

Conflict Resolution, Prevention and Handling Public Information Disputes

Dini Agustina¹, Jamalullail², Arief Subhan³

Universitas Sahid, Indonesia^{1,2}, UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta³

Email : diniagustina.komunikasi@gmail.com, jamalullail@usahid.ac.id, arief.subhan@uinjkt.ac.id

KEYWORDS

conflicts, disputes, public
information

ABSTRACT

Conflicts over public information disputes have increased in the past three years. This study aims to analyze the process of information flow that occurs in information dispute conflicts and to analyze solutions to prevent and handle information dispute conflict problems. This study intends to analyze conflict resolution resolution of public information disputes in Indonesia using communication theory and conflict resolution theory in depth. The methodology in this research is qualitative method using library research method. Based on the results of the research analysis, it was concluded that the process of information flow that occurs in conflicts over public information disputes is hampered due to dissatisfaction from public information applicants with requests for information submitted from public bodies, because there are differences in perception. The solution to conflict prevention is increased awareness of the parties involved regarding rights and obligations related to public information, training and education on public information disclosure, formulation of clear policies on related Standard Operating Procedures and increased internal mediation between public bodies and information applicants. In addition, solutions for handling information dispute conflicts, in addition to mediation and adjudication in accordance with regulations, can be improved through increasing understanding of regulations regarding Public Information Disclosure and increasing the institutional capacity of the Information Commission.

Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-SA 4.0)



1. Introduction

In the last three years there has been an increase in conflicts over public information disputes. Based on data from the DKI Jakarta Information Commission, there are 117 public information dispute registers during 2023 and show the highest increase (Information Commission, 2023). Disputes or conflicts are the consequences caused by interactions between individuals as social beings (Fuada, 2020). Public Information Disputes in Law No. 14 of 2008 are disputes involving public bodies and information applicants related to the fulfillment of the rights of information applicants to obtain information (Harun & Jumarianto, 2022). This dispute occurs if the information requester does

not get the expected answer or response from a public body due to rejection from the relevant institution. This then becomes a conflict situation involving both parties (Tjoetra, 2020).

The Indonesian government regulates public information disputes in a law known as the Public Information Disclosure Law (UU KIP) Number 14 of 2008. The explanation and mechanism of procedures for resolving public information disputes that occur in Court have also been determined by the Government through Supreme Court Regulation Number 2 of 2011. The Public Information Dispute Resolution Procedure has also been regulated in Information Commission Regulation (PerKI) Number 1 of 2013, but the implementation of this dispute still occurs in Indonesia. According to the explanation in this regulation, the Public Agency must submit Information to the Public which is its authority. However, information cannot be provided if the information includes information that is confidential and excluded in accordance with the provisions. This regulation also states that information applicants have the right to receive Public Information in accordance with established regulations (Badar, Chandra, Bagus, Roberto, & Kuntji, 2023). This law is a milestone in realizing the enforcement of democracy because of freedom and openness of information (Dini Hartiningsih, 2018).

The short process that occurs in the process of requesting public information disclosure is usually the applicant comes or asks for the information needed to the relevant public body. The applicant will then be handled by the local Information and Documentation Management Officer (PPID), then later PPID provides information to the applicant. However, if the public body represented by the local PPID refuses to provide the requested information, then if the public information applicant is not satisfied with the information provided, the information applicant has the right to submit a written objection to the PPID of the public body (Shabrina, 2020). The PPID of the public body then responds to the written response from the applicant for public information within a maximum of 30 working days. If then the public information applicant is not satisfied with the response given by the PPID of the public body, then the applicant has the right to proceed with this dispute case to the central information commission. The central information commission will then mediate and resolve conflicts over such information disputes between public bodies represented by PPID and public information applicants. Based on the explanation of this process, it is known that this dispute over public information does not just occur. There is a long process from the request for public information to the public body, the submission of objections, the written response of the public body and only then the filing of a public information dispute. This is the concern of researchers who want to examine in depth the process of preventing public information disputes and the process of resolving them (Sjoraida, 2015).

Based on data from the Central Information Commission in the 2022 public information report, it is stated that a total of 98 public information disputes have been resolved (Yanti, 2022). Of the 98 public information dispute registers, 84 conducted adjudication processes, 8 mediation processes and 6 revocations. The resolution of public information disputes in 2022 is mostly resolved through Adjudication, but not all applications submitted by Applicants can be further processed by the Central Information Commission due to certain conditions. According to KIP Law No. 14 of 2008, there is a dispute resolution stage called adjudication which is a stage of dispute resolution handled by the information commission. Adjudication is the most widely pursued process in resolving this case. This dispute process can also be resolved through mediation and revocation channels because there are usually things or documents that are inadequate so that further processes cannot be carried out. Mediation is an alternative in resolving information disputes in Indonesia (Utama, Widiati, & Suryani, 2020). Later, the decision from the results of the mediation agreement at the Information Commission will be final and binding on both parties (Kurnia & Wibowo, 2023).

Data from the DKI Jakarta information commission in 2023 shows an increasing trend of public information disputes in Indonesia. This information dispute occurs due to dissatisfaction from the public who receive public information from a public body, so they file an information dispute lawsuit.

This increasing public information dispute must certainly be resolved immediately through conflict resolution solutions. There are several factors that cause conflicts in information disputes, namely differences in perception and differences in understanding of the regulations governing Public Information Openness, and differences in interests between public bodies and the public. This study will discuss conflict resolution solutions to public information disputes, so that it is expected to reduce the number of Public Information dispute applicants in Indonesia. This research will discuss the resolution of public information disputes using communication theory, namely communication information theory, which will then be analyzed using conflict resolution theory.

This study intends to analyze conflict resolution resolution of public information disputes in Indonesia using communication theory and conflict resolution theory in depth. Based on this, there are three formulations of research problems that will be discussed by researchers, namely how the process of information flow that occurs in information conflict conflicts between public bodies and public information applicants, how to prevent information dispute conflict problems and how to solve information dispute conflict problems. This study aims to analyze the process of information flow that occurs in information dispute conflicts and to analyze information dispute conflict problem prevention solutions and to analyze information dispute conflict problem resolution solutions.

Research on the topic of information dispute conflict is expected to provide theoretical benefits for science, namely contributing to the development of communication science, especially organizational communication and conflict resolution. The practical benefit of this information dispute research is that it is expected to be a reference material for government and private organizations in resolving information disputes. Through the results of this study, it is expected to be a contribution of thought for related organizations such as public bodies and information applicants or the public in resolving conflicts of information disputes that occur.

For this reason, the significance of this study is that this case of public information disputes needs to be resolved and analyzed according to communication theory so that researchers are interested in analyzing conflicts that occur in conflicts of public information disputes between public bodies and the public. The results in this study can later be used as a reference in resolving the conflict process of public information disputes using communication theory and conflict resolution approaches.

2. Materials and Methods

The methodology in information dispute research is a qualitative method with library research. This method is a data collection method carried out by understanding, studying and analyzing theories from various literature sources related to research on the topic of public information disputes chosen by researchers. There are four stages in the literature study used by researchers, namely first preparing the tools and materials needed in research, preparing a bibliography of work processes, organizing and managing time in reading or recording research materials (Adlini, Dinda, Yulinda, Chotimah, & Merliyana, 2022). The process of collecting data carried out by researchers is carried out by finding sources and constructing analyses from various sources such as various books, journals and previous research that has been carried out related to the topic studied. In the final stage, researchers conduct an in-depth analysis of library materials and sources obtained by researchers from various references to support propositions and ideas in research.

3. Result and Discussion

Analysis of Key Conflict Issues

The main issue in this study is the conflict of public information disputes caused by differences in perceptions between information applicants and public bodies regarding the right to public information. Information applicants are of the view that they have the right to obtain the information requested, while public bodies are of the view that they have the right to keep public information

confidential. This difference in perception stems from differences in understanding of the KIP Law. This regulation explains that everyone has the right to obtain information that is open to public consumption, except for information that is excluded. However, this regulation also explains that public bodies have the authority to refuse to provide public information if such information is excluded.

This difference in perception can give rise to conflicts between information applicants and public bodies. An information applicant may feel aggrieved because his right to obtain public information cannot be fulfilled, whereas a public body may feel aggrieved because his right to keep public information confidential is violated.

In the laws and regulations governing information disclosure, it is also explained that the process of solving information disputes can be done through mediation or adjudication processes. Through this settlement mechanism, the state seeks to provide protection to the constitutional rights of its citizens in the Law (Muhaimin, 2018). Mediation is an effort to resolve public information disputes by consensus, while adjudication is an effort to resolve conflicts over public information disputes through the courts. Mediation aims to reach an amicable agreement between the applicant and the public body. The resolution of this dispute through adjudication aims to obtain a court decision that can be used as a legal basis for both parties.

Analysis of the parties involved in the conflict

According to the Public Information Disclosure Law (UU KIP) No. 14 of 2008, the parties involved in conflicts over public information disputes are

- a. The party requesting information is known as the public information requester. This party is a citizen or legal entity in Indonesia. These applicants can be individuals, groups, legal entities, or public bodies that submit requests for public information to public bodies.
- b. Parties who provide information to the public or called public bodies. This body is a state administrator which can be an executive institution, legislative or judicial institution, or other bodies whose budget funds are sourced from the APBN and APBD. Public bodies can also be nongovernmental organizations whose funds are sourced from state funds, public donations, or abroad. These public bodies can be state institutions, non-ministerial government agencies, local government agencies, nonstructural institutions, state-owned enterprises, regional-owned enterprises, foundations, associations, organizations formed by communities, regional-owned enterprises, foundations, or associations.
- c. The Information Commission as an independent state-appointed institution that functions to carry out the process of public information disclosure according to the Law. This commission is tasked with preparing technical guidelines that regulate the reference to public information service standards and resolve public information disputes through mediation or non-litigation adjudication channels.

This conflict of information disputes occurs when the applicant feels that his right to obtain public information is denied. The applicant can then request a request for information made in writing or by electronic means to a public body. Public bodies are then required to provide public information to applicants within a maximum period of 15 working days from the receipt of their request for information. If the public body refuses to provide information, then the applicant can file an objection to the public body. If the direct supervisor of PPID of the public body still refuses to provide public information, the applicant can continue the dispute request process to the Information Commission (IC).

The Information Commission will then mediate to resolve public information disputes. If mediation is unsuccessful, the IP will issue recommendations to the public body to submit the requested public information. If the public body does not implement the recommendations of the IP, the applicant can proceed with the lawsuit case to the court. Differences in perceptions between information applicants and public bodies regarding the right to public information are the main

factors that cause conflicts in public information disputes. Applicants or the public are of the view that they have the right to obtain the information they need, while public bodies are of the view that they have the right to keep public information confidential.

Analysis of Organizational Information Theory

Organizational Information Theory, introduced by Karl Weick in the framework of Cybernetics thinking, provides insight into how organizations process and understand information, especially confusing and multiinterpretive information. In the context of conflicting public information disputes, this theory can provide valuable analysis of how organizations manage and understand information.

Organizations tend to interpret information in multiple interpretations, especially when the information is complex or ambiguous. For this reason, interpretation analysis and multiinterpretation in conflicts of public information disputes, Public Bodies and information applicants may have different understandings related to access rights, rejection criteria, or urgency of information. This creates multiple interpretations that can be a source of conflict.

Organizational information theory emphasizes the importance of creating shared meaning among organizational members to make sense of complex information. For this reason, analysis in the context of conflict, it is important for Public Bodies and information applicants to build a common understanding regarding rights and obligations in accordance with the KIP Law. This mutual understanding can reduce potential conflicts and increase transparency.

The concept of Organizational Information Theory highlights the importance of effective communication processes in managing information. For this reason, according to the researcher's analysis, communication between Public Bodies and applicants must be clear, open, and effective. Lack of good communication can create uncertainty and complicate conflict. Organizations are seen as systems that can adapt to changing information. For this reason, the researcher's analysis, in the context of information dispute conflicts, Public Bodies need to adapt to changes in the demands of information applicants or changes in legal interpretation related to information disclosure.

In Organizational Information Theory Concepts it discusses the way organizations manage the uncertainty and complexity of information. For this reason, according to the researcher's analysis, conflicts over public information disputes often arise because of uncertainties related to information management. Public bodies should have effective mechanisms in place to manage uncertainty, including the clear and prompt handling of requests for information. Using organizational information theory, conflict analysis of public information disputes can provide a deeper perspective on the role of interpretation, communication, adaptation, and management of uncertainty in organizational dynamics. The integration of these theoretical principles in the handling of public information can help prevent or resolve conflicts more effectively.

This difference in perception stems from differences in understanding of the KIP Law. Applicants for public information generally understand the KIP Law literally, namely that every individual has the right to obtain a required public information except confidential and exempt information. Meanwhile, public bodies generally understand the KIP Law contextually, namely that public bodies have the authority to refuse to provide public information if the information is excluded.

Based on the explanation of this theory, it can answer the formulation of the first problem regarding how the process of information flow that occurs in information dispute conflicts involving public bodies and information applicants, namely the process of information flow in public information dispute conflicts can be described as follows:

- a. The applicant requests or submits a request for the required information data to a public body.
- b. Public bodies accept requests for such information.
- c. Public bodies conduct an analysis of these requests for information.
- d. Public bodies convey or refuse to provide information to the applicant.
- e. If a public body refuses to provide a request for information, there is an obstacle in the flow of communication that has the potential to cause objections and disputes over information, so that

later the applicant can file an objection due to dissatisfaction in receiving information. This happens because of differences in perception between the applicant and public bodies.

This information flow process can occur through either direct or indirect processes. In the process of direct flow of information, the applicant submits a request for information directly to the public body. The public body then accepts the application and conducts an analysis. If such public information can be provided, then the public body will provide such information to the applicant for public information. If such public information cannot be provided, then the public body will refuse to provide such information. In the process of indirect flow of information, the applicant submits a request for information to a public body through the media, such as websites or other media. The public body then receives the request for public information through the medium. The public body then conducts analysis and provides public information to the applicant through the medium. Organizational information theory can be used to analyze the process of information flow in public information dispute conflicts. This theory emphasizes the importance of interpretive processes in understanding information. Based on the explanation of this theory, it is concluded that the flow of information that occurs in conflicts over public information disputes is hindered due to dissatisfaction from applicants with requests for information submitted by public bodies, because they are not in accordance with the perceptions and expectations of public information applicants.

In the context of conflicting public information disputes, interpretive processes can occur at various stages in the process of information flow. In the early stages, public information applicants interpret the public information they need. This interpretation is influenced by various factors, such as the public information applicant's understanding of the KIP Law, the interests of the public information applicant, and the public information applicant's worldview. At a later stage, public bodies interpret the requests for public information they receive. This interpretation is influenced by various factors, such as a public body's understanding of information regulations, the interests of public bodies, and the public body's worldview. At the last stage, applicants for public information carry out interpretations of the public information they receive from public bodies. This interpretation is influenced by various factors, such as the public information applicant's understanding of the KIP Law, the interests of the public information applicant, and the public information applicant's worldview.

According to the researcher's analysis, differences in interpretation between applicants and public bodies are a major factor resulting in conflicts over public information disputes. This difference in interpretation is caused by various factors, including:

- a. Differences in understanding of the KIP Law. Applicants and public bodies often have different understandings of the KIP Law.
- b. Differences in interests. Information applicants and public bodies often have different interests.

According to researchers, solutions to overcome conflicts over public information disputes according to this organizational information theory, efforts are needed to increase understanding of the KIP Law, both by public information applicants and by public bodies. In addition, efforts are also needed to improve the institutional capacity of the Information Commission (IC). This effort can be done through:

- a. Socialization and training of the KIP Law. Socialization and training of the KIP Law can be carried out by various parties, for example by the government, non-governmental organizations, or professional organizations.
- b. Institutional capacity building of the Information Commission (IC). IP can improve its institutional capacity through various activities, for example by collaborating with related agencies, both domestic and foreign agencies. By increasing understanding of the KIP Law and increasing the institutional capacity of IP, it is expected to prevent conflicts over public information disputes.

Analysis of Conflict Resolution Theory

Conflict resolution theory is a theory that discusses ways to resolve conflicts. This theory emphasizes the importance of cooperation and communication in resolving conflicts. According to (Deutsch et al., 2020), conflict resolution consists of constructive conflict resolution and destructive conflict resolution. Constructive conflict resolution is an effective cooperative problem-solving process. Conflict is a problem that is resolved together cooperatively. Destructive conflict resolution is a competitive process and leads to negativity because the conflicting parties engage in competition in determining who will win and lose.

Analysis of conflict resolution theory related to Public Information Dispute Conflict can be categorized as destructive conflict. This is due to differences in perceptions between information applicants and public bodies regarding the right to public information. This difference in perception causes both parties to compete with each other to achieve their respective goals. Information applicants seek to obtain the information they need, whereas public bodies seek to keep the public information in their possession confidential. According to the analysis of this theory, there are four stages of problem solving between organizational groups according to (Deutsch et al., 2020), namely the exchange of impressions, problem identification, compiling problem solving and problem solving.

The stage of exchange of impressions is the stage where both parties know and understand each other. Both sides strive to build trust and mutual respect. This stage involves the exchange of impressions among the Public Body, the information applicant, and other related parties. This exchange may include understanding each party's rights and obligations under the KIP Law, as well as exploring the purposes and interests underlying the request for information. Implication analysis in this stage i.e. building a shared awareness and understanding of different views and interests is a critical first step to creating a cooperative foundation in conflict resolution.

The second stage is problem identification, which is the stage where both parties try to understand the problem at hand. Both sides seek to see the issue from each other's perspective. Parties to the conflict need to clearly identify the issues at the core of the conflict. This includes an understanding of disagreements regarding access to information, denial of requests, or criteria for refusal of conflict. Implication analysis of this stage i.e. proper problem identification helps focus on the elements that need to be solved, minimizes the potential for irrelevant debates, and helps parties to work together in formulating solutions.

The third stage is to compile a problem solving. This stage is the stage where both parties try to find a solution to solve the problem. Both parties are trying to find a problem-solving solution that is acceptable to both parties. At this stage, the parties should work together to devise various troubleshooting options. This may involve exploring alternative resolutions, re-discussing rejection criteria, or improving the information-providing process. Analysis of the implications of this stage is that cooperative efforts in developing problem solving require open and collaborative communication between Public Bodies, information applicants, and other related parties.

The fourth stage is problem solving. This stage is the stage where both parties implement the agreed solution. The two sides are trying to work together to resolve the issue. At this stage, the parties must reach an agreement and implement a mutually agreed solution. This involves a commitment to implement necessary changes or improvements in terms of access to public information. Analysis of the implications of this stage is that mutual agreement is needed which must be supported by effective enforcement and monitoring mechanisms for public information disclosure. By applying the principles of this conflict resolution theory, this study seeks to provide a more holistic and cooperative view in dealing with conflicts of public information disputes, with the aim of achieving a fair and sustainable solution for all parties involved.

Information Dispute Conflict Prevention Analysis: Integration of Organizational Information Theory and Conflict Resolution Theory

Analysis of information dispute conflict prevention is needed to answer the formulation of the second research problem, namely on how to prevent information dispute conflict solutions. Researchers will try to analyze using communication theory, namely organizational information theory and conflict resolution theory, so that it will provide solutions to recommendations for conflict prevention of public information disputes.

Organizational Information Theory:

Information Management: Public bodies need to develop effective and transparent information management systems. This includes clear procedures for processing public requests for information and presenting information in a structured manner. The lack of information obtained by the public and the low dissemination of socialization regarding the explanation of information disclosure regulations for the public both to Public Bodies and the public are obstacles experienced by the Information Commission (Martina, Nasution, & Suyanto, 2020).

Effective Communication: Establish open and effective communication channels between Public Bodies and information applicants to prevent misunderstanding and multiinterpretation.

Conflict Resolution Theory:

Cooperation in Problem Identification: Public bodies and information requesters need to collaborate in identifying issues that may arise along with requests for information. This approach prevents conflict escalation by creating a common understanding from the outset.

Joint Problem Solving: It is a proactive measure to encourage Public Bodies and information applicants to work together in developing solutions to problems before conflicts become disputes. It encourages constructive participation and ongoing problem solving.

Analysis of Information Dispute Conflict Prevention Recommendations:

- a. **Awareness Raising:** Parties involved need to raise awareness about the rights and obligations related to public information, so that conflicts can be avoided through better understanding. This can be overcome by socialization and explanation of public information disclosure clearly to the public.
- b. **Training and Education:** Involves training for parties who have the potential to conflict public information disputes. So that they can understand the procedures, laws, and principles of conflict prevention. This can be done by increasing the competency of understanding Information and Documentation Management Officers (PPID) of public bodies so that they can have competence and understanding of good information education to the public.
- c. **Clear Policy Development:** Public bodies need to have clear and publicly accessible policies regarding the management of public information, including procedures for responding to requests and objections. For this reason, it is necessary to prepare Standard Operating Procedures regarding the information request process, objection submission process to the complete public information dispute complaint process which is disseminated through the website of the relevant public body.
- d. **Internal mediation in the process of submitting objections submitted by applicants to public bodies initiated by PPID local public bodies,** so that the process of requesting information does not continue to the information commission.

Through the application of the principles of organizational information theory and conflict resolution theory, efforts to prevent public information dispute conflicts can become more holistic and effective, involving related parties proactively in handling disagreements.

Information Dispute Conflict Handling Analysis

Conflicts over public information disputes can occur due to differences in perceptions between applicants and public bodies regarding the right to public information. This difference in perception is caused by various factors, such as differences in understanding the regulations of the

Law on Public Information Openness (UU KIP) and differences in interests. In preventing conflicts over public information disputes, efforts are needed to increase understanding of the KIP Law, both by applicants and by public bodies, so as to improve communication and cooperation between the two parties.

Analysis of Conflict Handling using Organizational Information Theory and Conflict Resolution Theory

Organizational information theory emphasizes the importance of interpretive processes in understanding information. In the context of public information dispute conflicts, interpretive processes can occur at various stages in the conflict resolution process. At the objection stage, both parties interpret the request for public information and respond to the objection. These differences in interpretation can cause conflicts over public information disputes to be resolved constructively. At the mediation stage, the mediator's role is to help both parties to understand each other's interpretations. The mediator also has a role to assist both parties in finding the right solution. At the litigation stage, the judge's role is to understand the interpretation of both parties. The judge also has a role to give a verdict that is fair and in accordance with regulations.

Conflict resolution theory emphasizes the importance of cooperation and communication in resolving conflicts. In the context of conflicts over public information disputes, cooperation and communication can help both parties to understand each other and find solutions to problems.

Explanations regarding conflict handling of public information disputes are regulated by law. Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 14 of 2008 states in Article 37 paragraph (1) that efforts to resolve public information disputes are submitted to the Information Commission in accordance with its authority. This happens if the response to the request for information from the PPID supervisor in the objection procedure does not satisfy the claimant. It is further explained that this settlement effort is submitted a maximum of 14 working days from the receipt of the written response.

Information disputes have been resolved through mediation and adjudication processes (Mustofa, 2020). This Dispute Resolution Procedure is mentioned in Information Commission Regulation Number 1 of 2013 which explains that mediation will be carried out by the Information Commission. Mediation is carried out a maximum of 60 working days from the receipt of the application. After that, if it continues, Adjudication will be carried out. If mediation is unsuccessful, then the next step is through adjudication. Adjudication is a stage in the resolution of Public Information Disputes between the parties involved in the trial, the results of which will be determined and decided by the Information Commission. If it cannot be resolved, the public information dispute process can continue through the PTUN court and can continue until cassation legal efforts in the Supreme Court (Shabrina, 2020).

Analysis of Recommendations for Handling Public Information Dispute Conflicts

Here are some recommendations to improve the effectiveness of conflict handling of public information disputes:

- a. Increasing the same understanding of the Law governing Public Information Disclosure can help both parties to understand each other's rights and obligations, so as to have a common perception and view of information that can and cannot be given to the public.
- b. Improve the institutional capacity of the Information Commission. The Information Commission needs to have sufficient capacity to resolve conflicts of public information disputes effectively and efficiently through the implementation of fair handling of information disputes for both parties.

Based on the analysis above, conclusions can be drawn on recommendations for preventing and handling cases of public information disputes can be seen in the following table:

Table 1 Prevention and Handling of information dispute conflicts

Theory Analysis	Prevention Solutions Information Dispute Conflict	Handling Solutions Information Dispute Conflict
Organizational Information Theory	Public bodies need to develop effective and transparent information management systems and establish open and effective communication channels between Public Bodies and information applicants to prevent incomprehension and multiinterpretation.	Improved effective communication in the mediation and adjudication process in accordance with laws and regulations.
Conflict Resolution Theory	Increased awareness from the parties involved regarding rights and obligations related to public information, Training and Education on public information disclosure, formulation of clear Policies on related Standard Operating Procedures and increased internal mediation involving public bodies and information applicants.	Increased understanding of regulations concerning Public Information and increased the institutional capacity of the Information Commission to resolve dispute conflicts effectively and efficiently.

4. Conclusion

Public information dispute conflicts can be resolved constructively through a cooperative problem-solving process using organizational information theory analysis and conflict resolution theory. These two theories are then associated with Government regulations regarding Public Information Disclosure (PID) and Government Regulations regarding Public Information Dispute Resolution Procedures.

Based on the results of the research analysis, it was concluded that the process of information flow that occurs in information dispute conflicts is hampered due to dissatisfaction from information applicants with requests for information provided by public bodies, because they are not in accordance with the perceptions and expectations of public information applicants. For this reason, the solution to preventing information dispute conflicts is to increase awareness of the parties involved in information disputes regarding rights and obligations related to public information, training and education on public information disclosure, formulation of clear policies on related Standard Operating Procedures and increased internal mediation between public bodies and information applicants. In addition, solutions for handling information dispute conflicts, in addition to mediation and adjudication in accordance with regulations, can be improved through increasing understanding of regulations regarding public information and increasing the institutional capacity of the Information Commission.

5. References

- Adlini, Miza Nina, Dinda, Anisya Hanifa, Yulinda, Sarah, Chotimah, Octavia, & Merliyana, Sauda Julia. (2022). Metode penelitian kualitatif studi pustaka. *Edumaspul: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 6(1), 974–980.
- Badar, Hibza Meiridha, Chandra, Joemarthine, Bagus, Sujoko, Roberto, Rico, & Kuntji, A. Kori. (2023). ANALISA HUKUM TERHADAP KEWENANGAN KOMISI INFORMASI DALAM PENYELESAIAN SENGKETA INFORMASI DI PROVINSI SUMATERA SELATAN. *Lexstricta: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 1(3), 179–196.
- Deutsch, Eric W., Bandeira, Nuno, Sharma, Vagisha, Perez-Riverol, Yasset, Carver, Jeremy J., Kundu, Deepti J., García-Seisdedos, David, Jarnuczak, Andrew F., Hewapathirana, Suresh, & Pullman, Benjamin S. (2020). The ProteomeXchange consortium in 2020: enabling 'big data' approaches in proteomics. *Nucleic acids research*, 48(D1), D1145–D1152.
- Dini Hartiningsih, Helfi Agustin. (2018). *Kemitraan berbasis masjid: efektifitas pemutaran compact disc "sehat jiwa raga" dalam mempromosikan perilaku hidup bersih dan sehat*.
- Fuada, Izza Hasna. (2020). Penyelesaian Sengketa Antara Pekerja Dan Perusahaan Tentang Hak Atas Informasi. *JCH (Jurnal Cendekia Hukum)*, 5(2), 213–230.
- Harun, Tamliha, & Jumarianto, Jumarianto. (2022). PELAKSANAAN MEDIASI SENGKETA INFORMASI PUBLIK DI KOMISI INFORMASI PROVINSI KALIMANTAN SELATAN. *AS-SIYASAH: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Ilmu Politik*, 7(2), 69–77.
- Kurnia, Nilam, & Wibowo, Arif. (2023). Penyelesaian Sengketa Informasi Publik Perspektif Di Peradilan Tata Usaha Negara Di Indonesia: Komisi Informasi, Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara, Penyelesaian Sengketa Informasi Sinkronisasi. *Jurnal Penelitian Multidisiplin*, 2(1), 34–39.
- Martina, Urai Sri, Nasution, Belli, & Suyanto, Suyanto. (2020). Strategi Komunikasi Komisioner Komisi Informasi Provinsi Riau dalam Menyelesaikan Kasus Sengketa Informasi. *Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi (JKMS)*, 9(1), 412–431.
- Muhaimin, Muhaimin. (2018). Penguatan Penyelenggaraan Pelayanan Publik melalui Penyelesaian Sengketa Informasi Publik. *Jurnal Ilmiah Kebijakan Hukum*, 12(2), 213–226.
- Shabrina, Tita. (2020). Analisis Yuridis Dasar Pertimbangan Hakim Dalam Penyelesaian Sengketa Informasi Publik (Studi Putusan PTUN Nomor 2/G/KI/2016/PTUN-JKT). *NOVUM: JURNAL HUKUM*, 7(4).
- Sjoraida, Diah Fatma. (2015). Implementasi Kebijakan Keterbukaan Informasi Publik Pada Pemerintah Provinsi Jawa Barat. *Sosiohumaniora*, 17(3), 204–212.
- Tjoetra, Afrizal. (2020). PENYELESAIAN SENGKETA INFORMASI PUBLIK SEBAGAI PENDEKATAN PENGELOLAAN KONFLIK DALAM MASYARAKAT. *Jurnal Sosiologi Pendidikan Humanis*, 5(1), 10–23.
- Utama, I. Made Bayu Ari Budi, Widiati, Ida Ayu Putu, & Suryani, Luh Putu. (2020). Mekanisme Penyelesaian Sengketa Informasi Publik di Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara Denpasar. *Jurnal Preferensi Hukum*, 1(2), 93–98.
- Yanti, Herma. (2022). Implementasi Penyelesaian Sengketa Informasi Publik pada Komisi Informasi Provinsi Jambi. *Wajah Hukum*, 6(2), 453–461.