

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.38035/gijlss.v4i4><https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Received: 18 August 2026 | Revised: 02 September 2026 | Accepted: 10 September 2026

Recalibrating Police-Public Relations in the Digital Disruption Era: Building Public Trust Amid Disinformation Threats

Siti Farhani^{1*}, Muhammad Ridwan Fachri², Aris Machmud³, Arina Novizas Shebubakar⁴, Fitriah Faisal⁵

¹Universitas Al Azhar Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia, siti.farhani@uai.ac.id

²STIH IBLAM Jakarta, Jakarta, Indonesia, muhammadridwanfachri@gmail.com

³Universitas Al Azhar Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia, aries_machmud@uai.ac.id

⁴Universitas Al Azhar Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia, arina_novizas@uai.ac.id

⁵Universitas Halu Oleo, Sulawesi, Indonesia, fitriahfaisal@uho.ac.id

*Corresponding Author: siti.farhani@uai.ac.id¹

Abstract: Disinformation and digital manipulation have eroded public trust in institutions, including the police. In an era in which information can be rapidly manipulated and disseminated, police-public relations face novel challenges that require fundamental recalibration. This qualitative study examines police public-relations policy documents, selected case studies of police responses to disinformation incidents, and academic literature on public trust and policing published between 2021 and 2026. The data were analyzed through thematic and content analysis using trust-building theory and Situational Crisis Communication Theory (SCCT) as analytical frameworks. The analysis focuses on the characteristics of police communication, digital community engagement, and counter-disinformation mechanisms, with attention to transparency, procedural justice, institutional legitimacy, and public trust. The findings indicate that recalibrating police-public relations requires transformation in three interrelated domains: (1) proactive and transparent public communication strategies, (2) the use of digital platforms for direct and dialogic community engagement, and (3) credible and adaptive counter-disinformation mechanisms. The study further demonstrates that technological adoption alone is insufficient to establish sustainable public trust; police institutions must also provide transparent information, acknowledge errors where appropriate, create opportunities for public participation, and develop anticipatory responses to disinformation. Ultimately, recalibrating police-public relations in the digital era requires a shift from predominantly one-way communication toward sustained dialogic engagement, with transparency, accountability, and procedural fairness serving as foundations of institutional legitimacy and public trust.

Keywords: Police, Trust, Disinformation, Digital, Communication.

INTRODUCTION

Digital disruption has fundamentally transformed the landscape of relations between public institutions and the communities they serve. Suriadi (2025) asserts that the digital disinformation era systematically triggers a crisis of public trust toward state institutions. Sarjito (2024) affirms that hoaxes and disinformation constitute serious threats to national resilience amid the overwhelming current of information flow. Pradiyan et al. (2024) map that research on policing and social media has grown rapidly throughout 2013–2023 as a response to digital transformation. Herlydinata (2025) finds that social media offers significant opportunities for community policing, yet disinformation paradoxically becomes a substantial barrier in building public trust. Farid (2025) demonstrates that although community policing programs can increase crime reporting by up to 15 percent, their effectiveness remains hindered by various structural and institutional constraints. Recalibrating police-public relations has become an imperative amid the growing threat of disinformation.

Understanding key concepts is a crucial foundation before analyzing the relationship between the police and society in the digital age. Basuki & Setyawan (2022) define hoaxes as a phenomenon of media utilization deviation that has the potential to fragment national unity. Haq (2022) explains post-truth as a condition in which objective facts exert less influence than emotions and personal opinions. Handaningtias et al. (2022) define public trust as the foundation of the relationship between society and police institutions. Indarti (2019) explains that community policing in Indonesia is officially designated as the democratic community policing model. Rizki et al. (2025) conclude that information distortion in the digital sphere impacts legal legitimacy and social stability. Recalibrating police-public relations requires a comprehensive understanding of all these key concepts.

Digital transformation has compelled policing institutions to adopt data-driven approaches and virtual communication strategies. Afzal & Panagiotopoulos (2025) emphasize that data integration signifies a paradigm shift toward more adaptive and responsive systems. Fielding (2023) affirms that social media has become the primary arena for policing institutions to manage public perception. Jones et al. (2025) identify digital visibility as a determining factor in building robust public relationships. Zaidi & O'Connor (2024) critically examine the application of procedural justice principles in police interactions across online platforms. Pane et al. (2025) optimize cyber public relations management, while Pradipa et al. (2024) empirically measure public trust through social media engagement. Although a substantial body of research has extensively examined digital policing, the comprehensive integration of data utilization, procedural justice, and disinformation response strategies remains conspicuously underexplored.

Current research on digital policing remains fragmented across several related but insufficiently integrated domains, particularly police legitimacy and public trust, digital police communication, procedural justice in online interactions, and disinformation management. First, studies examining police legitimacy and public trust demonstrate the importance of digital communication but do not provide an integrated recalibration framework. Mensah et al. (2023), through an empirical study of the relationship between social media and perceptions of police legitimacy and cooperation, demonstrate the influence of social media on institutional legitimacy, but do not develop a comprehensive strategy for recalibrating police-public relations in response to digital disruption. Bradford (2026), through a broader review of research on public trust and police legitimacy, calls for the field to incorporate the challenges of the digital era, but does not empirically examine how police institutions should restructure their communication practices in response to disinformation. Second, studies focusing on digital police communication and digital trust examine specific communication settings rather than the broader police-public relationship. Jones et al. (2025)

examine police digital visibility and digital trust, while Jackson et al. (2025), using an experimental approach to online crime-reporting portals, demonstrate the importance of relational cues such as opportunities for citizens to be heard and respectful treatment. However, these studies focus on specific online service or communication environments and do not integrate the broader challenge of widespread digital disinformation into a comprehensive police-public communication framework. Third, research on disinformation and the information environment identifies the substantial risks posed by digital information distortion but does not sufficiently connect these risks to the institutional recalibration of policing. Surjatmodjo et al. (2024), through a critical review of disinformation and the information pandemic, establish its implications for social cohesion and state resilience, but do not specifically examine how police communication structures should be recalibrated in response. Taken together, these strands of research reveal a substantive gap in explaining how police institutions can simultaneously address disinformation, maintain procedural fairness in digital interactions, and sustain institutional legitimacy and public trust. The present study therefore proceeds from this gap by examining these dimensions as interconnected rather than as separate problems.

Disinformation and the erosion of public trust in policing have reached alarming levels in the digital age. Candra & Dinata (2025) demonstrate the urgency of law enforcement against hoaxes, yet repressive approaches alone prove insufficient to restore public confidence. Zhong et al. (2025) affirm that risk information disseminated through social media significantly shapes public trust in government institutions, particularly during crisis periods. Suriadi (2025) elaborates that the crisis of trust in public institutions within the digital disinformation era is multidimensional and necessitates holistic intervention. Surachman & Hutapea (2026) establish that the Police's post-riot crisis communication strategy remains reactive and has yet to adequately integrate disinformation literacy into its operational framework. Zhong et al. (2025) reinforce the finding that the processing of risk information on social media critically determines the trajectory of public trust. Without systematic recalibration, public confidence in policing institutions will continue to erode under the relentless flood of disinformation.

The recalibration of police-public relations in the digital disruption era requires an analytical framework that integrates the principles of the rule of law, procedural justice, institutional legitimacy, public trust, and crisis communication. The rule of law provides the normative foundation for legitimate police authority by requiring law enforcement to operate within established legal standards and to exercise power in a manner that is consistent, accountable, and legally justified. Within this framework, procedural justice explains how the manner in which police exercise their authority influences citizens' perceptions of legitimacy, trust, and willingness to cooperate. Contemporary scholarship affirms that citizen compliance and willingness to cooperate with the police are influenced more strongly by perceptions of fairness in law enforcement processes than by final outcomes alone, underscoring the need for future research on police legitimacy to explicitly incorporate the digital dimension (Bradford, 2026). This relationship becomes increasingly significant in the digital environment, where disinformation can distort public perceptions of police conduct and undermine the legitimacy that rests upon both lawful authority and fair procedures. The threat of disinformation systematically erodes the trust capital necessary for the rational-legal legitimacy of law enforcement authorities while simultaneously weakening social cohesion and the quality of public discourse (Surjatmodjo et al., 2024). Empirical evidence from Indonesia demonstrates that repeated exposure to critical content on social media accounts monitoring police conduct can construct a subjective public reality in which police officers are perceived as acting improperly, regardless of the legal validity of their actual actions (Alfaza & Utari, 2024). A similar pattern is evident in big data analysis of the

#PercumaLaporPolisi hashtag, which demonstrates how online public discourse can rapidly and extensively erode trust in the Police institution, thereby limiting the effectiveness of conventional legal clarification mechanisms (Handaningtias et al., 2022). At the international level, experiments involving online crime-reporting portals further demonstrate that the capacity of digitized police services to build trust depends substantially on the preservation of procedural justice cues, including opportunities for citizens to be heard and respectful treatment, rather than merely on technological availability (Jackson et al., 2025).

Situational Crisis Communication Theory (SCCT) provides an additional analytical basis for examining how institutions should communicate when information environments generate uncertainty, reputational threats, and contested interpretations of institutional responsibility (Coombs, 2007). Although SCCT was originally developed to explain organizational communication during identifiable crisis situations, its core principles are relevant to digital disinformation because contemporary information disruption is increasingly continuous, recurrent, and rapidly evolving rather than confined to isolated crisis events. Digital disinformation may emerge repeatedly, spread across platforms, mutate into new narratives, and accumulate effects on institutional credibility without developing into a single discrete crisis. Each episode may nevertheless generate uncertainty, attribute responsibility to the institution, and influence public perceptions of legitimacy and trust. Accordingly, this study does not apply SCCT mechanically to routine digital communication. Instead, it adapts its core principles of crisis responsibility and response strategy to a persistent digital information environment, while retaining its ethical emphasis on instructing and adjusting information (Coombs, 2007). The adaptation operationalizes these principles through early detection, timely clarification, transparency, acknowledgment of error where appropriate, corrective action, and public education. This approach enables SCCT to function not merely as a framework for post-crisis reputation management, but as an analytical bridge between anticipatory communication, procedural justice, institutional legitimacy, and continuous trust-building in the digital environment.

This study originates from the urgent need to formulate a recalibration model for police-public relations that is adaptive to the threat of digital disinformation. Several research demonstrates that the crisis of trust in public institutions within the digital disinformation era is multidimensional and necessitates a systemic approach. A few research are find that procedural justice principles have not yet fully guided police interactions on social media, thereby requiring fundamental improvements. Various studies are establish that public trust has now shifted to the digital realm, compelling policing institutions to maintain a credible presence in virtual spaces. Other research hav affirm that data integration within policing can enhance institutional transparency and accountability. Surjatmodjo et al. (2024) reveal that disinformation significantly impacts state resilience, including public confidence in law enforcement authorities. Accordingly, this study aims to formulate proactive communication strategies, optimize the utilization of digital platforms, and develop credible counter-disinformation mechanisms.

Against this background, the novelty of this study lies in developing an integrated recalibration framework for police-public relations that connects three dimensions that have largely been examined separately in previous research: proactive and transparent public communication, dialogic digital community engagement, and credible and adaptive counter-disinformation mechanisms. Rather than treating disinformation solely as a problem of false information requiring clarification or legal enforcement, this study conceptualizes it as a continuing institutional trust challenge requiring simultaneous attention to communication transparency, public participation, procedural fairness, and adaptive crisis-response capacity. The study further contributes theoretically by extending the analytical use of SCCT from discrete organizational crises toward a persistent digital disinformation environment, while

empirically contextualizing this adaptation within the Indonesian National Police. The resulting framework therefore positions police-public communication not merely as a mechanism for correcting false narratives after they emerge, but as a continuous trust-building process in which anticipation, dialogue, transparency, accountability, and coordinated counter-disinformation responses operate as mutually reinforcing components of institutional legitimacy.

Accordingly, this study aims to examine how police-public relations can be recalibrated in response to the persistent threat of digital disinformation in Indonesia. The study addresses three interrelated research questions. First, how proactive and transparent are the public communication practices of the Indonesian National Police in responding to digital disinformation, and what changes are required to strengthen transparency, accountability, and anticipatory communication? Second, to what extent do the Police's digital platforms facilitate direct and dialogic community engagement, and how can these platforms be strengthened to promote public participation and trust? Third, how credible, adaptive, and coordinated are the Police's existing counter-disinformation mechanisms, and what institutional improvements are required to strengthen early detection, response standardization, multi-stakeholder collaboration, and preventive public education? By addressing these questions, the study seeks to formulate an integrated recalibration framework connecting proactive communication, dialogic digital engagement, and credible counter-disinformation mechanisms as mutually reinforcing foundations of police legitimacy and public trust in the digital era.

METHODS

The data for this research were derived from three complementary sources: a dataset of 120 documented disinformation cases involving the Indonesian National Police, five qualitative case studies purposively selected from the 120-case dataset, and academic literature on public trust and policing published between 2021 and 2026. The 120-case dataset constituted the primary empirical dataset for the descriptive content analysis presented in the tables and was used to identify recurring patterns in police public communication, digital community engagement, and counter-disinformation responses. From these 120 cases, five cases were purposively selected for more detailed qualitative case-study analysis based on their significant impact on public trust and the availability of sufficient publicly accessible documentation concerning the Police's institutional response. Accordingly, the five cases did not constitute an independent sample but represented a qualitative analytical subset of the broader 120-case dataset. The case studies were examined in greater depth to identify the timing of institutional responses, the level of institutional responsibility acknowledged, the communication strategy employed, the degree of transparency, the presence of corrective or preventive action, and the extent of coordination with external stakeholders. The policy documents analyzed comprised publicly accessible Indonesian National Police public-relations communication guidelines and crisis-management materials published by the Public Relations Division. The academic literature comprised Scopus- and SINTA-indexed journal articles addressing digital policing transformation, procedural justice, public trust, and disinformation management. All empirical and documentary materials were obtained from publicly accessible sources that could be independently verified.

The literature search used the keywords “police public trust,” “digital policing,” “disinformation,” and “crisis communication” and was limited to publications within the 2021–2026 period. Articles were included when they substantially addressed digital policing, public trust, procedural justice, police communication, or disinformation management, while studies that did not materially address these themes were excluded. For the empirical dataset,

the 120 cases were identified and screened as documented disinformation incidents involving the Indonesian National Police during the 2021–2026 study period. A case was included when the available documentation established the existence of a false, misleading, or distorted information claim, a substantive connection between the claim and the Police, and an identifiable institutional communication or counter-disinformation response. Cases lacking sufficient documentation to establish the disinformation claim or the Police's response were excluded. Each case was coded according to the timing of the response, whether the response was reactive or proactive, the communication channel used, the level of transparency and accountability, the presence of acknowledgment of error, the communication strategy employed, the degree of digital community engagement, the presence of corrective or preventive action, and the extent of coordination with external stakeholders. The coding dimensions were derived from thematic analysis using trust-building theory and Situational Crisis Communication Theory (SCCT), with SCCT adapted to the context of recurring digital disinformation by operationalizing crisis responsibility, response strategy, instructing information, and adjusting information through the analytical categories of early detection, clarification, transparency, acknowledgment of error, corrective action, and public education. The coded 120-case dataset was analyzed descriptively to generate the frequencies and percentages presented in the tables, while the five purposively selected cases were subjected to comparative qualitative analysis. Finally, the findings from the 120-case content analysis, five qualitative case studies, policy documents, and academic literature were triangulated to identify recurring patterns, institutional gaps, and implications for recalibrating police-public relations.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Proactive and Transparent Public Communication Strategies

This research reveals a significant gap between the formal policy framework and the practical implementation of police public communication in the digital disinformation era. Afzal and Panagiotopoulos (2025) and Fielding (2023) demonstrate that policing institutions are increasingly transitioning toward digital communication; however, the findings of this study indicate that the Indonesian National Police (Polri) continues to rely substantially on reactive communication practices. In the cases examined, police responses were frequently initiated after disinformation had gained public attention, rather than through systematic early prevention and anticipation. This finding is consistent with Herlydinata (2025) and Muchtar (2025), who argue that Polri's digital transformation has not yet fully shifted its communication approach from reactive to proactive. The analysis further indicates that transparency and institutional acknowledgment of errors remain insufficiently emphasized in police communication practices. Wilnio et al. (2022) and Handaningtias et al. (2022) similarly associate limited transparency with the erosion of public trust, as reflected in the emergence of the #Percumalaporpolisi discourse. These findings suggest that although Polri has developed substantial digital communication capacity, technological adoption and rapid clarification alone are insufficient to establish sustainable public trust. Recalibration therefore requires a shift toward proactive, transparent, and accountable communication that addresses disinformation before it becomes entrenched in public discourse.

Table 1. Key Findings of the Analysis of the Indonesian National Police's Public Communication (2021–2026)

Indicator	Frequency of Cases	Percentage	Interpretation
Reactive Response (clarification after hoax goes viral)	94/120	78,3%	Dominant, exhibiting a "firefighting" pattern

Proactive Response (anticipation before hoax spreads widely)	26/120	21,7%	Remains low and requires strengthening
Mention of "clarification" in news coverage	112/120	93,3%	Procedurally robust
Mention of "transparency" in news coverage	34/120	28,3%	Weak, insufficiently emphasized
Mention of "accountability" in news coverage	18/120	15,0%	Extremely low
Public apology issued by the institution	7/120	5,8%	Almost nonexistent

This finding underscores that clarifying false information is insufficient without adequate procedural transparency. Suriadi (2025) and Azahwa et al. (2025) emphasize that the crisis of public trust is multidimensional and necessitates institutional acknowledgment of errors. Jones et al. (2025), and Jackson et al. (2025) are reinforce that digital trust is only established through relational cues and process transparency. Zaidi & O'Connor (2024) and Li & Sun (2025) demonstrate that procedural justice, including information openness, serves as a primary predictor of police legitimacy. In the Brigadir J case, the institution's initial falsehoods created a legitimacy deficit that rendered subsequent clarifications ineffective. Bradford affirms that research on police legitimacy must shift from mere procedural compliance toward acknowledging past institutional errors. Consequently, proactive and transparent communication is not an option but a necessity for restoring fractured public trust.

Table 2. Critical Differentiating Factors between Successful and Failed Cases

Dimension	More Effective Response Characteristics	Less Effective Response Characteristics	Analytical Implication
Speed of Response	Response initiated promptly after the emergence of disinformation	Response initiated after disinformation has become widely circulated or remains protracted	Speed is important for limiting the consolidation of false narratives
Initial Transparency	Complete and honest information	Information concealed or altered	Initial falsehood triggers a domino effect
Acknowledgment of Error	Acknowledged and remedied (rare)	Denied or refuted	Acknowledgment builds legitimacy
Narrative Consistency	Consistent across officials	Contradictory among officials	Inconsistency reinforces public skepticism

The findings of this study reinforce the results of international research on the critical role of transparency in modern policing. Mensah et al. (2023) found that the impact of social media on police legitimacy is largely contingent upon public perceptions of institutional honesty. Collier et al. (2022) and Whelan et al. (2026) demonstrate that digital law enforcement requires public legitimacy as a robust operational foundation. Sun & Gu (2026), in their study of Chinese policing, found that responsive and transparent approaches significantly enhance victim trust in cybercrime investigations. Pane et al. (2025) and Malik Ibrahim et al. (2025) affirm that Polri's communication strategy remains heavily oriented toward image management rather than substantive procedural transparency. Darafista et al.

(2025) quantitatively demonstrate that integrity and media coverage significantly influence public trust in Indonesia. Thus, the low rate of institutional apologies in Indonesian cases reflects a global challenge, yet it is particularly striking within the context of Indonesian policing.

Several alternative explanations warrant consideration before concluding that the failure of transparency originates solely from the police institution. Zhong et al. (2025) contend that the processing of risk information on social media is influenced by public cognition, not merely by institutional responses. Surjatmodjo et al. (2024) highlight that the information pandemic creates noise that renders official clarifications difficult to disseminate effectively to the public. Pradipa et al. (2024) demonstrate that public perceptions in Yogyakarta are shaped more by anonymous accounts than by official police clarifications. Candra & Dinata (2025), and Maaliki & Sopyonyono (2021) are emphasize repressive legal approaches that inadvertently divert focus from preventive communication. Rizki et al. (2025) identify that distortions of police duties in the post-truth era often stem from low digital literacy, rather than solely from police failures. However, these factors do not negate the police's responsibility to lead with transparent communication as the first line of defense.

The implications of these findings are critically important for efforts to recalibrate police-public relations amid digital disruption. Surachman & Hutapea (2026) emphasize that crisis communication strategies must commence from the pre-action phase, rather than waiting until cases go viral. Farid (2025) and Saputra & Margaret (2024) demonstrate that community policing programs in urban areas succeed when accompanied by open and equitable two-way communication. Setiawan et al. (2025) find that digital service innovations (SINAR) improve access, but trust remains contingent upon the transparency of the processes implemented. Paneo et al. (2026) and Ihsan et al. (2025) underscore that countering hoaxes must be balanced with preventive public education by public relations units. Afriansyah & Torrido (2024) position Polri as the frontline institution; however, this role entails not merely enforcement but also the construction of a credible narrative of truth. Consequently, recalibration must prioritize the integration of transparency metrics into the standard operating procedures of public relations.

This analysis has certain limitations that must be acknowledged, particularly its reliance on publicly available media coverage and official press releases. Ain et al. (2026) and Paskua et al. (2026) examine Polri's Instagram accounts; however, social media constitutes only one of many communication channels employed. Parindah & Hannah (2025), as well as Sri Rahayu et al. (2024), rely on news data that may be biased toward viral cases rather than routine incidents. Przeszlowski & Guerette (2025) employ experimental methods for public perceptions, whereas this study does not directly measure the perceptions of the public receiving the clarifications. Koestiono et al. (2026) demonstrate the dynamic influence of public opinion, which is difficult to isolate from other variables beyond institutional responses. Gold (2022) and Indarti (2019) emphasize the importance of tangible actions on the ground, which are not fully documented in news coverage of hoax cases. Therefore, future research should combine media analysis with public surveys to validate the effectiveness of the communication strategies that have been implemented.

Leveraging Digital Platforms for Direct Community Engagement

This study reveals that the utilization of digital platforms by the police is still dominated by one-way communication rather than equitable dialogic interaction. Analysis of 120 cases found that 89 cases (74.2%) involved the use of digital platforms; however, 78 out of these 89 cases (87.6%) were unilateral clarifications or warnings. Herlydinata (2025) and Muchtar (2025) identify that Polri's social media presence is active, yet two-way interaction remains highly limited. Ain et al. (2026) and Paskua et al. (2026) examine the Instagram

accounts @humasrestangsel and Polres Sikka, the majority of whose content is informative rather than dialogic. Fielding (2023) affirms that police communication on social media tends to be monologic due to concerns about losing control over institutional narratives. Pradipa et al. (2024) find that public perceptions in Yogyakarta are shaped more by the anonymous account @Txdtrberseragam than by official police clarifications. These findings indicate that direct community engagement through digital platforms is not yet optimal and remains instrumental-reactive in nature.

Table 3. Utilization of Digital Platforms by the Indonesian National Police in Disinformation Responses (2021–2026)

Digital Platform	Frequency of Use	Primary Function	Communication Pattern
Instagram @divisihumaspolri	89 (74.2%)	Hoax labeling, visual clarification	One-way (clarification)
Press Conferences (online/offline)	76 (63.3%)	Official institutional statements	One-way (statement)
Twitter/X	45 (37.5%)	Quick clarification, warnings	One-way (warning)
Virtual Police (warning DMs)	12 (10.0%)	Direct warnings to perpetrators	One-way (persuasive)
Interactive Content (Q&A, polling)	4 (3.3%)	Dialogue with the community	Two-way (very limited)

These findings indicate that direct community engagement through digital platforms has not yet become a strategic priority for the police. Jones et al. (2025), and Jackson et al. (2025) affirm that digital trust is only established through equitable and sustained relational interaction. Zaidi & O'Connor (2024) are find that procedural justice principles, including voice and public participation, have not yet fully guided police interactions on social media. Handaningtias et al. (2022) and Wilnio et al. (2022) demonstrate that the #Percumalaporporpolisi hashtag emerged from a sense of being unheard, rather than from a lack of one-way information. Malik Ibrahim et al. (2025) identify that Polri's social media communication strategy remains oriented toward image-building rather than dialogue development. Paneo et al. (2026) implement the Circular SOME model; however, the findings indicate that this approach has not yet reached meaningful two-way interaction. Direct community engagement through digital platforms is not merely an information channel but rather an emotional bridge that determines institutional legitimacy.

This study reveals that digital communication constituted a substantial component of police responses to disinformation. Of the 120 cases analyzed, 89 cases (74.2%) involved one-way clarification through digital platforms, while other cases involved warning or persuasion, public education, and two-way interaction.

Table 4. Digital Communication Patterns of the Indonesian National Police Based on Content Analysis

Communication Pattern	Frequency	Percentage	Example Cases
One-way clarification (hoax labeling)	89/120	74.2%	Jakarta lockdown hoax, traffic ticket rates
One-way warning/persuasion	12/120	10.0%	Virtual Police DM to hoax spreaders
Public education (infographics)	15/120	12.5%	Limited digital literacy campaigns

Two-way interaction (Q&A, dialogue)	4/120	3.3%	Bhayangkara Day 2022 creative competition
Total Cases Analyzed	120	100%	-

These findings align with the theoretical prediction that technology adoption does not automatically transform institutional communication patterns into more participatory ones. Pradiyan et al. (2024) map that the digital policing literature from 2013–2023 is dominated by studies on technology utilization rather than on the quality of resulting interactions. Afzal & Panagiotopoulos (2025) emphasize that data in policing should be used to enhance accountability; however, the findings indicate that data are more frequently employed for clarification than for dialogue. Przeszlowski & Guerette (2025) find that public perceptions of police technology are significantly influenced by direct interaction experiences, rather than merely by exposure to one-way information. Pradipa et al. (2024) demonstrate that public trust is more influenced by the anonymous account @Txdtrberseragam (70% of respondents) than by official police accounts (30% of respondents). Koestiono et al. (2026) confirm that public opinion about the law is shaped through social interaction on media platforms, rather than through passive consumption of institutional content. This consistency indicates that active community engagement through digital dialogue is an urgent necessity for the Indonesian National Police.

The findings of this study reinforce the results of international research on the dominance of one-way communication in digital policing across various countries. Collier et al. (2022) and Whelan et al. (2026) find that global cyber policing tends to use social media as an information channel rather than as a deliberative forum. Sun & Gu (2026), in their study of Chinese policing, find that responsive policing still relies on vertical communication rather than horizontal engagement with cybercrime victims. Bilişli et al. (2024), in their Turkish study, find that generational responses to disinformation on digital media differ; however, public institutions tend to overlook these differences in their communication strategies. Burhanuddin (2025) and Supriyadi et al. (2024) note that political communication and police recruitment through social media remain informative rather than participatory in nature. H. F. Kurniawan (2025) find that police representation in the media remains dominated by institutional narratives rather than by community experiences. Thus, these findings indicate that Indonesia faces similar challenges to other countries in transitioning from monologic to dialogic communication.

The findings of this study are contextualized through a narrative synthesis of selected international literature on digital policing and police communication. Because the studies reviewed were conducted using different research designs, institutional settings, and outcome measures, they are not treated as directly comparable empirical evidence. Instead, the literature is used to identify broader patterns that may contextualize the Indonesian findings. Collier et al. (2022) and Whelan et al. (2026) indicate that digital policing continues to rely substantially on information-oriented approaches. Zaidi and O'Connor (2024), examining Canadian police interactions on social media, highlight challenges in applying procedural justice principles in online communication. Sun and Gu (2026), in the context of China, demonstrate the importance of responsive policing while identifying limitations in horizontal communication with cybercrime victims. Bilişli et al. (2024), examining responses to disinformation in Türkiye, further demonstrate that generational differences influence how digital information is received and processed. These studies provide contextual support for the present finding that digital police communication requires greater attention to dialogue, public participation, and audience-specific engagement. However, the differences in research

design and institutional context mean that these findings are used as contextual literature rather than as evidence of direct cross-country comparative performance.

Several alternative explanations warrant consideration regarding the low level of two-way interaction on police digital platforms. Surjatmodjo et al. (2024) argue that the information pandemic creates noise that makes institutions reluctant to open dialogic spaces due to concerns about exploitation by hoax spreaders. Sarjito (2024) and Basuki & Setyawan (2022) emphasize that hoaxes and disinformation constitute threats to national resilience that require strict communication control. H. F. Kurniawan (2025) identifies that political disruption has led Polri to prefer controlled communication over open interaction to avoid reputational risks. Herlydinata (2025) notes that structural barriers, such as inadequate training and lack of legal clarity, limit broader police digital engagement. Rizki et al. (2025) demonstrate that public distortion of police duties in the post-truth era renders institutions more defensive in their communication. However, these factors do not negate the finding that active community engagement remains essential for building sustainable public trust.

The implications of these findings are critically important for efforts to recalibrate police-public relations through more participatory utilization of digital platforms. Farid (2025) and Saputra & Margaret (2024) demonstrate that community policing programs in urban areas succeed when accompanied by open and equitable two-way communication through digital media. Setiawan et al. (2025) find that digital service innovation (SINAR) improves access; however, trust remains contingent upon the personal interaction established through these platforms. Sri Rahayu et al. (2024) and Parindah & Hannah (2025) emphasize that optimizing Polri's public relations social media must encompass responses to public complaints and inquiries, rather than merely publicizing activities. Indarti (2019) and Margaret (2020) affirm that democratic community policing requires equitable public participation spaces, including in the digital realm. Afriansyah & Torrido (2024) position Polri as the frontline institution; however, this role must be realized through openness and engagement, not through communication authoritarianism. Consequently, recalibration must prioritize the development of two-way digital interaction capacity and the integration of public feedback mechanisms into existing platforms.

Table 5. Implications of Findings for the Development of Police Digital Platforms

Recalibration Aspect	Key Finding	Practical Implication
Two-way interaction	Only 3.3% of content is dialogic	Develop Q&A features, polling, and discussion forums
Community engagement	70% of perceptions from anonymous accounts	Build engagement with influencers and communities
Complaint responsiveness	Still low and reactive	Provide responsive online complaint mechanisms
Digital HR capacity	Structural barriers and training gaps	Enhance interactive digital communication training

This analysis has limitations in directly measuring the impact of digital interaction on public trust, as it did not involve public perception surveys. Ain et al. (2026) and Paskua et al. (2026) examine Instagram content; however, content analysis cannot measure audience satisfaction or trust levels. Parindah & Hannah (2025), as well as Sri Rahayu et al. (2024), rely on data from official accounts, while unofficial platforms and informal interactions were not comprehensively analyzed. Supriyadi et al. (2024) demonstrate that social media influences police recruitment; however, this study does not measure the long-term influence of digital interaction on police-public relations. Nur & Margaret (2024), and Paneo et al.

(2026) are examine community policing implementation in specific regions that may have different digital interaction characteristics compared to other areas. Pradipa et al. (2024) utilize a single account, @Txdtrberseragam, as a data source, thus limiting generalization to the Yogyakarta context. Therefore, future research should combine content analysis with longitudinal surveys to more validly measure the impact of two-way interaction on public trust.

Establishing Credible Counter-Disinformation Mechanisms

This study finds that the Indonesian National Police's counter-disinformation mechanisms have developed significantly from a reactive approach toward a more structured and collaborative framework. Analysis of 120 cases reveals that 42 cases (35%) involved structured mechanisms with early detection and coordinated responses. The launch of Operasi Nusantara Cooling System (NCS) in 2023 and the implementation of SCCT in 2026 mark a significant paradigm shift in crisis communication. Basuki & Setyawan (2022) and Sarjito (2024) predicted the need for a structured policy approach to counter hoaxes in the digital era. Candra & Dinata (2025), and Maaliki & Soponyono (2021) are emphasize repressive legal approaches; however, structured mechanisms place greater emphasis on evidence-based prevention and early detection. The Police have developed mechanisms encompassing cyber patrols, hoax labeling, collaboration with social media activists, and a context-oriented SCCT approach. These findings indicate that the Police have made significant progress in building more credible and measurable counter-disinformation mechanisms.

Table 6. Evolution of the Indonesian National Police's Counter-Disinformation Mechanisms (2021–2026)

Period	Mechanism	Characteristics	Credibility Level
2021	Instagram hoax labeling, Virtual Police	Reactive; clarification after hoaxes go viral	Moderate (fast but reactive)
2022	Cyber patrols, press conference clarifications	Reactive; law enforcement action	Moderate (limited reach)
2023	Operasi NCS, collaboration with social media activists, Humas Presisi Portal	Proactive, structured, national	High (coordinated)
2024–2025	SCCT, data-driven early detection, public education	Proactive, contextual, preventive	High (evidence-based)
2026	Integrated SCCT, Strategic Public Relations Working Meeting	Proactive, anticipatory, adaptive	Very High (anticipatory)

These findings underscore that the credibility of counter-disinformation mechanisms is highly dependent on the speed of early detection and structurally coordinated responses. Suriadi (2025) and Azahwa et al. (2025) emphasize that the crisis of public trust is multidimensional and requires an approach that is not merely reactive but also preventive and anticipatory. Jones et al. (2025), and Jackson et al. (2025) reinforce that digital trust is only built through transparent and accountable mechanisms, rather than through one-sided clarifications alone. H. F. Kurniawan (2025) and F. Kurniawan et al. (2025) notes that institutional image is difficult to restore if counter-disinformation mechanisms remain merely responsive without anticipation and long-term planning. In the case of Operasi NCS 2023–2024, the Police successfully prevented massive polarization during the General Election through structured mechanisms involving early detection and multi-stakeholder collaboration. Bradford (2026) affirms that research on police legitimacy must shift from mere procedural compliance toward the development of mechanisms that build trust sustainably. Therefore,

the development of credible counter-disinformation mechanisms constitutes a critical foundation for recalibrating police-public relations in the digital disruption era.

Table 7. Comparison of Structured and Spontaneous Counter-Disinformation Mechanisms

Dimension	Structured Mechanisms (42 cases)	Spontaneous Mechanisms (78 cases)
Detection Speed	Fast (early detection)	Slow (after going viral)
Coordination	Coordinated across units	Separate, unintegrated
Collaboration	Involves social media activists, Ministry of Communication and Informatics	Internal Police only
Example	Operasi NCS, SCCT 2026	Clarification in the Brigadir J case

The findings of this study align with the theoretical prediction that effective counter-disinformation mechanisms require a combination of early detection, rapid response, and multi-stakeholder collaboration. Afzal & Panagiotopoulos (2025) emphasize that data integration in policing can enhance accountability and transparency, as evidenced in the implementation of data-driven cyber patrols. Pane et al. (2025) implement the Circular SOME model for cyber public relations management, which aligns with the SCCT approach adopted by the Police in 2026. Surachman & Hutapea (2026) find that effective crisis communication strategies require planning before, during, and after critical incidents, consistent with the SCCT approach that emphasizes contextual assessment prior to response. Herlydinata (2025) and Muchtar (2025) identify that the opportunities and barriers for police digital engagement are highly dependent on early detection capacity and coordinated responses. This consistency indicates that the Police's counter-disinformation mechanisms have evolved in a direction consistent with international best practices, although field implementation still faces significant challenges.

Table 8. Gap between Policy and Practice in Counter-Disinformation

Policy Dimension	Policy Mandate	Actual Practice (Cases)	Gap Level
Early Detection	Perkabik No.1/2023: Hoax prevention	Routine cyber patrols, OSINT	Moderate (continually developing)
Rapid Response	SCCT: Contextual response	Responses vary across regions	Moderate (standardization needed)
Collaboration	Operasi NCS: Multi-stakeholder	Collaboration with social media activists	Low (needs expansion)
Public Education	Preventive digital literacy	Still low and limited	High (low priority)

The findings of this study reinforce the results of international research on the importance of structured counter-disinformation mechanisms in modern policing. Collier et al. (2022) and Whelan et al. (2026) find that global cyber policing requires an approach that integrates law enforcement with credible and measurable public communication. Sun & Gu (2026), in their study of Chinese policing, find that structured responsive mechanisms significantly and sustainably increase victim trust in cybercrime investigations. Bilişli et al. (2024), in their Turkish study, find that generational responses to disinformation on digital media differ, thus requiring counter-disinformation mechanisms to be tailored to the

characteristics of diverse audiences. Surjatmodjo et al. (2024) highlight that the information pandemic necessitates an approach that is not merely repressive but also involves massive and structured public education. Mitrin et al. (2026) caution that AI-based synthetic media add complexity to the disinformation challenge, requiring adaptive and anticipatory mechanisms. Thus, these findings indicate that Indonesia has moved in the right direction by adopting the SCCT approach and Operasi NCS.

Table 9. Comparison of Counter-Disinformation Mechanisms across Countries

Country	Primary Mechanism	Distinctive Feature
Indonesia	SCCT, Operasi NCS, hoax labeling	Collaboration with social media activists
China	Regulatory pyramid, responsive	Focus on victim protection
Canada	Online procedural justice	Procedural principles dominant
Turkey	Generational response	Tailored to generational characteristics
Global	Cyber law enforcement	Focus on infrastructure

Several alternative explanations warrant consideration regarding the effectiveness of the Police's counter-disinformation mechanisms, which still vary across regions and cases. Zhong et al. (2025) contend that the processing of risk information on social media is influenced by public cognition and low digital literacy, rather than solely by the effectiveness of institutional mechanisms. Surjatmodjo et al. (2024) highlight that the information pandemic creates noise that makes counter-disinformation mechanisms difficult to disseminate effectively and equitably to the public. Pradipa et al. (2024) demonstrate that public perceptions in Yogyakarta are shaped more by anonymous accounts than by official police clarifications, indicating the limited reach of official mechanisms. Ihsan et al. (2025) and Paneo et al. (2026) emphasize that hoax enforcement by the Special Criminal Investigation Directorate still faces resource and coordination constraints that affect mechanism effectiveness. Rizki et al. (2025) identify that public distortion of police duties in the post-truth era often stems from low digital literacy, rather than solely from police mechanism failures. However, these factors do not negate the importance of strengthening more adaptive counter-disinformation mechanisms.

The implications of these findings are critically important for the development of more credible and adaptive counter-disinformation mechanisms in the future. Surachman & Hutapea (2026) emphasize that crisis communication strategies must commence from the pre-action phase, rather than waiting until cases go viral, consistent with the SCCT approach that the Police have begun to adopt. Farid (2025) and Saputra & Margaret (2024) demonstrate that community policing programs in urban areas succeed when accompanied by open and preventive communication mechanisms, rather than merely reactive ones. Setiawan et al. (2025) find that digital service innovation (SINAR) improves access; however, counter-disinformation mechanisms remain dependent on integration with massive public education. Paneo et al. (2026) and Ihsan et al. (2025) underscore that countering hoaxes must be balanced with preventive public education and structured multi-stakeholder collaboration. Afriansyah & Torrido (2024) position the Police as the frontline institution; however, this role must be realized through mechanisms that not only enforce but also build a credible narrative of truth. Consequently, recalibration must prioritize strengthening early detection, standardizing responses, and expanding collaboration with digital communities.

Table 10. Implications of Findings for the Development of Counter-Disinformation Mechanisms

Recalibration Aspect	Key Finding	Practical Implication
Early Detection	Cyber patrols and OSINT are already operational	Develop AI-based early detection systems for hoaxes
Response Standardization	Responses vary across regions	Standardize SCCT protocols across all Regional Police jurisdictions
Collaboration	Collaboration with social media activists is limited	Expand collaboration with digital communities
Public Education	Digital literacy remains low	Integrate preventive education into every clarification

This analysis demonstrates three core empirical findings that collectively define the recalibration challenge facing police-public relations in the digital disinformation era. First, police public communication remains predominantly reactive, with 78.3% of the analyzed cases involving clarification after disinformation had already gained substantial circulation, while references to transparency and accountability remained comparatively limited. Second, digital engagement remains overwhelmingly one-way, with only 3.3% of the analyzed cases involving meaningful two-way interaction, indicating that the availability of digital platforms has not yet translated into sustained participatory communication. Third, counter-disinformation mechanisms have evolved toward more structured and anticipatory approaches, particularly through early detection, coordinated responses, and multi-stakeholder collaboration, but implementation remains uneven in terms of standardization, collaboration, and preventive public education. Taken together, these findings demonstrate that technological adoption alone does not constitute institutional recalibration. The overarching novelty and contribution of this study therefore lie in integrating proactive and transparent communication, dialogic digital engagement, and credible and adaptive counter-disinformation mechanisms into a single police-public relations recalibration framework. By connecting these three dimensions with procedural justice, institutional legitimacy, public trust, and the adapted application of SCCT to recurring digital disinformation, the study moves beyond viewing disinformation as an isolated communication or law-enforcement problem and conceptualizes it as a continuous institutional trust challenge. This integrated framework provides both a theoretical contribution to research on digital policing and crisis communication and a practical basis for strengthening anticipatory, participatory, transparent, and accountable police-public relations in the digital era.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the recalibration of police-public relations in the digital disruption era necessitates a fundamental transformation across three interrelated and cumulative strategic domains. First, police public communication strategies remain predominantly reactive, with 78.3 percent of responses issued after hoaxes had already spread widely, thereby requiring a shift toward proactive communication grounded in early detection and anticipation. Second, the utilization of digital platforms for direct community engagement remains dominated by one-way communication, with only 3.3 percent of content being dialogic in nature, thus necessitating the development of equitable and sustained two-way interaction. Third, credible counter-disinformation mechanisms have evolved from reactive approaches toward more structured frameworks through Operasi Nusantara Cooling System and the implementation of Situational Crisis Communication Theory; however, field implementation still faces challenges in standardization and reach expansion. Collectively, these three domains indicate that police institutions succeeding in building trust in the digital age are those capable of positioning themselves as trusted information sources amid the

overwhelming flood of information. Consequently, recalibrating police-public relations in the digital era demands a paradigm shift from a one-way communication model toward a dialogic engagement model, with transparency and accountability constituting the cornerstone of public trust.

This study has several limitations that should be considered when interpreting its findings. First, the analysis relies primarily on publicly accessible media coverage, official police communication, and documentary sources, which may privilege highly visible or widely circulated disinformation incidents over routine cases that receive limited public attention. Second, although the 120-case dataset and five qualitative case studies provide complementary empirical perspectives, the study does not directly measure the perceptions of citizens who received or encountered the Police's digital responses. Consequently, the identified relationships between communication practices, digital engagement, counter-disinformation mechanisms, and public trust should not be interpreted as causal effects. Third, the analysis does not comprehensively capture informal interactions occurring outside official police platforms, while tangible police actions on the ground may also influence public trust but are not consistently documented in digital or media sources. These limitations are consistent with observations in previous research that social media and news-based analyses may be affected by case visibility and cannot fully isolate the influence of institutional communication from broader public-opinion dynamics (Ain et al., 2026; Paskua et al., 2026; Parindah & Hannah, 2025; Sri Rahayu et al., 2024; Koestiono et al., 2026). Future research should therefore combine content analysis with longitudinal public surveys, experimental designs, and systematic analysis of informal digital interactions to assess more directly whether proactive communication, dialogic engagement, and structured counter-disinformation mechanisms produce measurable and sustained changes in public trust.

The findings of this study carry significant relevance for the development of policing policy in Indonesia and hold potential for adaptation by police institutions in other developing countries facing similar characteristics of digital disinformation. Practical implications encompass the need to strengthen artificial intelligence-based early detection capacity, standardize crisis response protocols across all regions, expand collaboration with digital communities and social media activists, and integrate public digital literacy education into every police communication activity. This study also affirms that the success of recalibration depends not only on technological and procedural aspects but primarily on institutional willingness to acknowledge errors, open spaces for public participation, and consistently implement transparency as a core value. The limitations of this study lie in its reliance on media coverage and the absence of direct public perception measurement; therefore, future research is advised to combine content analysis with longitudinal surveys and experiments to validate the effectiveness of the proposed recalibration strategies. Ultimately, this study offers a recalibration framework relevant to the Indonesian context and provides theoretical contributions to the development of digital policing studies, crisis communication, and disinformation management in an increasingly complex and dynamic post-truth era.

All authors contributed to the conceptualization and design of the study. The authors jointly contributed to data collection and curation, including the identification and documentation of the 120 disinformation cases and the selection of five cases for in-depth qualitative analysis. Formal analysis and interpretation of the findings were conducted collaboratively using thematic analysis, content analysis, and the adapted Situational Crisis Communication Theory framework. All authors contributed to the writing—original draft, reviewed and revised the manuscript critically for important intellectual content, and approved the final version of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Afriansyah, D., & Torrido, A. (2024). POLRI sebagai Garda Terdepan dalam Penegakan Hukum Korupsi Digital di Era Transformasi Teknologi. *The Juris*, 8(2), 491–500.
- Afzal, M., & Panagiotopoulos, P. (2025). Data in Policing: An Integrative Review. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 48(7), 411–430.
- Ain, Q., Pamungkas, A., & Qusnul Khotimah, W. (2026). Pemanfaatan Media Sosial Instagram @humasrestangsel sebagai Media Publikasi dalam Meningkatkan Citra Kepolisian. *Jurnal Ilmu Multidisiplin*, 4(6), 4739–4750.
- Alfaza, I. H., & Utari, P. (2024). Kultivasi Citra Kepolisian di Media Sosial. *Jurnal Komunikasi Massa*, 17(1), 81–91.
- Azahwa, S., Fitri, Z. M., & Wijaya, E. (2025). Penurunan Kepercayaan Publik Terhadap Kinerja Polisi sebagai Tantangan bagi Implementasi Good Policing Governance. *Similia Similibus*, 2(1), 2025.
- Basuki, U., & Setyawan, H. (2022). Langkah Strategis Menangkal Hoax: Suatu Pendekatan Kebijakan dan Hukum. *Jurnal Hukum Caraka Justitia*, 2(1), 1–22.
- Bilişli, Y., Çakmak, F., Zetter, S. A., & Ünal, M. I. (2024). Navigating truth and disinformation: A comparative analysis of generational responses to the 6 February 2023 earthquake in digital media in Türkiye. *Heliyon*, 10(19).
- Bradford, B. (2026). Research on public trust and police legitimacy: where next, and why? *Evidence Base*, 1(1).
- Burhanuddin, A. K. (2025). Dampak Komunikasi Politik Melalui Media Sosial Terhadap Paradigma Masyarakat. *Publisistik: Riset Jurnalistik Dan Media Komunikasi*, 2(2), 1–6.
- Candra, M., & Dinata, M. R. K. (2025). Penegakan Hukum terhadap Tindak Pidana Penyebaran Berita Hoaks melalui Media Sosial. *Arus Jurnal Sosial Dan Humaniora*, 5(2), 1577–1586.
- Collier, B., Thomas, D. R., Clayton, R., Hutchings, A., & Chua, Y. T. (2022). Influence, infrastructure, and recentering cybercrime policing: evaluating emerging approaches to online law enforcement through a market for cybercrime services. *Policing and Society*, 32(1), 103–124.
- Coombs, W. T. (2007). Protecting organization reputations during a crisis: The development and application of situational crisis communication theory. *Corporate reputation review*, 10(3), 163–176.
- Darafista, F., Sumardjoko, B., & Subowo, A. (2025). The influence of mass media coverage and police integrity on public trust in police law enforcement institutions. *Jurnal Pendidikan PKN (Pancasila Dan Kewarganegaraan)*, 6(2), 323–334.
- Farid, M. I. (2025). The Effectiveness of Community Policing Programs in Enhancing Public Trust in the Indonesian National Police (Polri) in Urban Areas. *Proceedings of Police Academy*, 1(1), 45–57.
- Fielding, N. G. (2023). Police communications and social media. *European Journal of Criminology*, 20(1), 316–334.
- Gold, J. (2022). Improving community relations in the police through procedural justice – an action learning initiative. *Action Learning: Research and Practice*, 19(3), 230–247.
- Handaningtias, U. R., Praceka, P. A., & Indriyany, I. A. (2022). Kepercayaan Publik (Public Trust) Terhadap Polisi: Studi Mengenai Wacana Public Dalam #Percumalaporporlisi Dengan Pendekatan Big Data Analysis. *Ijd-Demos*, 4(3).
- Haq, M. N. (2022). Anatomi dan Literasi Post-Truth. *Jurnal Riset Jurnalistik Dan Media Digital*, 99–114.
- Herlydinata, D. M. (2025). Toward Digital Community Policing: Opportunities and Barriers for Social Media Engagement in Indonesia | Proceedings of Police Academy. *Proceedings of Police Academy*, 1(1), 72–86.

- Ihsan, M., Yani, F., Ranika, D., Khotimah, N., & Hasan, A. (2025). Penegakan Hukum atas Penyebaran Informasi Palsu Bermuatan Politik di Media Digital. *Lex Justitia*, 7(2), 01–09.
- Indarti, E. (2019). Community Policing sebagai Democratic Policing; Konteks di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Kepolisian*, 13(2), 11–11.
- Jackson, J., Bradford, B., Chan, A., & Lee, Y. (2025). When trust turns digital: why relational cues matter in online crime-reporting portals. *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 2025, 1–35.
- Jones, M., Ralph, L., Millie, A., & Rowe, M. (2025). Policing and social media: Exploring police digital visibility. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 1–17.
- Koestiono, F., Hapsari, A. P., Permadi, R., Muchlis, M., & Metalia, D. (2026). Pengaruh Media Sosial terhadap Pembentukan Opini Publik Tentang Hukum. *Jurnal ISO: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial, Politik Dan Humaniora*, 6(1), 10–10.
- Kurniawan, F., Ma'mur, A. M., & Cindrakasih, R. R. (2025). Pemolisian dan Media: Dinamika Representasi dan Dampaknya pada Persepsi Publik. *Innovative: Journal Of Social Science Research*, 5(1), 2107–2122.
- Kurniawan, H. F. (2025). Eksistensi Kepolisian RI Ditengah Disrupsi Politik dan Citra Institusi. *Journal of Syntax Literate*, 10(6), 5988.
- Li, L., & Sun, I. Y. (2025). Procedural Justice and Police Legitimacy: Untangling the Effects of Racial and Ethnic Combinations Between the Police and Civilians. *Criminal Justice Review*, 50(2), 170–190.
- Maaliki, N. E., & Soponyono, E. (2021). Kebijakan Hukum Pidana Dalam Menanggulangi Tindak Pidana Berita Bohong. *Jurnal Pembangunan Hukum Indonesia*, 3(1), 59–69.
- Malik Ibrahim, S., Reinhard Golose, P., & Fadil Imran, M. (2025). Strategi Komunikasi Polri di Media Sosial. *Brand Communication*, 4(1), 58–67.
- Margaret, M. (2020). Community Policing sebagai Bentuk Pengendalian Sosial. *Deviance Jurnal Kriminologi*, 4(2), 152–164.
- Mensah, D., Jones, J. R., & Ford, V. L. (2023). Exploring Social Media's Impact on Societal Perceptions of Police Legitimacy and Cooperation. *Journal of Sociological Research*, 15(1), 15.
- Mitrin, A., Rahman, R., & Irawan, Y. (2026). Media Sintetis Berbasis AI dan Krisis Kepercayaan Publik dalam Komunikasi Politik. *PERSEPTIF: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Humaniora*, 4(1), 54–60.
- Muchtar, J. (2025). From Street to Cyberspace: Digital Transformation for Community-Oriented Policing. *Proceedings of Police Academy*, 1(1), 58–71.
- Nur, H. A., & Margaret, M. (2024). Implementation of Community Policing by The Narcotics Investigation Unit of Polresta Bogor Kota In Drug Abuse Prevention. *Journal of Law, Politic and Humanities*, 4(4), 635–648.
- Pane, M., Ghanistyana, L. P., Affipah, I. L., Cahyani, R. N., & Kartika, S. W. (2025). Implementasi The Circular Model Of Some dalam Pengelolaan Cyber Public Relations Kepolisian di Era Digital. *Jurnal Ilmiah Dinamika Sosial*, 9(1), 119–135.
- Paneo, R., Kadir, Y., & Ahmad, I. (2026). Peran Ditreskrimsus Dalam Penanggulangan Tindak Pidana Penyebaran Berita Bohong Dan Ujaran Kebencian (Studi Polda Gorontalo). *JURNAL MULTIDISIPLIN ILMU AKADEMIK*, 3(3), 1317–1325.
- Parindah, & Hannah, M. P. (2025). Optimalisasi Media Sosial Humas Polresta Palembang dalam Menangkal Penyebaran Informasi Hoaks untuk Meningkatkan Kepercayaan Masyarakat. *Triwikrama: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial*, 9(1), 171–180.
- Paskua, M. E., Mustafa, I., & Sedu, V. A. (2026). Aktivitas Humas Polres Sikka dalam Memanfaatkan Media Sosial sebagai Sarana Penyebaran Informasi Publik. *CENDEKIA: Jurnal Ilmu Pengetahuan*, 6(2), 1152–1162.

- Pradipa, R. A., Hamizan, W., & Mahendra, A. I. (2024). Penggunaan Media Sosial X pada Akun @Txdtrberseragam untuk Mengetahui Tingkat Kepercayaan Masyarakat Yogyakarta terhadap Kepolisian RI. *MUKASI: Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, 3(3), 236–248.
- Pradiyan, R. P., Harahap, H. S., & Sulistyanto, A. (2024). Kepolisian, Keamanan dan Media Sosial: Analisis Bibliometrik Data Scopus 2013-2023. *Jurnal Keamanan Nasional*, 10(1), 79–102.
- Przeszowski, K., & Guerette, R. T. (2025). Public perceptions on police use of information technologies: Findings from a randomized vignette experiment. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 96, 102336.
- Rizki, F., Setiono, J., & Sutrisno, S. (2025). Analysis of Public Distortion of Police Tasks That Impact Post-Truth Information. *Greenation International Journal of Law and Social Sciences*, 3(2), 446–453.
- Saputra, I., & Margaret, M. (2024). Implementasi Community Policing dalam Pencegahan Tawuran Warga di Wilayah Hukum Polsek Kebon Jeruk Jakarta Barat. *Anomie*, 6(3), 203–217.
- Sarjito, A. (2024). Hoaks, Disinformasi, dan Ketahanan Nasional: Ancaman Teknologi Informasi dalam Masyarakat Digital Indonesia. *Journal of Governance and Local Politics (JGLP)*, 6(2), 175–186.
- Setiawan, B., Muzahid, A., Sheva Saino, J., & Ahmad, S. (2025). Inovasi Layanan Sim Digital Nasional Presisi (SINAR): Tinjauan Literatur Terhadap Dampak dan Tantangan Pelayanan Online Polri. *Proceedings of Police Academy*, 1(1), 183–196.
- Sri Rahayu, F., Prameswari Yapasaputri, J., & Sihombing, R. (2024). Strategi Humas MABES POLRI: Meningkatkan Kepercayaan Publik Melalui Media Massa: Studi Kasus : Demonstrasi Penolakan UU PILKADA. *Retorika: Jurnal Komunikasi, Sosial Dan Ilmu Politik*, 1(7), 117–124.
- Sun, J., & Gu, S. (2026). Responsive policing for cyberfraud prevention: an empirical inquiry into the regulatory pyramid to protect cyberfraud victims in China. *Policing and Society*, 36(2), 232–252.
- Supriyadi, T., Putri, A. M., Rahmita, A., Dinah, B. A., & Munandar, T. H. (2024). Pengaruh Media Sosial terhadap Rekrutmen pada Anggota Kepolisian. *Concept: Journal of Social Humanities and Education*, 3(2), 223–230.
- Surachman, N., & Hutapea, E. B. (2026). Strategi Komunikasi Krisis dalam Membangun Citra Institusi Polri Pasca Kerusuhan September 2025. *Jurnal Cyber PR*, 6(1), 225–239.
- Suriadi, H. (2025). Krisis Kepercayaan Masyarakat terhadap Lembaga Publik di Era Disinformasi Digital. *Journal of Social, Educational and Religious Studies*, 1(1), 38–52.
- Surjatmodjo, D., Unde, A. A., Cangara, H., & Sonni, A. F. (2024). Information Pandemic: A Critical Review of Disinformation Spread on Social Media and Its Implications for State Resilience. *Social Sciences 2024*, Vol. 13, Page 418, 13(8), 418.
- Whelan, C., Martin, J., Dupont, B., & Harkin, D. (2026). ‘The name of the game’: policing perspectives on cybercrime disruption. *Police Practice and Research*, 27(2), 289–309.
- Wilnio, M., Alifa Nugrahutami Yunianto, M., Mirza Adira, M., & Mani, L. (2022). Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Tingkat Kepercayaan Publik Terhadap Institusi Polri: Tagar #Percumalaporpolisi Dalam Menindaklanjuti Laporan. *Syntax Literate ; Jurnal Ilmiah Indonesia*, 7(11), 16493–16513.
- Yashila, P., & Athifahputih, R. (2022). Penegakan Hukum Terhadap Penyebaran Berita Hoax Dilihat dari Tinjauan Hukum. *Jurnal Hukum Dan Pembangunan Ekonomi*, 10(1), 64–77.

- Zaidi, H., & O'Connor, C. D. (2024). Policing social media: Are procedural justice principles guiding Canadian police interactions online? *International Journal of Police Science and Management*, 26(2), 258–268.
- Zhong, Q., Peng, Z., & Zhang, X. (2025). Shaping Trust Through Information Processing: How Social Media Risk Information Affects Government Trust During a Crisis. *Risk Analysis*, 45(11), 3682–3699.