

The Integration of Governance Theory in the Development of Equitable Legal Policies

Safaruddin Harefa

Universitas Tanjungpura, Pontianak. Indonesia

Correspondence: safaruddinharefa@hukum.untan.ac.id



Received: November 4, 2025 | Revised: November 20, 2025 | Accepted: November 30, 2025



<https://doi.org/10.69812/jgs.v2i3.188>

ABSTRACT

This study addresses the limitations of state-centric legal systems in responding to increasingly complex social, political, and institutional challenges, which often result in legal policies that are formally valid but substantively unjust. It aims to explain how the systematic integration of governance principles can strengthen the legitimacy, fairness, and effectiveness of legal policymaking. Employing a normative juridical method, the research analyzes legislation, policy documents, jurisprudence, and scholarly works using statute, conceptual, and comparative approaches to examine how transparency, participation, accountability, and the rule of law are embedded in the formulation and implementation of legal policies. The findings show that when governance principles guide lawmaking, legal policy shifts from a unilateral exercise of state authority to a participatory and collaborative process involving multiple actors, thereby enhancing legal certainty, protecting public interests, and promoting social justice. The analysis also reveals that governance based mechanisms such as public consultation, judicial review, independent oversight bodies, and open-data regulations help reduce principal agent problems, curb corruption risks, and align legal outcomes with societal expectations. The study concludes that legal systems are better able to meet societal needs, maintain public trust, and support equitable development when governance principles are consistently institutionalized throughout the policy cycle, from agenda setting and drafting to implementation and evaluation, positioning governance theory as a foundational paradigm for designing responsive, accountable, and sustainable legal frameworks.

Keyword: Accountability, Governance, Legal Policy, Participation



INTRODUCTION

The formulation of legal policies has traditionally centered on state authority and statutory legitimacy, yet contemporary governance challenges reveal that legality alone does not guarantee justice or equity. Although laws serve as tools to regulate society and uphold constitutional values, they often fall short in addressing structural inequalities, public distrust, and the misuse of power. Legal systems that neglect transparency, participation, and accountability risk becoming

instruments of domination rather than justice (Iristian, 2024). This gap indicates the need to reconceptualize legal policymaking through the lens of governance theory, which emphasizes the process of decision-making and the manner in which decisions are implemented for the public good.

While previous studies have examined good governance in public administration (Pomeranz & Stedman, 2020), regulatory complexity and legal uncertainty (Wahyudi et al., 2024), and the relationship between rule-of-law principles and institutional accountability (Bimantara & Salman, 2025), these works tend to treat governance and legal policymaking as parallel but separate fields. Very few studies develop an explicit conceptual model showing how governance principles structurally shape the formulation of equitable legal policies. This article fills that gap by offering an integrated framework that positions transparency, participation, accountability, and rule of law as core determinants of justice-oriented legal policies. This conceptual integration represents the article's originality compared to prior scholarship, which has not systematically connected governance theory with normative legal design.

Governance, as defined by the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP), refers to the process of decision-making and the process by which decisions are implemented. Good governance, therefore, is governance that embodies transparency, accountability, participation, responsiveness, effectiveness, equity, and adherence to the rule of law. However, these principles remain inconsistently embedded within legal policy frameworks. In Indonesia and many other jurisdictions, governance structures still struggle with overlapping regulations, legal uncertainty, corruption risks, and limited civic participation (Pomeranz & Stedman, 2020; Wahyudi et al., 2024). Legal frameworks may be enacted, but without governance values, they fail to ensure justice, inclusiveness, and public legitimacy.

The urgency of integrating governance principles into legal policy is further reinforced by the critical role of the rule of law. Rule of law ensures that power is exercised based on legal norms rather than arbitrary will and protects fundamental rights through legal mechanisms. Yet breaches of the rule of law such as policy decisions driven by political interests, weak institutional oversight, or the absence of meaningful public consultation undermine both governance and legal justice. Scholars argue that governance cannot be considered "good" if it only complies procedurally with the law but fails to protect human dignity, equality, and accountability (Bimantara & Salman, 2025). Thus, equitable legal policy requires more than compliance; it demands ethical legitimacy, institutional integrity, and societal participation.

Despite the global recognition of good governance principles, their integration into legal policymaking remains fragmented and often superficial. Policy formulation is frequently conducted behind closed doors, public participation is treated as procedural formality, and accountability mechanisms are weak or politically influenced. Meanwhile, corruption, administrative inefficiency, and elite-driven decisions continue to erode trust in legal institutions (Utami et al., 2024). These conditions reveal a systemic gap between normative legal frameworks and governance-based approaches, demonstrating why law must not only regulate but also reflect fairness, inclusiveness, and public responsibility.

This article responds to these challenges by proposing governance theory as a foundational paradigm for developing equitable legal policies. It argues that integrating principles such as transparency, participation, accountability, and rule of law is essential to transforming legal systems from authority-centered to justice-centered frameworks. The first section explores the Theoretical

Foundations of Governance in Shaping Legal Policies, focusing on the evolution of governance theory and its relevance to legal development. The second section presents Policy Analysis and the Integration of Governance Principles in Equitable Legal Frameworks, examining how these principles can be operationalized in legislative processes, institutional practices, and public policy design.

By positioning governance as both a theoretical lens and practical framework, this study aims to bridge the divide between law and justice, state and society, authority and accountability. It seeks to demonstrate that equitable legal policies can only emerge when lawmaking is not merely a statutory exercise but a participatory, transparent, and ethically governed process aligned with public welfare. In doing so, it contributes to academic debates and practical discourse on how governance theory can guide the creation of legal systems that are not only valid in form but also fair in substance.

Accordingly, this study pursues two main objectives: (1) to analyze how governance principles transparency, participation, accountability, and rule of law can be integrated into the formulation of equitable legal policies; and (2) to develop a conceptual framework that links governance theory with normative legal policymaking. To achieve these aims, the research addresses the following guiding questions: (a) In what ways do contemporary legal-policy processes fall short of governance principles? (b) How can governance theory provide a conceptual basis for designing equitable legal policies? and (c) What governance-based mechanisms can strengthen fairness, legitimacy, and accountability in legal policymaking? These objectives and questions structure the analysis presented in the subsequent sections.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a normative juridical research method that focuses on examining legal principles, statutory regulations, legal doctrines, and relevant jurisprudence (Negara, 2023). The selection of legal materials was conducted using clear and systematic criteria: (1) a time frame of 2010–2024, reflecting a period of intensified governance-oriented legal reforms; (2) Indonesia as the primary jurisdiction, complemented by comparative references to jurisdictions with advanced governance frameworks such as the United Kingdom, Australia, and South Korea; and (3) specific types of documents, including legislation, government regulations, ministerial regulations, official policy papers, international governance instruments, and domestic as well as international court decisions. Secondary materials such as academic books, peer-reviewed articles, legal commentaries, and institutional reports (e.g., OECD, UNDP) were selected for their relevance, credibility, and contribution to governance-based legal analysis.

The analysis was operationalized using a statute approach, to interpret and evaluate the content and structure of governing laws; a conceptual approach, to connect legal norms with theoretical foundations of governance and justice; and a comparative approach, to assess similarities, differences, and potential lessons from other jurisdictions. Qualitative juridical analysis was employed to interpret legal texts, identify normative gaps, assess policy coherence, and evaluate whether existing legal frameworks reflect governance principles such as transparency, accountability, participation, and the rule of law (Al Amaren et al., 2020). No human participants were involved; thus, ethical considerations were limited to maintaining academic integrity, proper citation, and the avoidance of plagiarism. This methodological design ensures analytical rigor and provides a

robust foundation for proposing theoretically grounded and legally justifiable policy recommendations.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Theoretical Foundations of Governance in Shaping Legal Policies

The development of legal policies in modern states is increasingly shaped by the transformation of governance from hierarchical state authority toward cooperative, network-based regulation. Governance does not position the state as the sole creator of law, but as one actor among multiple institutions interacting in policy formulation. Law becomes an outcome of negotiated authority rather than unilateral state command. This shift reflects the limitations of traditional government, which relies on command-and-control, bureaucratic structures, and positivist legal doctrines detached from social complexity (International Panel on Social Progress (IPSP), 2018; Mansouri & Quiroga-Villamarín, 2025). Previous studies tend to focus either on normative principles of good governance or on proceduralism in law, without analyzing how these frameworks collide in practice. For example, procedurally valid law may lack social legitimacy if it excludes public participation. This article addresses that gap by exploring how governance theory can guide legal policymaking toward justice-centered outcomes rather than mere compliance with authority.

Table 1. Comparison Between Legal Positivism and Governance Theory

No	Aspect	Legal Positivism	Governance Theory
1	Source of Authority	State-centered	Multi-actor, distributed
2	Decision Model	Command and control	Negotiation and collaboration
3	Legitimacy Basis	Procedural validity	Public participation & discourse
4	Policy Style	Hierarchical	Network-based

Source: (Kamil, 2025)

The table comparing key aspects of Legal Positivism and Governance Theory should be further optimized by adding a clear source note either referencing specific literature or indicating that the table is the author's own construction. Each term in the columns, such as source of authority, decision model, legitimacy basis, and policy style, should be briefly defined or explained in the text to ensure conceptual clarity for readers. The accompanying narrative should also interpret the most important insights from the table, such as the shift from state-centered authority to multi-actor governance or the transition from command-and-control decision-making to more collaborative and participatory models, rather than merely restating the table's contents.

Theoretical foundations of governance stem from political science and legal theory, evolving in response to the inadequacies of classical paradigms. Traditional legal positivism, influenced by thinkers such as John Austin and Hans Kelsen, focuses on law as a sovereign command or a norm hierarchy. Governance theory challenges this by suggesting that authority is no longer monopolized by the state but is distributed across multiple centers. Rhodes conceptualizes this as a move from "government" to "governance," where state power is fragmented into networks of interdependence (Fanani & Zulkarnain, 2022).

In legal policy terms, this requires moving beyond a monolithic lawmaking process to one grounded in deliberation, participation, and accountability. Law becomes a living instrument shaped through dialogue, rather than a static directive from centralized authorities. Central to this transformation is the emergence of participatory legitimacy, which emphasizes that laws acquire

authority not only through formal enactment but through meaningful public engagement. Habermas strengthens this by introducing discourse ethics arguing that legal norms gain validity when they arise from inclusive and rational public discourse (Guzman, 2007; Nurcahya, 2025). Thus, governance emphasizes that legal rules must be socially justifiable, ensuring both procedural soundness and ethical endorsement. The rule of law acts as the foundational structure for governance-oriented legal policies, supporting mechanisms that enable participation, transparency, and accountability to function effectively. These principles ensure that law operates as a socially embedded instrument rather than a mere command (Hutauruk, 2025; Webber, 2024). Together, they transform law from a mere command to a socially embedded process.

Table 2. Governance Mechanisms for Reducing Principal-Agent Problems

No	Mechanism	Purpose	Example
1	Transparency laws	Reducing information asymmetry	Open government data
2	Public consultation	Preventing moral hazard	Legislative hearings
3	Judicial oversight	Ensuring legality	Constitutional review
4	Independent commissions	Monitoring decisions	Anti-corruption agencies

Source: (Humah, 2025)

Governance theory also draws on principal-agent models, originally developed in corporate governance but increasingly relevant to legal policy. Citizens are the principals, delegating authority to state actors as agents. This delegation risks moral hazard, information asymmetry, and self-serving decisions. Legal policies may be drafted not to serve public interests but to secure political advantage, economic control, or bureaucratic convenience. Governance responds by embedding mechanisms of oversight judicial review, transparency laws, public consultations, independent commissions, and civil society monitoring (Hendrastuti & Harahap, 2023; Ul Musawir, 2024). These reduce the distance between the governed and the governing, aligning legal policy with societal expectations.

Unlike classical legal formalism, governance theory recognizes that law operates within socio-political environments shaped by negotiation, power, and institutional dynamics. Law is not created in isolation but is influenced by external pressures economic globalization, human rights discourses, environmental concerns, and digital transformation (Lorenz et al., 2024). This demands a flexible approach where legal policymaking integrates ethical considerations, empirical realities, and participatory frameworks. Governance transitions law from a top-down structure to a responsive and reflexive mechanism capable of addressing complex challenges.

The relationship between governance and equity is crucial in legal policymaking. Law should not only regulate but also correct inequalities and uphold justice. Governance contributes to equity by demanding inclusiveness particularly the involvement of marginalized communities in policymaking. By prioritizing equitable engagement, governance ensures that legal policies incorporate diverse social perspectives rather than privileging dominant interests (Akinbi, 2025). For example, policies on land use, criminal justice, or digital surveillance may disproportionately harm vulnerable groups if deliberation is limited to political elites. Governance requires that voices from different social strata not only those in power shape legal policies. This produces laws that are more socially legitimate and ethically justified (Onyeaka et al., 2024).

Mechanisms of participation are essential to operationalize these principles. Public hearings, stakeholder forums, civil society submissions, and digital consultations provide spaces where legal norms are debated and refined. Such mechanisms integrate experiential knowledge and community priorities into lawmaking, fostering policies that are responsive and legitimate (Hendriks, 2012; Whitley, 2024). Transparency supports governance by limiting secrecy and enhancing public trust. Open legislative processes, accessible policy drafts, and visible governmental decisions mitigate opportunities for corruption and mismanagement, while reinforcing the credibility of law.

Accountability ensures that institutions remain answerable for their actions. Beyond formal compliance, governance extends accountability to ethical responsibility, responsiveness, and correction of errors. Independent institutions and judicial oversight strengthen these checks, ensuring that public power aligns with societal interests (Bovens et al., 2008; Frosio & Geiger, 2023). Especially in contemporary democracies, accountability is no longer confined to state organs but extends to private actors involved in regulation such as social media platforms, multinational corporations, and financial institutions.

The infusion of governance theory into legal policymaking also redefines the role of institutions. Parliaments, courts, administrative agencies, and international bodies interact in a polycentric legal order. Governance coordinates these multiple actors through guiding norms, including rule of law, proportionality, subsidiarity, and public reasoning, preventing fragmentation and fostering policy coherence. A multidimensional understanding of governance reshapes the function of legal institutions by situating them not as unilateral decision-makers but as facilitators of coordinated action. Courts operate not merely as interpreters but as evaluators of policy rationality and guardians of constitutional values, while administrative agencies combine expertise with participatory accountability to implement adaptive regulations (Buchan et al., 2023; Mendy & Sarr, 2025). Nonetheless, judicial authority must remain disciplined by constitutional limits to avoid judicial supremacy, which would displace participatory lawmaking processes.

Administrative agencies embody another crucial element in governance-centric legal policy. Their expertise and proximity to societal issues enable them to formulate, implement, and evaluate regulations more dynamically than parliaments. However, this also introduces concerns of bureaucratic autonomy and technocratic dominance. Governance counters these risks by mandating procedural safeguards: impact assessments, stakeholder consultations, periodic review of regulations, and judicial oversight (Umasugi, 2025). These practices ensure that administrative regulations remain anchored to legality, transparency, and public benefit. Agencies thus transform from insulated bureaucracies to accountable regulatory bodies interlinked with democratic norms.

Globalization intensifies the relevance of governance in shaping legal policy. Transnational challenges such as climate change, cybercrime, financial crises, and migration cannot be resolved within isolated national legal frameworks. International organizations, treaties, and soft law instruments increasingly influence domestic policy structures. Governance thus facilitates harmonization between domestic law and global norms while preserving national constitutional identity (Ip, 2011). Legal policies are then crafted not as insular instruments but as components of a broader regulatory ecosystem.

Digital transformation further accelerates the need for governance in legal policymaking. AI, big data, and algorithmic governance require adaptive legal frameworks that integrate technical, ethical, and participatory elements to safeguard rights and equality (Onoja et al., 2021). For example, algorithmic

transparency, data protection frameworks, and human rights impact assessments become critical in safeguarding autonomy, privacy, and equality. Legal policies in the digital era thus require a fusion of normative doctrine, technical knowledge, and participatory input to ensure accountability in non-human decision systems (Hakimi et al., 2025).

Corruption undermines governance and distorts legal policies by redirecting laws to serve private interests. Strengthening integrity systems including asset declarations, whistleblower protection, and transparent procurement aligns legal practice with public trust, demonstrating convergence of rule of law and governance principles (Bhandari, 2023). When governance and legal enforcement converge, policy becomes a tool to dismantle patronage networks and restore public trust.

In contexts where democratic institutions are fragile, legal policies shaped by governance theory contribute to stabilizing political order. They distribute power, prevent authoritarian consolidation, and foster legal resilience. Decentralization, coordination mechanisms, and intergovernmental dialogue ensure effective implementation while balancing local autonomy with national coherence (Abou Ltaif & Mihai-Yiannaki, 2024). However, decentralization without governance principles can lead to fragmented legal systems or local elite domination. Thus, mechanisms for coordination, monitoring, and intergovernmental dialogue become essential.

An evolving dimension of governance theory in legal policymaking is reflexivity. Legal systems are designed to learn and adapt, incorporating societal feedback, empirical evidence, and judicial interpretation to continuously improve policy outcome. This stands in contrast to rigid legal positivism, which treats laws as static commands. Reflexivity positions governance as a dynamic process rather than a fixed structure, enhancing law's ability to respond to uncertainty, crises, and pluralistic demands.

The principle of proportionality emerges as a crucial doctrinal instrument within governance-oriented legal policy. It ensures that legal restrictions are justified, suitable, and balanced relative to their objectives, preserving individual freedoms while achieving public goals. Proportionality supports governance by requiring reasoned justification, evidence-based policymaking, and continuous assessment of less restrictive alternatives. This elevates the quality of legal reasoning while preserving individual freedoms.

In multi-level governance systems, such as the European Union, policymaking involves interaction among supranational institutions, national governments, and local authorities. Legal policies must align with overarching treaties, constitutional principles, and regional contexts. This layered structure of authority necessitates cooperation, subsidiarity, and mutual recognition. Governance theory explains how legal norms travel across jurisdictions, evolve through dialogue, and achieve coherence without absolute centralization. This challenges traditional notions of sovereignty but enhances legal innovation and adaptability.

Ultimately, governance in legal policymaking is not merely a procedural ideal but a substantive reorientation of how power, law, and society interact. It requires institutions to justify decisions, incorporate diverse voices, and remain accountable to constitutional and ethical standards. Law is repositioned as a dynamic and collectively constructed framework, integrating ethical, institutional, and participatory considerations. To strengthen the theoretical foundation and provide a clearer basis for subsequent policy analysis, this article adopts an integrated analytical framework that synthesizes key governance principles

transparency, accountability, participation, and the rule of law into a coherent model for assessing equitable legal policymaking. In this framework:

- a. Transparency functions as an enabling condition that ensures open access to information and reduces asymmetry between policymakers and the public;
- b. Participation transforms transparency into deliberative engagement by allowing affected groups to contribute knowledge, preferences, and critiques;
- c. Accountability operates as a control mechanism that evaluates whether decision-makers justify their actions, correct errors, and remain answerable to legal and public standards; and
- d. The rule of law provides normative boundaries that guarantee legality, proportionality, and protection of rights.

These principles are mutually reinforcing: transparency enables participation; participation enhances legitimacy; legitimacy underpins accountability; and accountability maintains alignment with the rule of law. This analytical framework will guide the interpretation of policy cases and tables presented in the subsequent sections.

2. Policy Analysis and Integration of Governance Principles in Equitable Legal Frameworks

Policymaking in contemporary legal systems is no longer a linear exercise of state authority but a negotiation between competing interests, institutional mandates, and societal expectations. Governance reshapes legal policy by embedding transparency, accountability, participation, and equity, ensuring that decisions are informed by collective input rather than imposed unilaterally. These principles challenge traditional state-centric policymaking, which often treats laws as instruments of control rather than frameworks of justice (Bernstein et al., 2025).

The shift introduces a more inclusive method of designing policies that balance power, guarantee legal certainty, and prevent marginalization. Within this structure, law becomes a bridge between authority and society, requiring that decisions be justified, contestable, and aligned with public welfare. Public policy decisions are frequently influenced by political incentives, bureaucratic behavior, and elite interests. This creates a distance between the objectives of legal frameworks and the realities experienced by citizens.

The politics of policymaking demonstrate that legal outcomes are frequently shaped by negotiations, institutional resistance, or informal networks rather than rational legal principles. Governance principles address these gaps by embedding mechanisms of scrutiny and inclusive oversight such as public consultations, stakeholder hearings, judicial review, freedom of information, and ethical codes ensuring that legal policies reflect public interest and constitutional values (Radtke & Renn, 2024).

Embedding governance in legal frameworks requires proportionality and fairness to be central in policymaking. This extends beyond procedural correctness and requires governments to justify why a certain rule is necessary, whether it respects fundamental rights, and whether alternative measures could achieve the same objective with less restriction. Courts in many jurisdictions apply proportionality to measure whether legal policies are coercive or balanced. This integration ensures that regulatory frameworks remain just and evidence-based, avoiding arbitrary or excessive interventions (Cottier et al., 2017).

Participation stands at the core of governance-based legal policymaking. Communities affected by legislation are no longer passive recipients but co-creators of legal norms. Public hearings, digital participatory platforms,

community deliberations, and expert consultations enrich the policymaking process with empirical knowledge and ethical insight. In contexts where policymaking excludes civil society, legal frameworks tend to reflect narrow interests and provoke resistance. Conversely, when laws are formulated through dialogue between government and society, they are more likely to be implemented effectively and respected voluntarily (Lawton & Macaulay, 2013).

Active citizen involvement transforms compliance from mere obligation into voluntary adherence, strengthening societal trust in legal institutions. Accountability binds policymakers to the outcomes of their decisions. It is not limited to criminal or administrative liability but extends to moral and institutional responsibility. Legislative bodies must justify why laws are necessary; executives must implement them in line with constitutional mandates; and courts must ensure that they remain within the boundaries of legality. Accountability is reinforced by independent institutions such as audit bodies, ombudsman commissions, and anti-corruption agencies. These institutions provide external checks and monitor whether public power remains tethered to public interest. Without accountability, governance loses its corrective function, and legal frameworks risk being exploited for patronage, rent-seeking, or authoritarian consolidation.

Transparency complements accountability by unveiling policymaking to public scrutiny. Legal frameworks grounded in governance principles require openness not only in the publication of laws but in the entire regulatory process agenda setting, drafting, consultation, enforcement, and judicial review. Transparency exposes the reasoning behind policy choices, the data used, and the actors involved (Licht et al., 2014). It also enables civil monitoring by journalists, academics, and civil society. When transparency is absent, policy decisions can be driven by lobbying or informal influence, distorting equity and fairness. Therefore, open access to information transforms legal policy from secretive negotiations into a public act of responsibility (Isbandono et al., 2025).

Equity is the central measure of whether governance principles have been successfully integrated into legal policy. Legal systems must not only provide equality before the law but also address structural disparities that prevent fair access to justice. Policies in land rights, welfare distribution, criminal justice, environmental regulation, and digital governance often disproportionately harm vulnerable groups when equity is not prioritized (Jitmau et al., 2025). Governance responds by promoting inclusive representation and distributive justice in legal policymaking. This ensures that minority groups, indigenous peoples, women, and economically marginalized communities can influence laws that affect their lives. Equity redefines the goal of policy not only to regulate but to repair historical imbalances (Syuib, 2025).

Digital transformation creates new legal challenges that require governance-based frameworks. Data protection, algorithmic decision-making, cybersecurity, and digital identity systems pose risks to privacy, autonomy, and non-discrimination. Traditional legal drafting is often slow and reactive, unable to anticipate rapid technological shifts. Governance offers a solution by promoting adaptive regulation, interdisciplinary policymaking, ethical AI standards, and participatory technology governance. Legal frameworks for data integration in public institutions, for instance, must respect privacy rights while enabling efficiency. This requires clear consent mechanisms, data stewardship, transparency in algorithmic processes, and independent supervisory authorities. When governance principles structure digital policies, technological innovation aligns with human dignity.

The integration of governance principles in legal frameworks becomes critical when addressing policy failures rooted in centralized decision-making and bureaucratic rigidity. In many jurisdictions, legal norms are drafted without adequate social mapping, resulting in laws that are technically valid but practically ineffective. Governance-oriented policymaking demands comprehensive assessment of societal needs before regulation is implemented. Policy instruments must be based on empirical data, stakeholder perspectives, and feasible enforcement mechanisms.

This approach prevents regulatory inflation where laws are made in excess but fail in execution. Instead, it supports policies that are realistic, enforceable, and responsive to evolving societal conditions. The politics of policymaking often determine whether governance principles are genuinely implemented or reduced to symbolic rhetoric. Political actors may adopt the language of transparency, participation, or accountability while maintaining decision-making within elite circles. This phenomenon creates superficial reforms laws that mention governance but lack mechanisms for enforcement. To overcome this, governance must be institutionalized, not merely proclaimed. Institutionalization involves codifying participation procedures, establishing independent oversight bodies, empowering civil society through legal standing, ensuring judicial accessibility, and applying sanctions for non-compliance by public officials (Cairney & Toomey, 2025). Through these mechanisms, governance evolves from a normative ideal to a legal obligation.

Conflicts between efficiency and participation frequently arise in governance-based legal systems. Policymakers may argue that stakeholder consultation delays urgent legislation or complicates administrative processes. However, excluding participation can lead to long-term resistance, legal uncertainty, and social unrest. Governance balances efficiency with legitimacy by adopting structured consultation timelines, digital participation platforms, and expert committees. These instruments enable timely decision-making while preserving inclusiveness. Moreover, technology accelerates governance practices by providing real-time feedback, virtual public forums, and transparent documentation of policy deliberations. Digital governance thus becomes a tool for harmonizing state authority with civic engagement.

A critical dimension in integrating governance into legal frameworks is inter-institutional coordination. Laws do not operate in isolation; they intersect across governmental agencies, regional administrations, courts, and private institutions. Without coordination, legal frameworks become fragmented, contradictory, and prone to bureaucratic conflict. Governance promotes horizontal and vertical integration horizontal among ministries and agencies, vertical between national and local governments. In federal or decentralized systems, this ensures harmonization of local regulations with national standards.

In centralized states, it prevents administrative duplication and clarifies roles in implementation. Coordination mechanisms such as policy councils, joint regulatory committees, and multi-level reforms support legal coherence without suppressing local innovation. The role of civil society in governance-based legal policy extends beyond consultation (Feng et al., 2025). Civil society organizations act as watchdogs, policy innovators, and bridges between the state and marginalized communities.

They contribute to drafting legislation, monitoring policy outcomes, filing strategic litigation, and mobilizing public opinion. Their participation enriches legal policymaking with context-specific knowledge particularly in areas such as environmental protection, anti-corruption, indigenous rights, and digital freedom.

Governance frameworks recognize civil society as an essential component of democratic infrastructure. Laws that restrict associations, protest rights, or freedom of information undermine governance and weaken equitable legal frameworks. International influences also shape how governance principles are integrated into domestic legal systems. Global institutions such as the United Nations, OECD, and World Bank promote governance standards that link rule of law with democratic accountability.

International treaties on human rights, anti-corruption, environmental sustainability, and digital privacy require states to reform their legal frameworks accordingly. Governance thus becomes a bridge between domestic sovereignty and global responsibility. Countries that embed governance principles not only strengthen internal policy quality but also enhance international credibility and investment trust. Conversely, failure to integrate governance may lead to sanctions, diplomatic isolation, or economic instability.

Policy evaluation forms the final stage where governance principles demonstrate their practical relevance. Laws are not static; they require continual assessment to measure effectiveness, unintended consequences, and social perception. Governance promotes reflexive policymaking, where legal frameworks are open to revision based on evidence, community feedback, and judicial interpretation. Monitoring and evaluation tools such as regulatory impact assessments, public satisfaction surveys, and human rights audits provide data to refine legal norms. This ensures that policies remain equitable and adaptable to shifting realities. Reflexivity prevents legal stagnation and sustains public trust in legal institutions.

When governance principles permeate legal policymaking, law transforms into a collective commitment rather than a governmental decree. Equity becomes a measurable outcome rather than a rhetorical promise. Policies reflect not only state authority but negotiated consent between government and society. This does not diminish the role of the state; it redefines it as facilitator, guarantor of justice, and protector of rights. Governance aligns power with responsibility, law with legitimacy, and policy with ethical obligation. The result is a legal framework where justice is not assumed but constructed through reasoned dialogue, institutional integrity, and civic partnership.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that integrating governance principles transparency, participation, accountability, and the rule of law fundamentally enhances the legitimacy, fairness, and effectiveness of legal policies. By shifting from centralized, command-and-control approaches to multi-actor, participatory frameworks, legal policymaking becomes more inclusive, responsive, and socially legitimate. Theoretically, this research contributes by linking governance principles directly to normative legal design, extending classical legal positivism with concepts of reflexivity, participatory legitimacy, and ethical accountability.

Practically, it recommends that legislators institutionalize participatory mechanisms, courts apply governance-sensitive judicial review, administrative agencies implement reflexive and transparent regulation, and civil society engage actively as watchdogs and co-creators of law. For future research, empirical studies could assess the implementation of governance principles across legal sectors, compare cross-jurisdictional practices, develop measurable governance indicators, and examine the role of digital tools in enhancing accountability and participation. Overall, law achieves equity, legitimacy, and public trust only when

governance values are operationalized throughout policymaking, transforming legal systems from mere instruments of authority into mechanisms of justice that ethically serve society..

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

-

REFERENCES

- Abou Ltaif, S., & Mihai-Yiannaki, S. (2024). Exploring the Impact of Political Patronage Networks on Financial Stability: Lebanon's 2019 Economic Crisis. *Economies*, 12(7), 183. <https://doi.org/10.3390/economies12070183>
- Akinbi, I. (2025). Transformative Governance for Peacebuilding: Bridging Institutional Accountability and Equitable Development in Post-Conflict Societies. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, 6, 6470–6487. <https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.6.0525.1789>
- Al Amaren, E., Hamad, A., & Al Mashhour, O. (2020). An Introduction to the Legal Research Method: To Clear the Blurred Image on How Students Understand the Method of the Legal Science Research. *International Journal of Law and Politics Studies*, 1, 50–55.
- Bernstein, S., Glas, A., & Laurence, M. (2025). *Norms, Practices, and Social Change in Global Politics*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009560986>
- Bhandari, M. (2023). The Corruption: A Chronic Disease of Humanity Causes, Effects and Consequences. *ASEJ Scientific Journal of Bielsko-Biala School of Finance and Law*, 27(1), 6–19. <https://doi.org/10.19192/wsfp.sj1.2023.1>
- Bimantara, A., & Salman, R. (2025). The Constitutional Court's Decision on the Perppu on Mass Organizations from the Perspective of Rechtsstaat and Critical Legal Studies. *JUSTISI*, 11(3), 927–948. <https://doi.org/10.33506/js.v11i3.4662>
- Bovens, M., Schillemans, T., & 't Hart, P. (2008). Does Public Accountability Work? An Assessment Tool. *Public Administration*, 86, 225–242. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2008.00716.x>
- Buchan, R., Franchini, D., & Tsagourias, N. (2023). Effectiveness, Authority, and Legitimacy of the Current System of International Dispute Settlement and Possible Reforms. In R. Buchan, D. Franchini, & N. Tsagourias (Eds.), *The Changing Character of International Dispute Settlement: Challenges and Prospects* (pp. 135–364). Cambridge University Press.
- Cairney, P., & Toomey, C. (2025). Systems Leadership: A Qualitative Systematic Review of Advice for Policymakers. *Open Research Europe*, 5, 6. <https://doi.org/10.12688/openreseurope.18982.1>
- Cottier, T., Echandi, R., Liechti, R., Payosova, T., & Sieber-Gasser, C. (2017). The Principle of Proportionality in International Law: Foundations and Variations. *The Journal of World Investment & Trade*, 18, 628–672. <https://doi.org/10.1163/22119000-12340054>
- Fanani, A., & Zulkarnain, M. S. (2022). Understanding John Austin's Legal Positivism Theory and Hans Kelsen's Pure Legal Theory: An Introduction for Beginners. *Sultan Omar 'Ali Saifuddien Centre for Islam Studies (SOASCIS) Journal*, 1(2), 107–118.
- Feng, R., Zhang, L., & Xu, H. (2025). Data-driven governance: Developing evaluation indices for China's intelligent political and legal systems. *Sustainable Futures*, 10, 101207. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sftr.2025.101207>

- Frosio, G., & Geiger, C. (2023). Taking Fundamental Rights Seriously in the Digital Services Act's Platform Liability Regime. *European Law Journal*, 29, 31–77. <https://doi.org/10.1111/eulj.12475>
- Guzman, S. (2007). Rational Legal Authority. In *The Encyclopedia of Social Theory* (pp. 1–2). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405165518.wbeosr026.pub2>
- Hakimi, M., Zarinkhail, S., Aslamzai, S., & Sahnosh, F. A. (2025). Artificial Intelligence and Legal Reform in Developing Countries: Advancing Ethical, Rights-Based, and Accountable Digital Governance. *Jurnal Ilmiah Telsinas Elektro Sipil Dan Teknik Informasi*, 8, 127–144. <https://doi.org/10.38043/telsinas.v8i2.6934>
- Hendrastuti, R., & Harahap, R. (2023). Agency Theory: Review of the Theory and Current Research. *Jurnal Akuntansi Aktual*, 10, 85. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um004v10i12023p085>
- Hendriks, C. (2012). *The Politics of Public Deliberation: Citizen Engagement and Interest Advocacy*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230347564>
- Humah, D. (2025). Evaluation of the Legislative Process in the Revision of the TNI Law: Transparency, Public Participation, and Constitutionality. *Jurnal Hukum Dan Keadilan*, 2(6), 19–27. <https://doi.org/10.61942/jhk.v2i6.452>
- Hutauruk, A. (2025). Law Under the Grip of Power. *Jurnal Indonesia Sosial Sains*, 6(7), 2445–2453. <https://doi.org/10.59141/jiss.v6i7.1816>
- International Panel on Social Progress (IPSP). (2018). Political Regulation, Governance, and Societal Transformations. In International Panel on Social Progress (IPSP) (Ed.), *Rethinking Society for the 21st Century: Report of the International Panel on Social Progress* (pp. 371–596). Cambridge University Press.
- Ip, E. (2011). Globalization and the Future of the Law of the Sovereign State. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, 8, 636–655. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/moq033>
- Iristian, Y. (2024). Ensuring Administrative Legality and Justice Through Judicial Review in Indonesia. *Journal of International Multidisciplinary Research*, 2, 214–234. <https://doi.org/10.62504/jimr390>
- Isbandono, P., Utami, D. A., Prastyawan, A., Gamaputra, G., & Lestari, Y. (2025). Transparency and Accountability in Public Services and Policies in Administrative Law: A Comparative Study of Indonesia and Norway. *Pena Justisia*, 24(1), 3998–4016. <https://doi.org/10.31941/pj.v24i2.6029>
- Jitmau, S., Naim, S., & Akhdharisa, M. (2025). Implementation of the Principle of Equality Before the Law in the Dynamics of Indonesian Law. *JUSTISI*, 11(2), 441–455. <https://doi.org/10.33506/js.v11i2.4088>
- Kamil, R. (2025). Legal positivism influence on law enforcement and judicial practice in Indonesia. *JUSTISI*, 11(2), 542–569. <https://doi.org/10.33506/js.v11i2.4049>
- Lawton, A., & Macaulay, M. (2013). Localism in Practice: Investigating Citizen Participation and Good Governance in Local Government Standards of Conduct. *Public Administration Review*, 74. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12161>
- Licht, J., Naurin, D., Esaiasson, P., & Gilljam, M. (2014). When Does Transparency Generate Legitimacy? Experimenting on a Context-Bound Relationship. *Governance*, 27. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12021>
- Lorenz, A., Anders, L. H., Müller, D., & Němec, J. (2024). Actors, Institutions and Narratives: The Neo-Institutional Framework of Analysis. In *Narrating the Rule of Law: The Future of Europe*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978->

3-031-66332-1_2

- Mansouri, N., & Quiroga-Villamarín, D. R. (2025). Ways of Seeing International Institutions. In N. Mansouri & D. R. Quiroga-Villamarín (Eds.), *Ways of Seeing International Organisations: New Perspectives for International Institutional Law* (pp. 57–308). Cambridge University Press.
- Mendy, O., & Sarr, E. (2025). The Judiciary in Governance: Understanding the Juridical Nature and Function of the Constitutional Court of Indonesia. *Journal of Indonesian Constitutional Law*, 2, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.71239/jicl.v2i1.45>
- Negara, T. A. S. (2023). Normative Legal Research in Indonesia: Its Origins and Approaches. *Audito Comparative Law Journal (ACLJ)*, 4(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.22219/aclj.v4i1.24855>
- Nurchaya, Y. (2025). Rational-Legal Authority and Electoral Legitimacy: Reassessing Max Weber's Theory of Power through the 2024 Election in Bandung. *Jejak Digital: Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin*, 1(6), 4251–4258. <https://doi.org/10.63822/vjxng929>
- Onoja, J., Hamza, O., Collins, A., Ubamadu, C., Eweje, A., Daraojimba, A., & Pub, A. (2021). Digital Transformation and Data Governance: Strategies for Regulatory Compliance and Secure AI-Driven Business Operations. *Journal of Frontiers in Multidisciplinary Research*, 2, 43–55. <https://doi.org/10.54660/IJFMR.2021.2.1.43-55>
- Onyeaka, H., Siyanbola, K. F., Akinsemolu, A. A., Tamasiga, P., Mbaeyi-Nwaoha, I. E., Okonkwo, C. E., Odeyemi, O. A., & Oladipo, E. K. (2024). Promoting Equity and Justice: Harnessing the Right to Food for Africa's Food Security. *Agriculture & Food Security*, 13, 52. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40066-024-00505-0>
- Pomeranz, E., & Stedman, R. (2020). Measuring Good Governance: Piloting an Instrument for Evaluating Good Governance Principles. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning*, 22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1523908X.2020.1753181>
- Radtke, J., & Renn, O. (2024). Participation in Energy Transitions: A Comparison of Policy Styles. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 118, 103743. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2024.103743>
- Syuib, M. (2025). Equal Access to Justice for Persons with Disabilities: A Comparative Legal Analysis of Indonesia and Australia under the CPRD. *As-Siyasi: Journal of Constitutional Law*, 5(1), 27–38. <https://doi.org/10.24042/as-siyasi.v5i1.26855>
- UI Musawir, A. (2024). Revisiting the Principal-Agent Framework in the Context of Projects: Drawing Parallels with Corporate Governance. *Project Management Journal*, 56(1), 41–56. <https://doi.org/10.1177/87569728241270572>
- Umasugi, M. (2025). Bureaucratic Reform and Public Policy Dynamics: Evaluation Study of One Data Indonesia Program. *International Journal of Community Service (IJCS)*, 4, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.55299/ijcs.v4i1.1279>
- Utami, T. K., May, N. S., Ajijah, S. N., Al Zaidan, H., & Hendrawan, F. M. P. (2024). Analysis of the Implementation of Good Governance Principles in the Formation of Laws and Regulations in Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Law and Justice*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.47134/ijlj.v2i2.3421>
- Wahyudi, S., Ansar, A., Melmambessy, D., Afiyah, S., & Ariadi, W. (2024). Application of Good Governance Principles in Improving the Performance of Government Agencies: A Review of the Case of Developing Countries. *Global International Journal of Innovative Research*, 1(2), 168–174.

<https://doi.org/10.59613/global.v1i2.31>

Webber, J. (2024). Democracy-Friendly Theory of the Rule of Law. *Hague Journal on the Rule of Law*, 16(2), 339–374. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40803-024-00240-5>

Whitley, H. (2024). Exogenous, Endogenous, and Peripheral Actors: A Situational Analysis of Stakeholder Inclusion within Transboundary Water Governance. *Sustainability*, 16(9), 3647. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16093647>