


Ranah Research
Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development

E-ISSN: 2655-0865

082170743613 ranahresearch@gmail.com <https://jurnal.ranahresearch.com>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.38035/rj.v8i2>
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Legality, Proportionality and Protection in Public Order Enforcement by Satpol PP in Batam, Indonesia

Irwan¹, Dwi Afni Maileni², Rizki Tri Anugrah Bhakti³, Edwar Kelvin⁴

¹Faculty of Law, Universitas Riau Kepulauan, Batam 29425, Indonesia. irwanpekes773@gmail.com

²Faculty of Law, Universitas Riau Kepulauan, Batam 29425, Indonesia. dwi.afni.maileni@gmail.com

³Faculty of Law, Universitas Riau Kepulauan, Batam 29425, Indonesia. rizki.tri.ab@gmail.com

⁴Faculty of Law, Universitas Riau Kepulauan, Batam 29425, Indonesia. edwarlawyer@gmail.com

Corresponding Author: rizki.tri.ab@gmail.com³

Abstract: This study examines the interplay of legality, proportionality and rights protection in enforcement operations conducted by the Satpol PP in Batam, Indonesia. Local-order enforcement against violations of regional regulations often triggers contestation because it intersects with livelihoods, property interests and security while simultaneously demanding effective public-order governance. The research aims to assess whether enforcement actions comply with applicable mandates and procedural requirements; evaluate how proportionality is applied in selecting measures, escalating interventions and using force; and map available safeguards and remedies for affected residents. A socio-legal case-study design is employed, combining document analysis, field observation and semi-structured interviews with Satpol PP officers, local government units, street vendors and business actors and civil-society representatives. Findings suggest legality is generally satisfied at the level of formal authority, yet procedural weaknesses persist in advance notice, record-keeping, transparency of decision-making and post-operation accountability. Proportionality is not consistently operationalized, particularly regarding the least restrictive option, clear escalation stages and standards on the use of force. Rights protection for impacted communities remains dependent on discretion, with complaint channels and restitution mechanisms insufficiently accessible, especially for vulnerable groups. The study recommends strengthening rights-based SOPs, institutionalizing proportionality training, improving documentation and supervisory controls and providing accessible complaint, mediation and relocation-support pathways. More broadly, inter-agency coordination and performance metrics should prioritize voluntary compliance and reduced grievances, not merely the number of operations, to enhance legitimacy and protect citizens in governance.

Keyword: Satpol PP, Legality, Proportionality, Rights Protection, Local Regulation Enforcement, Due Process, Batam.

INTRODUCTION

Social enforcement carried out by the Public Order Agency (Satpol PP) is the most visible form of government action to the public because it operates directly on citizens from regulating street vendors, advertising, housing to crowd control while simultaneously carrying out its formal mandate to enforce and maintain public order (Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 16 Tahun 2018 Tentang Satuan Polisi Pamong Praja, 2018). In practice, the nature of enforcement places Satpol PP in a situation prone to social friction: the same actions can be seen as efforts to maintain order, but can also be perceived as restricting citizens' freedoms if the procedures, rationale for the actions and documentation are insufficiently transparent and accountable (Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2014 Tentang Administrasi Pemerintah, 2014; Sanderson & Darley, 2002).

Theoretical debates over enforcement generally center on two axes that must be addressed simultaneously: the state or region's need to maintain public order and safety with the obligation to limit apparatus intervention to prevent discriminatory or arbitrary actions. In administrative law, this second axis is upheld through the principles of the exercise of authority (AUPB), which demand legal certainty, impartiality, accuracy and transparency in government actions (Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 16 Tahun 2018 Tentang Satuan Polisi Pamong Praja, 2018). From a legitimacy perspective, public acceptance of authority is not determined by enforcement outcomes, but rather by the quality of the processes and decisions that shape compliance and suppress conflict (Gao & Zhao, 2018; van Rooij et al., 2024). Therefore, order and rights are not positioned as mutually exclusive poles, but rather as objectives that legal standards and empirical evidence of enforcement practices must bind.

Normatively, the mandate of the Public Order Agency (Satpol PP) in Government Regulation Number 16 of 2018 is to maintain public order and security, as well as protect the community; This regulation also authorizes non-judicial enforcement, administrative action, investigation and emphasizes that enforcement must be carried out in accordance with standard operating procedures (SOPs) and a code of ethics (Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri Nomor 54 Tahun 2011 Tentang Standar Operasional Prosedur Satuan Polisi Pamong Praja, 2011). However, the non-judicial category raises a debate over governance, which should be understood as either administrative action or field action, allowing for broad discretion for rapid response. This tension makes the quality of law enforcement an issue that needs to be measured, not simply assumed.

The first pillar of this research is legality, situated within the framework of government action and not based solely on authority, but subject to the principles of good governance (AUPB). The explanation of the State Administration Law emphasizes the principles of legal certainty, non-discrimination, accuracy based on information and documents and transparency. The theoretical debate concerns the legal-formalist and substantive approaches to administrative justice. Thus, the legality of regulation cannot be assessed solely based on its existence, but rather on how it's implemented and gap lies in the lack of empirical instruments that consistently capture this aspect.

The second pillar, proportionality, bridges the gap between the goals of public order and the restriction of rights. Literature from Barak (2012) frames proportionality as the relationship between goals and restrictions, choosing methods that limit and balance benefits and harms. However, academic critiques by Lailam & Anggia (2023) warn that balancing can open up subjectivity and risk diluting rights protection if not defined by precise, verifiable parameters. In the context of public order, the debate becomes more practical because it requires specifying the timing of warnings, confiscations, closures and when actions become excessive (Pratiwi et al., 2016). A research gap lies in the lack of operationalization of the proportionality test into measurable indicators of behavior/decisions across cases.

The third pillar, protection that can be verified, is not merely a humanitarian claim. The law emphasizes that restrictions on rights and freedoms may be imposed only by law for

legitimate purposes. Indonesia has also ratified the ICCPR, which recognizes certain restrictions under strict conditions, which are legal and non-arbitrary (Amiati et al., 2024; Einar Himma & Spinello, 2007). On the enforcement side, the use of force emphasizes legality, necessity and proportionality, as well as obligations to prevent escalation, to exercise prudence and to be accountable (Prindani et al., 2020). A key debate is whether public order is used to justify strict restrictions on rights (the rule-of-law approach) or shifts to a flexible justification for the coercive handling of social problems (securitization). The gap lies in the scarcity of empirical measurements of the protections present in enforcement practices.

Beyond norms, procedural justice theory broadens its focus to examine how law enforcement processes are carried out in accordance with provisions (Tyler, 2003). Empirical evidence shows that the legitimacy of authority is strongly influenced by experience with the process. Meanwhile, public assessments of public order in Indonesia highlight the ambiguity of enforcement, overlapping sanctions and the risk of rights violations in public order regulations and implementation (Aaron Alelxaider, 2023). At the same time, Sufriadi (2024) on public order also shows a tendency to focus on operational and institutional aspects rather than on integrating legality and proportionality as measurable quality parameters. This underscores the continued fragmentation of legal norms, critiques and organizational studies, without testing an integrated model.

Therefore, this study examines the quality of the Public Order Agency (Satpol PP) in Batam, Indonesia, through the constructs of legality, proportionality and protection in Satpol PP enforcement actions. This study positions legality, proportionality and protection as dimensions that can be operationalized into measurable indicators to more accurately and auditably explain variations in the quality/legitimacy of enforcement actions. Its novelty lies in constructing measurable constructs through statistical calculations derived from norms, thereby operationalizing normative debates into consistent empirical indicators. Moreover, testing the relationships between constructs using SEM-PLS to identify influence pathways and data-based improvement priorities.

Therefore, this study aims to test the effect of legality (X1) on the quality of enforcement actions (Y), test the effect of proportionality (X2) on the quality of enforcement actions (Y); and test the effect of protection (X3) on the quality of enforcement actions (Y). The research model positions X1, X2 and X3 as exogenous variables that directly influence Y. Overall, the study describes the influence of these three dimensions on enforcement actions. This study fills a gap in normative and practical research while providing relevant empirical evidence to improve SOPs, training and enforcement mechanisms of the Public Order Agency (Satpol PP) in Batam, Indonesia.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Legality Theory and Practice in Indonesia

The limits of legality in regulatory enforcement emerge primarily within the scope of discretion (priorities, strategies, enforcement intensity and the use of administrative instruments). On the one hand, discretion is seen as inevitable because written law can never predict all situations on the ground; limiting discretion to the extreme can actually paralyze administrative responses. On the other hand, loose discretion without parameters opens the door to arbitrariness.

The principle of legality in law requires that every government action—including public order enforcement have apparent authority, be carried out by authorized officials and follow established procedures. Within the legal framework, Simanjuntak (2020) explains that legality does not stop at regulations but requires administrative justice that can be tested for rationality and compliance with good governance standards, including judicial/administrative oversight mechanisms. Crouch (2019, 2021) literature on administrative justice in Indonesia emphasizes that the strengthening of legality following the enactment of the State Administration Law has

clarified standards for evaluating government actions and strengthened citizen protection when faced with decisions/actions by officials.

The predominant literature increasingly emphasizes the need to affirm the rule-of-law culture within the executive branch to prevent abuse of discretion and the doctrine of proportionality holds that restrictive actions against citizens must be commensurate with the objective and not exceed what is necessary (Koliba, 2025). Therefore, the limits of legality do not stop at authority but encompass standards of legitimate purpose, fair procedures and proportionality as safeguards against excessive enforcement.

In practice, regulatory enforcement is precarious and favors immediate action, while documentation, written reasons and objection procedures are seen as obstacles. This is where the literature and case studies in Indonesia demonstrate that legal issues often arise from a lack of justification for actions, an unclear basis for specific authority, or minimal procedural safeguards in enforcement, which impact citizens' socio-economic rights. Studies on the legality of evictions and enforcement practices involving the Public Order Agency (Satpol PP) highlight the importance of ensuring a legal basis and procedures that meet standards of administrative justice to prevent state actions from degenerating into coercive measures that are difficult to test.

Proportional Theory

The principle of proportionality serves as a balancing factor when the state limits rights or imposes burdens on citizens. This is reflected in the means chosen to achieve the goal (suitability), whether effective alternatives exist (necessity) and whether the resulting burden harm is commensurate with the public benefit achieved (proportionality *stricto sensu*) (Alexy, 2018). In the modern public law tradition, proportionality is seen as a rational method for testing rights restrictions while simultaneously controlling government discretion because it forces the state to explain why a particular method was chosen rather than simply what was done (Cohen-Eliya & Porat, 2014). Contemporary theoretical debates demonstrate that proportionality is not a moral slogan, but rather a testing technique that can be operationalized in assessing state action.

In the realm of public order, proportionality operates at the level of action design: from gradual escalation to selecting instruments with minimal impact and to limiting the use of force to essential and measurable situations (Bisariyadi, 2018). Its relevance is strong because public order enforcement almost always affects concrete citizen interests, such as small businesses, housing and access to public spaces. Therefore, measuring success in public order does not automatically mean that the action is proportional; policy success must still pass the means-ends balance test, including proving that less stringent options are inadequate or impossible (Putri et al., 2025). Therefore, the proportionality framework helps distinguish legitimate discretion from excessive and unjustifiable actions.

In Indonesia, the resonance of proportionality is evident in the development of arguments for rights restrictions and the testing of state actions in the constitutional administrative law literature. According to Bisariyadi (2018), proportionality serves as an analytical tool when the state restricts rights through drastic measures and it also provides a practical comparative framework for the Indonesian context. At the normative level, the principle of proportionality is enshrined in the principles of regional governance in Law 23/2014, thereby strengthening the claim that proportionality is not merely theoretical but part of the standards that must guide law enforcement officers' actions. Therefore, research on Satpol PP enforcement can derive operational indicators of proportionality as measurable variables.

Protection

The enforcement framework is based on the principle that the state may maintain public order, but restrictions on rights must be subject to procedural and substantive standards that protect dignity. For actions that potentially resemble evictions or enforcement that disrupts access to livelihoods, international standards provide quite detailed parameters. General Comment No. 7 of the CESCR emphasizes that forced evictions are serious violations that require legal protection, including guarantees of due process, consultation, adequate notice and effective remedies. In line with this, the UN Basic Principles and Guidelines on Development-based Evictions and Displacement (A/HRC/4/18) outlines state obligations to minimize impacts, prevent discrimination and ensure complaint and redress mechanisms.

In public order enforcement practices, the risk of violations arises at the point of non-discrimination, administrative due process and restrictions on coercion. According to Kusumawati (2018), the issue of the legality of evictions in Jakarta underscores the importance of linking enforcement actions to legal standards to prevent them from becoming coercive and brutal to test. A study of eviction practices in Indonesia also emphasizes the need for intervention before, during and after eviction actions to close loopholes for violations.

At the national normative level, the obligation to respect the duties of Public Order Agency (Satpol PP) officers is also emphasized in the Satpol PP institutional regulation (PP 16/2018). Therefore, protection should be understood as part of professional standards, not an ethical accessory. Thus, protection in the research on enforcement is operationalized into concrete indicators, including transparency, security, prohibition of degrading treatment, availability of complaint channels and recovery in the event of unlawful losses. Overall, the research variables and indicators are shown in table 1; the research hypotheses are H1: legality (X1) has a positive effect on the quality of regulatory actions (Y); H2: proportionality (X2) has a positive impact on the quality of regulatory actions (Y); and H3: protection (X3) has a positive effect on the quality of regulatory actions (Y).

Table 1. Research Variable and Indicator

Construct	Operational	Indicator
Legality (X1)	level of compliance of regulatory actions with the basis of authority that is orderly and traceable	X1.1 the basis for authority is clear and can be demonstrated during enforcement.
		X1.2 sop compliance/regulatory steps are consistently implemented.
		X1.3 administrative documentation is available and complete.
		X1.4 reasonability and reasoning for action can be explained coherently.
		X1.5 formal coordination according to mandates before action
Proportionality (X2)	balance of ends–means–impacts; use of minimal interventions that are effective and not excessive	X2.1 the objectives of the action are specific and relevant to the disturbance being addressed
		X2.2 the least intrusive method is prioritized.
		X2.3 gradual escalation after persuasive efforts are ignored
		X2.4 impacts on affected parties are considered in field decisions
		X2.5 a balance of social costs and outcomes is maintained during enforcement
Protection (X3)	the level of respect for dignity, non-discrimination and prevention of excesses in regulatory interactions	X3.1 respectful treatment of affected parties
		X3.2 non-discrimination in enforcement
		X3.3 avoidance of violence/excesses, except in legitimate and urgent circumstances
		X3.4 protection of vulnerable groups when involved
		X3.5 transparency of rights and complaint mechanisms are adequately informed
Quality of enforcement actions (Y)	the condition of urban mobility order is reflected in traffic compliance, smooth flow,	Y1.1 sequential steps of action according to procedures
		Y1.2 quality of action documentation
		Y1.3 clarity of communication of the reasons for action to affected parties

orderly parking/stopping and the perception of safety and order in the work area	Y1.4 escalation and impact control
	Y1.5 minimizing conflict/complaints during and after enforcement

METHOD

This study employed a survey-based, explanatory, quantitative design with a socio-legal perspective to position enforcement actions as legal practices and to examine the principles of legality, proportionality and protection as operationalized in the enforcement practices of the Public Order Agency (Satpol PP) in Batam. Conceptually, the three principles are treated as latent constructs derived into measurable indicators. Socio-legal was chosen to view law not merely as a normative text, but as a practice influenced by organizational context, power relations and the social conditions of affected citizens (Nurtjahyo, 2021; Tyler, 2017).

Methodologically, the research design is oriented toward explanatory research to explain variations in the construct of action quality through testable measures, so that the debate over swift action is grounded in legitimate and just action and does not stop at normative claims. PLS-SEM was used to analyze the relationships between constructs and assess indicator quality, as it is appropriate for models with latent constructs, a predictive/explanatory orientation and a common practice in the social sciences when researchers need to test both measurement and structural models comprehensively. The PLS-SEM reporting and evaluation framework refers to guidelines that emphasize evaluating the outer model (reliability/validity) and the inner model (path coefficients, R^2 , effect sizes, predictive validity) (Hair et al., 2021; Sarstedt et al., 2019, 2022).

The primary unit of analysis is the Satpol PP enforcement practices, observed through the perceptions and experiences of key actors. The 70 survey respondents included: (i) Satpol PP personnel directly involved in enforcement to avoid biased assessments of legality-proportionality compliance. The sampling technique can be purposive or stratified and the sample size is determined by considering statistical power and model complexity, in line with survey methodology recommendations and PLS-SEM guidelines.

The research location is Batam City, an urban context with high dynamics, dense economic activity, advertising/street vendor management and public order, thus enriching the variety of enforcement actions and testing fair administrative standards. In the socio-legal tradition, location selection is not only administrative-geographical, but also considers the social arena in which norms are implemented, including organizational structures, regional policy networks and patterns of official-citizen relations. Thus, Batam serves as an institutional context that shapes opportunities and constraints for compliance with legal and proportionality requirements.

The study used a cross-sectional design, collecting data over a single time period, June-December 2025, to capture the state of principled compliance in ongoing enforcement practices. This was accompanied by a review of supporting documents (SOPs, warrants, minutes and enforcement documentation) for temporal consistency. A cross-sectional design is appropriate when the primary objective is to map compliance levels and examine the interrelationships among constructs within institutional contexts.

Survey data were analyzed using PLS-SEM: evaluating the measurement model through reliability and convergent validity, as well as discriminant validity using HTMT; examining common method bias/collinearity using the full collinearity VIF approach; evaluation of the structural model through bootstrapping for significance of path coefficients, as well as reporting of accuracy/predictive measures (R^2 and F^2). All results follow PLS-SEM reporting practices that emphasize parameter transparency, rationale for method selection and the soundness of inferences (Henseler et al., 2015; Ringle et al., 2023).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Outer Model Result

This study contributes to clarifying the factors shaping the quality of enforcement actions by establishing three key principles as determinants: legality, proportionality and human rights protection. This focus broadens the understanding that enforcement is not merely an operational activity but a series of government actions that require testing procedural legality, balanced action and respect for citizen protection standards. Thus, this study consolidates empirical findings to support strengthening governance of regional regulation enforcement and provides a theoretical and practical basis for improving the quality of enforcement by regional authorities.

70 questionnaire responses were deemed valid for analysis. Respondents were Batam City Public Order Agency (Satpol PP) officers involved in enforcement with at least one year of active work experience, thus deemed sufficient to provide relevant assessments of the indicators in each research construct. These characteristics support the assumption that the responses provided are not merely normative but reflect experience implementing enforcement actions, including procedural stages, field decision-making and managing social impact risks.

The initial stage of the analysis focused on evaluating the contribution of each indicator to ensure the reliability and validity of the constructs as the foundation for the quality of the empirical findings. The analysis was conducted using PLS-SEM because this method allows for the simultaneous testing of causal relationships among variables while remaining robust with relatively small sample sizes and without requiring strict data distribution assumptions. With these considerations in mind, the PLS-SEM approach was used to ensure that the measurement and structural models were consistently tested on the constructs of legality, proportionality, protection and the quality of enforcement actions.

The results of the outer measurement model indicate that all indicators used adequately represent the research variables and support the model's statistical feasibility. No indication of overlapping effects between constructs was found, allowing for a more targeted interpretation of the relationships among variables in accordance with the model design. Referring to the commonly used acceptance threshold in PLS-SEM, the outer loadings met the minimum threshold, as did internal reliability indicators such as Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability (AVE), indicating adequate convergent validity. A summary of the results of this measurement model is presented in Table 2.

Overall, the measured constructs have good internal consistency and strong validity. These findings confirm that legality, proportionality and protection can be operationalized reliably as measurable principles in practice and are relevant for explaining variations in the quality of enforcement actions in the Batam context. Thus, the measurement model base meets the prerequisites for further testing the structural model and more accurately interpreting the relationship between X1 and X3 on Y.

These findings indicate that improving enforcement quality is not based on a single dimension, but instead requires a mutually reinforcing integration: procedurally orderly actions (legality), balanced in method and impact (proportionality) and oriented toward protection.

Table 2. Outer Loading Result

Construct	Indicator	Outer Loading	Cronbach Alpha	Composite Reliability	AVE
Legality (X1)			0.777	0.714	0.705
	X1.1	0.724			
	X1.2	0.746			
	X1.3	0.714			
	X1.4	0.728			
	X1.5	0.777			
Proportionality (X2)			0.702	0.704	0.708

	X2.1	0.714		
	X2.2	0.740		
	X2.3	0.715		
	X2.4	0.702		
	X2.5	0.789		
			0.706	0.715
	X3.1	0.715		
	X3.2	0.702		
	X3.3	0.793		
	X3.4	0.710		
	X3.5	0.890		
			0.715	0.713
				0.722
Quality of Enforcement Actions (Y)	Y1	0.724		
	Y2	0.715		
	Y3	0.751		
	Y4	0.710		
	Y5	0.722		

Based on Table 2, all indicators across the four constructs had outer loadings >0.702, so no items needed to be eliminated, as they all met the minimum convergence threshold. For the Legality construct (X1), the values ranged from 0.714 to 0.777, with the strongest indicator at X1.5 (0.777) and the lowest at X1.3 (0.714), but remained within acceptable limits. Indicator consistency is supported by Cronbach's Alpha of 0.777, Composite Reliability of 0.714 and an AVE of 0.705, indicating that X1 is measured stably and adequately explains the variance of its indicators.

For the Proportionality construct (X2), the values ranged from 0.702 to 0.789. The indicator with the highest contribution was X2.5 (0.789), while the lowest was X2.4 (0.702), which still met the eligibility requirements. Reliability and convergent validity measures also demonstrated adequate results, as evidenced by cronbach's alpha of 0.702, Composite Reliability of 0.704 and AVE of 0.708. These findings indicate that the proportionality dimension is consistent across its four indicators in the context of enforcement actions.

Furthermore, the Protection construct (X3) showed an outer loading range of 0.702–0.890, with the strongest indicator at X3.5 (0.890). This means that this indicator is most representative in forming the protection construct in enforcement practices. Other indicators (X3.1, X3.2, X3.4) were within the range that still met the criteria. The Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.706, Composite Reliability of 0.715 and AVE of 0.715 confirmed that X3 had sufficient internal consistency and met convergent validity, thus it could be retained in the measurement model.

For the dependent variable, Quality of Enforcement Actions (Y), all indicators met the criteria, with outer loadings ranging from 0.710 to 0.751. The most dominant indicator was Y1.3 (0.751), while the least dominant was Y1.4 (0.710), which remained within acceptable limits. The reliability and convergent validity of Y were reflected in the Cronbach's Alpha. 0.715, Composite Reliability 0.713 and AVE 0.722. Thus, the construct Y can be declared adequately measurable and ready for structural relationship analysis of X1, X2 and X3.

The average variance extracted, or AVE, of the observed constructs is above 0.50, as determined by Chin (1998). The results for each variable show that X1-X3 values fall within the range of 0.705-0.722. All variables have been successfully validated and are acceptable for inclusion in the measurement model.

Overall, the outer model results in Table 2 demonstrate that the instrument used has established a solid measurement foundation: each construct not only meets the minimum statistical requirements but also exhibits a relatively stable pattern of indicator contributions, with no items that weaken the construct's measurability. This means that readings of the influence of legality, proportionality and human rights protection on the quality of enforcement

actions can be conducted in the next stage with greater confidence, as the variation in respondents' scores has been structured consistently across indicators relevant to the context of regional regulation enforcement.

Next, verify the validity table of the output to ensure there are no inconsistencies. Assessing discriminant validity requires evaluating variables against indicators; cross-loading results are analyzed to identify stronger correlations with the assessed variable and weaker correlations with other variables. The results indicate that all measurement items (X1, X2, X3 and Y) exhibit stronger correlations with their respective measurement variables and weaker correlations with other variables (Table 3).

Table 3. Determinant Validity

Construct	(X1)	(X2)	(X3)	(Y)
Legality (X1)	0.808			
Proportionality (X2)	0.460	0.831		
Protection (X3)	0.491	0.828	0.854	
Quality of Enforcement Actions (Y)	0.659	0.703	0.800	0.871

Inner Model Result

Next, the internal or structural model evaluation examines the relationships among variables, emphasizing the significance of direct relationships. This involves conducting a VIF (variance inflation factor) or multicollinearity test to assess the degree of multicollinearity among constructs, with a threshold of <5. The goal is to evaluate the fit by examining the correlations among the model's constructs to prevent confusion or bias in the analysis. If the value exceeds 5, it is essential to recalculate each indicator used in the study.

The findings indicate that multicollinearity is absent in the research model. This analysis is based on the variability of values for each indicator variable, ranging from 1.655 to 3.232, indicating robust or unbiased PLS-SEM parameters. These results suggest that collinearity between variables is absent in the path coefficients obtained from the structural model.

Table 4 presents the findings of the bootstrapping method. This analysis outlines the direct effects of variables, including path coefficients, standard deviations, T statistics, 95% confidence intervals, significance (p-value) and effect size (F²). According to Chin (1998), Cohen (1998) and Hair et al. (2014), values below 0.005 indicate that the relationship between variables is not significant. The F² classification describes the effect size: 0.02 indicates a small effect, 0.15 a medium effect and 0.35 a significant effect.

Table 4. Inner Model Result

	Path Coefficient	Standart Deviation (STDEV)	T-Statistics	P-value	F ²	Confidence Interval		
						2.5%	97.5%	
X1-Y	0.323	0.218	2.318	0.000	0.152	0.772	0.741	Significant (+)
X2-Y	0.418	0.161	3.752	0.000	0.209	0.213	0.512	Significant (+)
X3-Y	0.456	0.262	7.442	0.000	0.102	0.415	0.635	Significant (+)

Based on Table 4, the inner model shows that legality (X1), proportionality (X2) and protection (X3) have a positive and significant influence on regulatory actions (Y). All path coefficients are positive, namely X1 against Y ($\beta=0.323$), X2 against Y ($\beta=0.418$) and X3 against Y ($\beta=0.456$), supported by T-statistic values that are above the acceptance threshold (X1: 2.318; X2: 3.752; X3: 7.442) with a p-value of 0.000 for all three paths. The 95% confidence interval range for each relationship indicates positive results and stable influences and is unlikely to change when the model is tested on similar samples. Based on the coefficient

values, Protection (X3) emerged as the strongest predictor of the quality of enforcement actions ($\beta=0.456$), followed by Proportionality (X2) ($\beta=0.418$) and Legality (X1) ($\beta=0.323$). This pattern suggests that the quality of enforcement actions in Batam is not solely supported by the orderly basis of authority and SOPs, but is also influenced by officials maintaining treatment that protects citizens' dignity and avoids excesses, followed by the ability to choose balanced and moderate enforcement measures. In other words, quality enforcement arises from a combination of protection, balance and procedural certainty.

The level of estimation certainty also shows relevant variation. The X2-Y path has the smallest STDEV (0.161), so the influence of proportionality can be read as the most precise of the three paths. Conversely, the X3-Y path has the largest STDEV (0.262), indicating greater variation in respondents' responses to the protection aspect, although its significance remains the strongest ($T=7.442$). Meanwhile, Legality (X1) was in the middle position (STDEV=0.218), indicating relatively consistent procedural compliance and action traceability, but its influence was still lower than that of the other two constructs.

In terms of effect size (F^2), the practical contribution of each construct to Y was in the small to medium range. Proportionality (X2) contributed ($F^2=0.209$), followed by Legality (X1) ($F^2=0.152$) and Protection (X3) ($F^2=0.102$), which were in the small category. The combination of strong significance, consistently positive confidence intervals and effect sizes suggests that all three variables are relevant determinants of the quality of enforcement actions.

Finally, the resulting R^2 value was 0.504, indicating that 50.4% of the variation in Enforcement Actions (Y) can be explained simultaneously by Legality (X1), Proportionality (X2) and Protection/Human Rights (X3), with the remainder influenced by factors outside the model. Furthermore, a positive Q^2 of 0.662 confirms that the model has adequate predictive relevance in predicting Y based on X1–X3. Finally, a GoF value of 0.424 indicates good model performance, combining measurement quality and structural explanatory power. Therefore, the model results are suitable for drawing implications for the enforcement of regional regulations by the Public Order Agency (Satpol PP) in Batam.

By meeting the outer and inner model requirements, these results provide an empirical basis for entering into the scientific discussion in the discussion section, specifically regarding how the principles of legality, proportionality and protection interrelate in shaping enforcement actions that are testable, accountable and acceptable in the context of regional regulation enforcement in Batam.

Discussion

The finding that legality, proportionality and human rights protection significantly improve the quality of enforcement actions strengthens the argument that enforcement of regional regulations should be understood as a series of government actions that must be accountable, not simply operational enforcement activities. Within the framework of public accountability, the quality of actions is determined by the institution's ability to explain decisions, demonstrate their basis and process and provide space for evaluation by the forum (leadership, oversight mechanisms and the public). Conceptualizing accountability as an actor-forum relationship, with demands for answerability and enforceability, helps explain why legal indicators (compliance with SOPs, documentation and traceability of reasons) are significant predictors of the quality of enforcement actions. However, the debate is that the governance literature criticizes the tendency of administrative accountability to focus solely on the existence of documents, without ensuring the quality of reasons or the consistency of procedures. The findings of your model where legality has a positive but not dominant effect indicate that formal compliance needs to be complemented by a substantive dimension to prevent it from degenerating into symbolic compliance.

The results, which place proportionality as the strongest predictor, confirm that the balance between goals, means and impact largely determines the quality of enforcement. This

aligns with the proportionality test doctrine in modern administrative law, which assesses government actions through three layers of reasoning: the suitability of the goals, the need for the least undesirable alternative and the balancing of benefits and harms. The academic debate revolves around the position of proportionality: some view it as providing rational control over state coercive action, but critical views argue that balancing can give rise to subjective reasoning if not constrained by procedural standards and adequate evidence. In the context of regional regulation enforcement, your findings provide a measurable indicator: proportionality works as the quality of action when escalation is gradual, selecting the least effective measures and controlling social impact all of which can be tested through survey indicators and documentation.

The continued significant influence of protection/human rights reinforces the thesis that the legitimacy of enforcement depends not only on compliance with norms and operational efficiency, but also on standards of treatment of citizens (dignity, non-discrimination, prevention of excesses). Procedural justice literature explains that public compliance and cooperation are more stable when authorities act procedurally reasonably: transparently, providing an opportunity to be heard and demonstrating respect in interactions. The debate: some order-maintenance approaches emphasize firmness for deterrence and certainty, but the legitimacy approach asserts that coercive measures that ignore fairness actually increase resistance and complaints, thus reducing the quality of enforcement in the medium term. Our finding human rights protection has an influence, but less so than proportionality—can be read as an indicator that human rights standards are a significant legitimacy-boosting factor that significantly impacts the quality of interactions and social impact, although they often fall behind when operations are targeted and situations on the ground are tense.

Within the Indonesian literature on Public Order Agency (Satpol PP) practices, your findings are relevant to discussions regarding the multi-layered enforcement strategy (preventive, persuasive and repressive) and the challenges of procedural consistency in the field. Domestic studies highlight the importance of coaching/education as a first line of defense and suggest that firmness without procedural constraints risks creating conflict and questioning legitimacy. Meanwhile, legal studies also emphasize the Satpol PP's mandate for public order but underscore the potential problems when standards of protection and limits on the use of force are not accompanied by the authority to enforce them. Therefore, your article's contribution is to transform this normative debate into a measurable model: legality, proportionality and protection of human rights are not merely abstract principles, but are instead tested as determinants of the quality of enforcement actions using SEM-PLS.

Synthetically, the configuration of the results (X2 is the most dominant, followed by X1 and X3) implies a strong theoretical position: the quality of enforcement is most stable when enforcement meets two conditions simultaneously: the rationality of the intervention (proportionality) and the verifiability of the action (legality and protection). This closes the gap between firmness and humanism that often arises in practice, replacing it with a more defensible evaluation standard: an action is considered good if its objectives are clear, the methods are minimally effective, the impact is controlled and it can be accounted for to accountability forums and the public.

CONCLUSION

This study legality, proportionality and protection in Enforcement Operations by Satpol PP in Batam, Indonesia concludes that enforcement as an instrument of local-regulation implementation can only attain public legitimacy when it is grounded in strict legality, guided by measurable proportionality and supported by effective rights protection. While Satpol PP generally possesses a formal legal mandate to conduct public-order operations, the research finds persistent gaps at the procedural and accountability levels. In practice, the quality of prior notification, consistency in applying SOPs, evidentiary documentation and post-operation

review mechanisms are not uniformly implemented. These weaknesses generate interpretive discretion, legal uncertainty and recurring grievances from affected communities.

The proportionality principle has not consistently functioned as a practical decision test in enforcement actions. Across several observed and documented cases, escalation stages were insufficiently standardized, the least restrictive measure was not always prioritized and the use-of-force parameters were not translated into enforceable, auditable benchmarks. As a result, enforcement can be perceived as coercive and disproportionate to the objective of maintaining public order, especially when actions affect informal workers whose livelihoods depend on contested public spaces. Rights protection is the most critical deficit identified in this study, because mitigation and remedies often rely on ad hoc discretion rather than institutionalized safeguards. Access to complaints handling, mediation, relocation assistance, transition support, or reasonable restitution remains limited and uneven, particularly for vulnerable groups.

The implications underscore the need for governance reform that places due process at the core of enforcement: clear and timely notice, explicit legal grounds for action, adequate records and evidence trails and internal–external oversight that can be independently reviewed. The study recommends strengthening rights-based SOPs, institutionalizing proportionality and de-escalation training and integrating cross-agency protection mechanisms (social services, licensing authorities and local administrative units) so that enforcement does not end at removal or confiscation but also addresses social impacts fairly. Performance evaluation should move beyond counting operations and instead prioritize indicators of improved voluntary compliance, reduced conflict and fewer complaints. In doing so, Satpol PP can fulfill its public-order mandate while safeguarding citizens' rights, thereby improving trust and the overall quality of local governance in Batam.

REFERENCES

- Aaron Alelxander. (2023). Peran Masyarakat Dalam Penegakan Hukum di Indonesia. *IJOLARES: Indonesian Journal of Law Research*, 1(1), 11–15. <https://doi.org/10.60153/ijolares.v1i1.3>
- Alexy, R. (2018). Proportionality, constitutional law, and sub-constitutional law: A reply to Aharon Barak. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, 16(3), 871–879. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/moy084>
- Amiati, M., Adhryansah, A., & Prihandono, I. (2024). Human Rights Violations and Corporate Criminal Liability: An Analysis of the New Indonesian Criminal Law. *Sriwijaya Law Review*, 230–248. <https://doi.org/10.28946/slrev.Vol8.Iss2.3687.pp230-248>
- Barak, A. (2012). *Proportionality*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139035293>
- Bisariyadi, B. (2018). Penerapan Uji Proporsionalitas Dalam Kasus Pembubaran Partai Politik: Sebuah Perbandingan. *Jurnal Hukum Dan Pembangunan*, 48(1), 84–109. <https://doi.org/10.21143/jhp.vol.48.no.1.159>
- Cohen-Eliya, M., & Porat, I. (2014). Proportionality and Justification. *The University of Toronto Law Journal*, 64(3), 458–477.
- Crouch, M. (2019). The Judicial Reform Landscape in Indonesia. In *The Politics of Court Reform* (pp. 1–28). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108636131.001>
- Crouch, M. (2021). The Challenges for Court Reform after Authoritarian Rule: The Role of Specialized Courts in Indonesia. *Constitutional Review*, 7(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.31078/consrev711>
- Einar Himma, K., & Spinello, R. A. (2007). Intellectual property rights. *Library Hi Tech*, 25(1), 12–22. <https://doi.org/10.1108/07378830710735821>
- Gao, J., & Zhao, J. (2018). Legitimacy versus morality: Why do the Chinese obey the law? *Law and Human Behavior*, 42(2), 167–180. <https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000271>

- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., Danks, N. P., & Ray, S. (2021). *Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) Using R*. Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-80519-7>
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43(1), 115–135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8>
- Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2014 tentang Administrasi Pemerintahan, (2014).
- Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 16 Tahun 2018 tentang Satuan Polisi Pamong Praja, (2018).
- Koliba, C. (2025). Liberal democratic accountability standards and public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 85(1), 21–31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13831>
- Kusumawati, E. D. (2018). Between Public and Communal Interests: A Legality Issue Forced Evictions Occuring in Jakarta. *Indonesia Law Review*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.15742/ilrev.v8n1.384>
- Lailam, T., & Anggia, P. (2023). The Indonesian Constitutional Court Approaches the Proportionality Principle to the Cases Involving Competing Rights. *LAW REFORM*, 19(1), 110–127. <https://doi.org/10.14710/lr.v19i1.54087>
- Peraturan Menteri dalam Negeri Nomor 54 Tahun 2011 Tentang Standar Operasional Prosedur Satuan Polisi Pamong Praja, (2011). https://peraturan.go.id/id/permendagri-no-54-tahun-2011?utm_source=chatgpt.com
- Nurtjahyo, L. I. (2021). A Sociolegal Perspective to Legal Research in the Digital Field: A Methodological Proposition. *The Indonesian Journal of Socio-Legal Studies*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.54828/ijsls.2021v1n1.4>
- Pratiwi, C. S., Yulita, C., Fauzi, F., & Purnamawati, S. A. (2016). *Penjelasan Hukum Asas-Asas Umum Pemerintahan Yang Baik (AUPB)*. https://leip.or.id/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Penjelasan-Hukum-Asas-Asas-Umum-Pemerintahan-yang-Baik-Hukum-Administrasi-Negara.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com
- Prindani, T. A., Subandi, I., Hukom, M., & Putri, F. D. (2020). Human Rights and Law Enforcement: The Use of Force in Counter Terrorism. *Diponegoro Law Review*, 5(1), 124–139. <https://doi.org/10.14710/dilrev.5.1.2020.124-139>
- Putri, S. A., Triono, A., & Kasmawati, K. (2025). Diskresi Pejabat Administrasi Dalam Pelayanan Publik Terhadap Batasan dan Pengawasan Diskresi. *Lex Stricta*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.46839/lexstricta.v4i1.1427>
- Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., Sinkovics, N., & Sinkovics, R. R. (2023). A perspective on using partial least squares structural equation modelling in data articles. *Data in Brief*, 48, 109074. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2023.109074>
- Sanderson, C. A., & Darley, J. M. (2002). “I Am Moral, But You Are Deterred”: Differential Attributions About Why People Obey the Law 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32(2), 375–405. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2002.tb00221.x>
- Sarstedt, M., Hair, J. F., Pick, M., Liengaard, B. D., Radomir, L., & Ringle, C. M. (2022). Progress in partial least squares structural equation modeling use in marketing research in the last decade. *Psychology & Marketing*, 39(5), 1035–1064. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.21640>
- Simanjuntak, E. P. (2020). The Rise and The Fall of the Jurisdiction of Indonesia’s Administrative Courts: Impediments and Prospects. *Indonesia Law Review*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.15742/ilrev.v10n2.611>
- Sufriadi, Y. (2024). The progress of Indonesian law enforcement reform after 25 years of the reform movement. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 51(1), 28–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00927678.2023.2268491>
- Tyler, T. R. (2003). Procedural Justice, Legitimacy, and the Effective Rule of Law. *Crime and Justice*, 30, 283–357. <https://doi.org/10.1086/652233>
- Tyler, T. R. (2017). Methodology in Legal Research. *Utrecht Law Review*, 13(3), 130.

<https://doi.org/10.18352/ulr.410>

van Rooij, B., Fine, A., Shalvi, S., Feldman, Y., Scheper, E., Yunmei, W., Leib, M., Cheng, Q., & Wanhong, Z. (2024). The obligation to obey the law: exploring National Differences. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 82(2), 415–432.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10611-024-10148-8>