive responses to rapidly developing digital issues may occur, thereby potentially contributing to the erosion of public trust and institutional legitimacy. Thus, legal reforms to police crisis communication strategies based on digital transparency and institutional accountability are needed. It requires the development of an integrated digital crisis governance model that integrates information technology, human rights protection, the principle of public information transparency, and strengthens the legitimacy of law enforcement within Indonesia's digital democracy system.

Based on these conclusions, this study recommends that the government and the Indonesian National Police immediately reformulate police public communication regulations through a revision of the Police Law and the formation of special regulations regarding the digital crisis communication system for law enforcement institutions. These legal reforms should include national crisis communication standards, a rapid digital clarification mechanism, obligations for real-time information transparency, due process of law protection, and a disinformation mitigation system for state institutions. Furthermore, the police need to establish a National Police Crisis Command Center integrated with a media monitoring system, artificial intelligence sentiment analysis, an early warning system, and a unified public communication system to accelerate the detection and response to escalations of digital public opinion. Human resource capacity building should also be carried out through education in digital communication, crisis communication, media intelligence, and human rights-based communication ethics for all police officers. Furthermore, collaboration between the police, government, mass media, academics, and digital platforms is needed to build public digital literacy and prevent the spread of hoaxes and digital propaganda that can disrupt security, stability, and public trust in law enforcement. With these legal and institutional reforms, it is hoped that the Indonesian police crisis communication system will develop into a transparent, adaptive, accountable, humanistic, and digitally-based public communication system to strengthen public trust, institutional legitimacy, and the effectiveness of a democratic rule of law in an era of information disruption.

References

- Ananda, R. S., Nurfadhilah, N. S., Agustina, A. S., Zahra, D., & Raissa. (2025). Etika Profesi Kepolisian Dan Pengaruhnya Terhadap Penegakan Hukum Yang Adil Dan Transparan. *Jurnal Kajian Kontemporer Hukum Dan Masyarakat*, Vol. 3(1), 6.
- Detya Wiryany, Selina Natasha, dan R. K. (2022). Perkembangan Teknologi Informasi dan Komunikasi terhadap Perubahan Sistem Komunikasi Indonesia. *Jurnal Nomosleca*.
- Hanifah, M., & Maharani, D. (2025). Konferensi Pers Dan Keterbukaan Informasi Publik Sebagai Indikator Kinerja Kepolisian Di Era Demokrasi. *Triwikrama: Jurnal Multidisiplin Ilmu Sosial*, 9, 11–20.
- Hasan, K., Husna, A., Muchlis, M., Fitri, D., & Zulfadli, Z. (2023). Transformasi Komunikasi Massa Era Digital antara Peluang dan Tantangan. *JPP Jurnal Politik Dan Pemerintahan*, 41–55.
- I Ketut Windia. (2020). Kedudukan Hukum Aparatur Sipil Negara Dilingkungan Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia. *Kerta Dyatmika*, 17(1), 21–30. <https://doi.org/10.46650/kd.17.1.815.21-30>
- Ibrahim, S. M., Golose, P. R., & Imran, M. F. (2025). Strategi Komunikasi Polri di Media Sosial. *Brand Communication*, 4(1), 58–67. <https://doi.org/10.70704/bc.v4i1.367>
- Indrayani, I. I. (2022). Retorika dan Power Relations: Strategi Restorasi Citra Kepolisian Republik Indonesia pada Kasus Ferdy Sambo. *Jurnal Komunikatif*, 11(2), 165–178. <https://doi.org/10.33508/jk.v11i2.4270>
- Iwansyah, I., & Hoesein, Z. A. (2025). Problematika Penegakan Kode Etik Kepolisian Sebagai Akibat Menurunnya Integritas Kepolisian Republik Indonesia Di Masyarakat [Problems in Enforcing the Police Code of Ethics as a Result of the Declining Integrity of the Republic of Indonesia Police in Soc. *Jurnal Retentum*, 4(2), 132–44.
- McMullen, P. C., Howie, W. O., Philipsen, N., Bryant, V. C., Setlow, P. D., Calhoun, M., & Green, Z. D. (2014). Electronic medical records and electronic health records: Overview for nurse practitioners. *Journal for Nurse Practitioners*, 10(9), 660–665. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nurpra.2014.07.013>
- Muhyiddin, A. (2022). Strategi Polri Merespon Komunikasi Krisis Setelah Muncul #PercumaLaporPolisi. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, 6, 9179–9189.
- Nababan, S. (2020). Strategi Pelayanan Informasi untuk meningkatkan Keterbukaan Informasi Publik. *Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, 17(2), 166. <https://doi.org/10.31315/jik.v17i2.3694>
- Purba, H., & Sitorus, F. K. (2023). Truth, Post Truth, dan Dinamikanya di Indonesia: Sebuah Kajian Literatur. *Sosial Horizon: Jurnal Pendidikan Sosial*, 10(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.31571/sosial.v10i1.5001>
- Ramadani, T. (2019). Pengelolaan Komunikasi Publik. *Jurnal Good Governance*, 15(1). <https://doi.org/10.32834/gg.v15i1.42>
- Ranofika, F., & Susi, Y. (2023). Implementasi Tugas Kepolisian Khusus Tentang Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia. *Jurnal Al-Mada*, 6(3), 588–603.
- Sarihati, T., Luthfie, M., & Kurniadi, B. (2022). *Komunikasi Politik, Media Massa, dan Opini Publik*. Jakarta: RajaGrafindo Persada-Rajawali Pers.

Yogie Alwatan. (2023). Komunikasi Krisis Polri: Strategi Image Repair Polri Dalam Tragedi Kanjuruhan. *Translitera: Jurnal Kajian Komunikasi Dan Studi Media*, 12(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.35457/translitera.v12i1.2694>