

Preventing Drug Abuse Among Students in Indonesia: A Problem-Oriented Policing Approach

Sihol Sibarani

Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Kepolisian, Jakarta, Indonesia

Email: sihol.sibarani@stik-ptik.ac.id

HOW TO CITE: | ABSTRACT:

Sihol Sibarani (2026). Preventing Drug Abuse Among Students in Indonesia: A Problem-Oriented Policing Approach International Journal of Special Education, 41(22s), 915-929

Drug abuse among students remains a significant prevention challenge in Indonesia. Although existing responses include law enforcement, school-based prevention, community initiatives, and rehabilitation, student drug involvement is associated with multiple individual, social, family, environmental, and institutional conditions that are unlikely to be addressed through a single intervention. This article examines how Problem-Oriented Policing (POP) can be applied to strengthen the prevention of drug abuse among students in Indonesia. Using a structured narrative review of Indonesian and international literature, the study synthesises evidence on the nature and drivers of student drug abuse, existing Indonesian responses, and lessons from evaluated prevention and intervention approaches. The evidence is interpreted through the Scanning, Analysis, Response, and Assessment (SARA) problem-solving model. The review identifies three principal findings. First, student drug abuse is heterogeneous and multifactorial, requiring specific problems to be defined rather than treating student drug use as a uniform phenomenon. Second, Indonesia already possesses a broad response architecture, but greater attention is needed to matching interventions and responsible actors to the conditions underlying particular problems. Third, international evidence does not support a single universally effective intervention; outcomes vary according to intervention mechanisms, implementation, target populations, and context. Based on these findings, the article proposes a SARA-based framework connecting specific problems, underlying conditions, appropriate responses, responsible actors, and measurable outcomes. The framework positions police as important but differentiated participants who may act as enforcers, problem analysts, partners, coordinators, or referral actors depending on the nature of the problem. The article argues that POP can contribute to Indonesian student drug prevention by providing a consistent problem-solving process through which locally tailored, multi-agency, and evidence-informed responses can be developed and assessed.

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:

Copyright: © 2026 Authors.
Open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Keywords: Problem-Oriented Policing; SARA; student drug abuse; drug prevention; policing; Indonesia

1. Introduction

Drug abuse among students remains a significant social, public health, and policing challenge in Indonesia. National data indicate that the problem persists despite continuing prevention and enforcement efforts. According to the Indonesian National Narcotics Board (Badan Narkotika Nasional, BNN), the prevalence of drug abuse among students increased from 1.44% in 2021 to 1.52% in 2023 (BNN, 2023). Students also continue to appear in drug-related cases recorded by law enforcement. The consequences extend beyond criminal justice concerns, as drug involvement can adversely affect students' educational development, social relationships, health, and future opportunities. Preventing drug abuse among students therefore remains an important concern not only for law enforcement agencies, but also for schools, families, health services, and communities.

Student drug abuse, however, cannot be understood solely as an individual act of offending or as a problem of inadequate law enforcement. Evidence from Indonesia indicates that illicit drug use among students is associated with a range of behavioural and social conditions. Using data from 31,439 participants in the National Narcotics Survey of Indonesian Students, Astuti et al. (2022) found associations between illicit drug use and health-risk behaviours as well as peer, family, and neighbourhood contexts. Other research has similarly highlighted the relevance of family environments and social relationships to drug misuse among Indonesian students. These findings suggest that student drug abuse is a multifactorial problem shaped by interacting individual, social, family, and environmental conditions. Consequently, interventions directed only at drug-related offending may leave important conditions contributing to the problem unaddressed.

Indonesia has already developed multiple responses to drug abuse, including law enforcement, school-based drug education, community prevention initiatives, and rehabilitation. Law enforcement agencies undertake drug detection and enforcement, while BNN and educational institutions conduct prevention and awareness programmes in schools. Community-based initiatives also seek to mobilise local participation in drug prevention. The Indonesian legal framework itself incorporates prevention, enforcement, rehabilitation, and community participation. The central challenge, therefore, is not simply the absence of preventive interventions. Rather, it concerns how different responses are selected, coordinated, targeted at the conditions producing particular drug problems, and evaluated for their effectiveness. The persistence and complexity of student drug abuse raise an important question as to whether existing interventions can be organised within a more systematic problem-solving process.

Problem-Oriented Policing (POP) provides a potentially useful framework for addressing this challenge. Developed by Goldstein (1979), POP encourages police agencies to move beyond responding repeatedly to individual incidents and instead focus on identifying and addressing the substantive problems underlying recurring demands for police intervention. This approach is commonly operationalised through the SARA model, Scanning, Analysis, Response, and Assessment, which provides a structured process for defining recurring problems, analysing the conditions contributing to them, developing tailored responses, and assessing whether those responses have reduced the problem (Eck and Spelman, 1987). Importantly, POP does not prescribe a particular intervention or assume that enforcement is always the appropriate response. Instead, the response should follow from analysis of the specific problem and may involve police

enforcement, preventive interventions, environmental changes, treatment, or collaboration with other agencies.

This problem-solving orientation is particularly relevant to student drug prevention. International evidence demonstrates considerable variation in the effects of school-based drug-prevention programmes, police involvement in schools, life-skills interventions, enforcement strategies, and rehabilitative approaches. The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC, 2023) similarly emphasises that law enforcement involvement in school-based drug prevention should form part of broader collaborative and evidence-informed prevention efforts. However, despite an established literature on drug prevention and a substantial body of research on POP, limited attention has been given to how these bodies of evidence can be integrated to inform a problem-oriented response to student drug abuse within the Indonesian policing context. Rather than identifying a single programme for nationwide adoption, a POP perspective may provide a framework through which different local drug problems can be diagnosed and appropriate responses selected according to their underlying conditions.

Against this background, this article asks: How can Problem-Oriented Policing be applied to strengthen the prevention of drug abuse among students in Indonesia? Using a structured review of Indonesian and international literature, the article examines the nature and underlying conditions of student drug abuse, evaluates existing prevention approaches and their limitations, and considers how relevant evidence can inform the four stages of the SARA problem-solving process. The article contributes to the policing literature by applying POP to the specific context of student drug abuse in Indonesia and developing a SARA-based framework that connects problem identification and analysis with contextually appropriate interventions, responsible stakeholders, and measurable outcomes. In doing so, it conceptualises the role of the police not as the sole provider of drug prevention, but as one component of a broader

problem-solving partnership involving BNN, educational institutions, health and rehabilitation services, families, and communities.

2. Problem-Oriented Policing as an Analytical Framework

2.1 Problem-Oriented Policing

Problem-Oriented Policing (POP) emerged from Goldstein's (1979) critique of conventional approaches to policing that placed greater emphasis on organisational processes and recurring responses to individual incidents than on the substantive problems that generated demands for police intervention. Goldstein argued that police effectiveness should ultimately be assessed by the extent to which policing addresses the problems experienced by communities, rather than simply by measures of police activity. From this perspective, recurring incidents should not automatically be treated as isolated events but examined as manifestations of broader problems whose underlying conditions may require different forms of intervention.

A central principle of POP is therefore that responses should follow analysis of the problem rather than precede it. This distinguishes problem-oriented policing from approaches in which predetermined responses, particularly enforcement, are routinely applied to different problems. Enforcement remains an important policing option, but POP requires consideration of whether it addresses the conditions sustaining a particular problem and whether alternative or complementary responses may be more appropriate. Depending on the nature of the problem, responses may include targeted enforcement, prevention, environmental changes, community engagement, referral to specialist services, or collaboration with other institutions.

Evidence suggests that POP can contribute to reductions in crime and disorder when this problem-solving orientation is implemented effectively. Systematic reviews of POP interventions have generally identified positive effects across different crime and disorder problems, although outcomes vary according to

the quality of problem analysis and implementation (Weisburd et al., 2008; Hinkle et al., 2020). These findings are particularly relevant to complex problems that cannot readily be addressed through a single policing intervention. The value of POP lies not in prescribing a universal programme, but in providing a process through which responses can be tailored to the characteristics and causes of specific problems.

2.2 The SARA Problem-Solving Model

The principles of POP are commonly operationalised through the SARA model developed from problem-solving policing in Newport News (Eck and Spelman, 1987). SARA consists of four interconnected stages: **Scanning, Analysis, Response, and Assessment**. Rather than functioning as a rigid sequence, these stages provide an iterative framework through which problems can be identified, understood, addressed, and reassessed.

Scanning involves identifying and defining recurring problems that warrant intervention. This requires moving beyond individual incidents to establish patterns in the people, places, behaviours, harms, and circumstances associated with the problem. In the context of student drug abuse, scanning would therefore involve identifying the nature and scale of specific drug-related problems, the student populations affected, locations or environments in which problems recur, and the harms associated with them. Importantly, police-recorded incidents represent only one source of information. Data from schools, BNN, health and rehabilitation services, students, families, and communities may provide additional insight into problems that do not routinely come to police attention.

Analysis seeks to explain why the identified problem is occurring and what conditions allow it to persist. This stage is particularly important because similar manifestations of drug abuse may arise from different underlying conditions. Student drug involvement may, for example, be associated with peer and family environments, drug availability, social influences, individual vulnerabilities, or institutional conditions.

Analysis should therefore distinguish between the visible manifestation of a problem and the conditions contributing to it. It should also help determine which organisations or stakeholders are best placed to address those conditions.

Response involves developing and implementing interventions matched to the findings of the analysis. POP does not require police to assume responsibility for every condition identified. Where analysis reveals organised drug supply or distribution around educational environments, targeted law enforcement may be appropriate. Where the principal problem concerns social influence, limited resistance skills, family vulnerabilities, or substance dependence, schools, health services, rehabilitation providers, families, or other agencies may be better positioned to deliver particular interventions. Police may consequently operate as enforcers, problem analysts, partners, coordinators, or referral actors depending on the nature of the problem. The central requirement is that the response is connected to the conditions identified during analysis rather than selected solely because it is familiar or institutionally convenient.

Assessment examines whether the response has achieved its intended outcomes and whether the original problem has been reduced. This distinction between police activity and problem reduction is fundamental to POP. Measures such as the number of arrests, enforcement operations, anti-drug seminars, or participating students may indicate programme outputs, but they do not necessarily demonstrate that student drug abuse has declined. Assessment should therefore consider outcomes relevant to the problem being addressed, including changes in drug use, repeat involvement, drug availability, help-seeking, knowledge and attitudes, school safety, treatment engagement, or other indicators appropriate to the intervention. Where outcomes are limited or unintended consequences emerge, findings from assessment should inform renewed scanning and analysis and lead to modification of the response.

3. Methods

3.1 Review Design

This article employs a structured narrative literature review to examine how Problem-Oriented Policing (POP) can be applied to strengthen the prevention of drug abuse among students in Indonesia. A literature-based approach was selected because the research question requires the integration of evidence from several related areas, including student drug use in Indonesia, factors associated with drug involvement, existing Indonesian prevention and enforcement responses, international drug-prevention interventions, and problem-oriented policing.

3.2 Identification and Selection of Literature

The evidence base builds on literature identified during the original research and is supplemented by updated searches conducted in preparing this article. Literature was sought across four principal areas: (1) drug abuse and associated risk factors among students and adolescents, particularly in Indonesia; (2) Indonesian drug-prevention, enforcement, and rehabilitation responses; (3) international evidence concerning school- and community-based drug prevention, policing interventions, and rehabilitation; and (4) POP and the SARA problem-solving model.

Search terms reflected these areas and included combinations of terms relating to *student drug abuse*, *adolescent substance use*, *school-based drug prevention*, *drug education*, *police drug prevention*, *problem-oriented policing*, *problem-solving policing*, *SARA*, and *Indonesia*. Reference tracking was also used to identify additional relevant studies from the bibliographies of key publications, consistent with the literature-review approach described by Snyder (2019).

Priority was given to peer-reviewed empirical studies, systematic reviews and meta-analyses when assessing risk factors or intervention effectiveness. Official publications from Indonesian institutions, including the National Narcotics Board (Badan Narkotika Nasional, BNN), relevant government agencies, and legislation were used to establish the Indonesian policy and institutional context. Publications

from international organisations, particularly the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), were used where they provided evidence-informed guidance directly relevant to drug prevention and the role of law enforcement.

3.3 Use of Indonesian and International Evidence

The review distinguishes between Indonesian and international evidence because they perform different analytical functions. Indonesian research, official statistics, legislation, and institutional material are prioritised for establishing the nature of student drug abuse, its relevant social and environmental conditions, and the existing prevention and enforcement context. This provides the contextual foundation for determining the types of problems to which POP might be applied.

International research is used primarily to examine evidence concerning potential response mechanisms and lessons from evaluated interventions. These include school-based prevention, social-competence and life-skills approaches, police involvement in schools, targeted enforcement, community-based prevention, and treatment or rehabilitation-oriented responses. International interventions are not treated as programmes that can automatically be transferred to Indonesia. Instead, the review considers what the evidence indicates about their mechanisms, effectiveness, limitations, implementation conditions, and potential relevance to problems identified in the Indonesian context.

This distinction is particularly important because interventions developed in different legal, educational, cultural, and policing environments may not produce equivalent outcomes in Indonesia. Accordingly, the review focuses on transferable principles and mechanisms rather than assuming direct programme transferability.

3.4 Analytical Approach

The evidence was synthesised using the four stages of the SARA model. Evidence concerning the prevalence, patterns, populations, locations,

and harms associated with student drug abuse was considered in relation to **Scanning**. Evidence concerning the conditions associated with student drug involvement was considered under **Analysis** and organised around individual and behavioural, peer and social, family, environmental or opportunity, and institutional factors.

4. Results

4.1 Nature and Drivers of Student Drug Abuse in Indonesia

The reviewed evidence indicates that drug abuse among students in Indonesia constitutes a continuing problem that extends beyond individual incidents of drug possession or use. National data reported by the Indonesian National Narcotics Board (Badan Narkotika Nasional, BNN) estimated the prevalence of drug abuse among students at 1.44% in 2021 and 1.52% in 2023 (BNN, 2023). Although these figures should be interpreted within the methodological and population parameters of the respective surveys, they indicate that drug involvement among students remains a relevant prevention concern. Law-enforcement and institutional data further demonstrate continuing student exposure to drug-related risks, although recorded cases alone cannot be treated as a direct measure of the underlying prevalence of student drug use.

The literature also indicates that student drug involvement is not distributed uniformly across the student population. Analysis of data from 31,439 participants in the National Narcotics Survey of Indonesian Students found variation in illicit drug-use patterns across educational levels and associations between drug use and other health-risk behaviours (Astuti et al., 2022). This suggests that the category of “students” should not be treated as a homogeneous risk group. Differences in age, educational setting, social environment, and patterns of exposure may produce different drug-related problems and consequently different prevention needs.

At the **individual and behavioural level**, drug involvement has been associated with broader

patterns of health-risk behaviour. Indonesian student survey data indicate that illicit drug use may occur alongside other forms of risk-taking rather than as an isolated behaviour (Astuti et al., 2022). International evidence concerning adolescent substance use similarly identifies individual vulnerabilities, coping processes, knowledge, attitudes, and behavioural characteristics as relevant components of drug-use risk (Nawi et al., 2021). These findings suggest that understanding student drug involvement requires attention not only to whether students know that drugs are harmful, but also to the behavioural and developmental contexts within which decisions about drug use occur.

Peer and social influences represent a second recurring theme. The Indonesian evidence identifies social context and peer relationships as relevant to patterns of illicit drug use among students (Astuti et al., 2022). This is consistent with the broader adolescent drug-use literature, which identifies peer substance use, social influence, and peer norms as important risk factors (Nawi et al., 2021). Peer influence is therefore relevant not simply as interpersonal “pressure”, but as part of the wider social environment through which attitudes, opportunities, and behaviours related to drugs may be reinforced.

The **family environment** constitutes another important dimension. Indonesian research based on national student survey data has identified associations between drug misuse and aspects of family life, including poor communication with parents and experiences of verbal or physical violence (Romadlona et al., 2021). Broader evidence also identifies parental monitoring, family relationships, family conflict, and substance use within the household as factors associated with adolescent substance-use risk (Nawi et al., 2021). Family conditions should therefore be understood as one component of a wider risk environment rather than as a single explanation for student drug abuse.

A fourth domain concerns the **environmental and opportunity conditions** that shape access

to drugs. The reviewed literature and Indonesian institutional material indicate that prevention cannot be separated from the availability and distribution of illicit drugs within the environments occupied by young people. Physical accessibility, local drug markets, social networks, and increasingly technology-mediated communication may create opportunities for students to encounter or obtain illicit substances. However, the available Indonesian evidence does not establish that these conditions operate uniformly across locations. The nature of drug availability and distribution should therefore be understood as potentially place- and problem-specific.

Taken together, these findings indicate that student drug abuse in Indonesia is better understood as a **heterogeneous and multifactorial problem** than as a single category of offending. Drug involvement may reflect different combinations of behavioural vulnerability, peer and family influences, opportunities for access, and institutional conditions. The literature does not support the assumption that all student drug problems arise from the same causes or will respond to the same intervention. This distinction is important for the subsequent examination of existing Indonesian responses and international prevention evidence.

4.2 Existing Indonesian Responses and Their Limitations

The reviewed evidence indicates that Indonesia does not rely on a single approach to preventing and responding to drug abuse. Existing responses combine **law enforcement, school-based prevention, community participation, and rehabilitation**, involving multiple institutions including the Indonesian National Police (Polri), the National Narcotics Board (Badan Narkotika Nasional, BNN), educational institutions, health and rehabilitation services, local government, families, and communities. The Indonesian legal framework similarly incorporates prevention and eradication alongside treatment, rehabilitation, and community participation (Republic of Indonesia, 2009). The principal issue is therefore not an absence of intervention, but the different

functions, evidence bases, and limitations of the responses currently available.

Law enforcement responses

Law enforcement remains an important component of Indonesia's response to illicit drugs. Polri and BNN undertake investigations, arrests, drug seizures, disruption of distribution networks, and other enforcement activities intended to reduce the availability and supply of illicit drugs. Within educational contexts, enforcement may also involve responding to drug incidents involving students or drug distribution affecting school environments.

Such responses are particularly relevant where the identified problem concerns drug supply, organised distribution, or individuals deliberately targeting young people. However, the literature reviewed for this article provides limited evidence that enforcement activity alone produces sustained reductions in drug use among students. Arrests, seizures, and enforcement operations primarily measure criminal justice activity and disruption of detected drug markets; they do not necessarily demonstrate changes in the behavioural, family, peer, or other social conditions associated with student drug use.

School-based prevention

Prevention within educational settings constitutes a second major component of the Indonesian response. BNN, police agencies, schools, and other stakeholders conduct anti-drug education, awareness campaigns, socialisation activities, and other forms of prevention directed at students. More recent institutional developments have also sought to strengthen the integration of anti-drug education within the educational system, indicating continued policy attention to school-based prevention.

School-based approaches have an important preventive function because educational institutions provide opportunities to reach young people before drug involvement develops or becomes more serious. The reviewed Indonesian literature nevertheless identifies implementation

challenges. Previous research has reported variation in the delivery of school-based drug education, including limitations relating to programme implementation and the capacity of educators to communicate drug-prevention material effectively (Rasul, 2013; Pina and Soedirham, 2015).

Community-based prevention

Indonesia also employs community-based approaches intended to increase local participation in preventing drug abuse. The Drug-Free Village (*Desa Bersinar*) initiative, for example, seeks to involve communities in identifying and responding to local drug problems through collaboration between BNN, local authorities, and community stakeholders. Such approaches recognise that drug prevention extends beyond formal law-enforcement institutions and that communities may possess knowledge of local conditions that is not captured through official crime data.

Treatment and rehabilitation

Treatment and rehabilitation represent a further component of the Indonesian drug-control framework. Indonesian narcotics legislation recognises medical and social rehabilitation, reflecting an institutional basis for responding to drug dependence through mechanisms other than punishment alone. This is particularly relevant when drug involvement reflects substance dependence or other needs requiring specialist intervention.

Fragmentation and the problem of intervention selection

The more significant limitation identified through the review concerns the relationship between **problem diagnosis and intervention selection**. Enforcement may be appropriate for concentrated drug supply around educational environments but poorly suited to addressing weak resistance skills or family vulnerabilities. School-based education may address knowledge or social competence but cannot by itself disrupt organised distribution networks. Rehabilitation may respond to dependence but is not a substitute for primary prevention. Community

initiatives may strengthen local participation but require clearly defined problems and sustainable coordination.

The evidence therefore suggests that the central challenge is not simply to expand the number of anti-drug activities, nor to replace enforcement with prevention. Rather, it is to determine **which response is appropriate for which problem, which institution is best positioned to deliver it, and how its effectiveness should be assessed**. This issue of problem-response alignment provides the basis for examining what can be learned from international prevention evidence.

4.3 Lessons from International Prevention Evidence

International evidence provides a broad range of approaches to preventing and responding to drug use among young people, including enforcement around educational environments, school-based education, social-competence and life-skills programmes, police involvement in schools, technology-supported prevention, and treatment-oriented responses. The reviewed evidence does not, however, identify a single intervention that can be considered universally effective. Instead, outcomes vary according to the mechanism of the intervention, the population targeted, the quality of implementation, and the context in which it is delivered. International experience is therefore most useful for identifying response mechanisms, limitations, and potential unintended consequences rather than programmes that can simply be transferred to Indonesia.

Enforcement and place-based responses

International drug-control strategies include enhanced enforcement around schools and other locations occupied by young people. Drug-Free School Zone policies in the United States, for example, seek to deter drug activity through enhanced penalties for offences committed within specified distances of educational facilities. Such approaches illustrate the potential role of place-based enforcement when drug distribution is concentrated around particular locations.

The evidence reviewed in this study nevertheless demonstrates the importance of carefully defining the problem before adopting geographically based enforcement. Research on Drug-Free School Zones has raised questions concerning the size and design of designated zones, the extent to which they correspond to actual patterns of drug activity, and their potential to produce disproportionate or unintended criminal justice consequences (Brownsberger et al., 2004; Freer and Keefer, 2021; Gonzalez et al., 2022; Saptanti et al., 2023). The broader lesson is therefore not that enhanced school-zone penalties should necessarily be replicated elsewhere, but that enforcement is more defensible when it is targeted towards empirically identified places, patterns, and sources of drug-related harm.

School-based education, social competence, and life skills

A substantial body of international evidence concerns prevention delivered through schools. These programmes differ considerably in their theoretical foundations and delivery methods. Some primarily provide information concerning the risks and consequences of drug use, while others seek to strengthen social competence, decision-making, coping strategies, resistance skills, and the ability to manage peer influence.

Life Skills Training (LST) represents one prominent example of the latter approach. Evidence reviewed in the original study indicates that programmes incorporating social and resistance skills can produce longer-term preventive effects under appropriate implementation conditions (Botvin and Griffin, 2004; Griffin et al., 2023). The significance of this evidence lies less in the LST programme as a specific model for direct adoption in Indonesia than in the mechanism it illustrates: prevention may require strengthening the skills through which young people respond to social influence and risk rather than relying exclusively on the transmission of information about drugs.

This distinction is reinforced by evaluations of other school-based programmes. Research on Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE), for

example, has reported improvements in some knowledge and attitudinal outcomes but substantially weaker or inconsistent effects on longer-term drug-use behaviour (Clayton et al., 1996; West and O'Neal, 2004). Evidence from Brazil's police-delivered PROERD programme has similarly produced limited or mixed behavioural effects despite its preventive objectives (Sanchez et al., 2021). These findings demonstrate that the delivery of drug-prevention education, including programmes delivered by police officers, should not itself be treated as evidence of preventive effectiveness.

Taken together, this literature suggests an important distinction between **knowledge acquisition and behavioural prevention**. Information concerning the dangers of drugs may remain an important component of prevention, but the reviewed evidence provides stronger grounds for considering interactive approaches that address social competence, decision-making, peer influence, and other conditions associated with drug-use behaviour.

Police involvement in educational settings

International experience also demonstrates that the role assigned to police within schools requires careful consideration. School Resource Officer (SRO) programmes in the United States represent one of the most institutionalised forms of police presence in educational environments. Although such programmes may seek to improve safety, prevention, and police-student relationships, research has identified potential unintended consequences, including increased reporting of student behaviour to law enforcement and greater use of exclusionary discipline in some contexts (Devlin and Gottfredson, 2018; Fisher and Hennessy, 2016).

This conclusion is consistent with UNODC guidance on the role of law enforcement officers in school-based drug-use prevention. Rather than positioning law enforcement as the sole provider of prevention, the guidance emphasises evidence-informed approaches, collaboration, appropriate training, and integration with broader prevention systems (UNODC, 2023). International evidence

therefore supports a differentiated role for police: officers may contribute to prevention, safety, information-sharing, referral, and enforcement, but their involvement should correspond to the particular problem and to functions for which law-enforcement expertise is appropriate.

Overall lessons from international evidence

Third, the international evidence supports the importance of **matching interventions to identified conditions**. Where the principal condition is concentrated drug supply, targeted enforcement may be appropriate. Where social influence and limited resistance skills are central, social-competence interventions may be more relevant. Where problematic use or dependence is present, treatment and rehabilitation may be required. The value of international evidence for Indonesia consequently lies not in identifying a model programme for replication, but in expanding the range of evidence-informed responses that can be considered once a specific local problem and its underlying conditions have been identified.

5. Discussion: Applying Problem-Oriented Policing to Student Drug Abuse Prevention in Indonesia

The findings of this review suggest that the principal value of Problem-Oriented Policing (POP) for preventing student drug abuse in Indonesia lies not in introducing a single new prevention programme, but in providing a systematic process for determining which responses are appropriate to particular problems. The evidence indicates that student drug abuse is heterogeneous and associated with multiple individual, social, family, environmental, and institutional conditions. At the same time, Indonesia already employs enforcement, educational, community-based, and rehabilitative responses, while international evidence demonstrates considerable variation in the effectiveness of different interventions. Taken together, these findings support a shift from asking which intervention Indonesia should adopt towards asking **what specific problem is occurring, what conditions are sustaining it,**

which response and actor are best positioned to address those conditions, and whether the response reduces the problem.

5.1 Scanning: From a National Drug Problem to Locally Defined Problems

The first implication of POP is that “drug abuse among students in Indonesia” is too broad to function as a single operational problem. National prevalence estimates are important for establishing the significance of student drug use, but they do not necessarily identify the particular problems that require intervention within different communities. Indonesia's geographical, social, and educational diversity makes it unlikely that student drug problems occur in identical forms across locations.

Scanning should therefore translate the broad national concern into **specific, recurring and actionable problems**. These might include repeated drug distribution around particular educational environments, recurring drug use among identifiable student groups, online distribution networks targeting young people in a locality, or repeated involvement of students already known to prevention, health, or criminal justice agencies. These examples should not be treated as predetermined categories; the purpose of scanning is precisely to determine which patterns are present in a particular setting.

This requires information beyond recorded criminal cases. Police data can identify arrests, incidents, locations, and distribution patterns known to law enforcement, but they cannot independently measure the prevalence or full character of student drug use. Schools may identify changes in student behaviour or recurring incidents that never reach police attention; BNN may provide prevalence and prevention information; health and rehabilitation services may identify patterns of treatment need; and students, families, and communities may provide information about accessibility, social environments, and emerging forms of drug involvement. Combining these sources can provide a more complete definition of the problem.

5.2 Analysis: Understanding the Conditions Sustaining the Problem

Once a recurring problem has been defined, the Analysis stage requires examination of the conditions that allow it to emerge or persist. The findings of this review demonstrate why this stage is particularly important for student drug abuse. Indonesian and international evidence identifies associations with individual and behavioural vulnerabilities, peer and social influences, family environments, opportunities for drug access, and institutional conditions. These factors may interact, but they should not be assumed to operate equally in every setting.

Analysis therefore needs to move beyond general statements such as “peer pressure causes student drug abuse” or “students lack awareness of the dangers of drugs”. For a specific problem, agencies should establish which conditions are actually present and how they contribute to recurring harm. If drug use is concentrated within a particular peer network, for example, the relevant mechanism may differ substantially from a problem characterised by organised drug distribution around an educational location. Similarly, repeated involvement among students experiencing substance dependence presents a different problem from experimentation associated primarily with social influence.

Analysis should therefore identify not only **why the problem occurs**, but also **which actor is best positioned to address each contributing condition**. Depending on the problem, responsibility may be distributed across Polri, BNN, schools, health and rehabilitation services, social services, families, and community organisations. Police involvement may range from primary responsibility for targeted enforcement to a supporting role involving information-sharing, coordination, referral, or partnership.

5.3 Response: Matching Interventions and Actors to Identified Conditions

The Response stage represents the point at which the Indonesian and international evidence reviewed in this article can be translated into

problem-solving options. The central principle is **problem-response alignment**: interventions should be selected because their mechanisms address conditions identified during analysis, not simply because they are familiar, visible, or already institutionally available.

Where analysis identifies concentrated drug distribution or supply networks affecting students, targeted enforcement may constitute an appropriate response. This may involve investigation and disruption of suppliers, monitoring of specific locations, or cooperation between police, BNN, educational institutions, and communities. International experience with place-based enforcement nevertheless demonstrates that interventions should be geographically and empirically targeted rather than based on assumptions that all areas surrounding schools present equivalent levels of drug-related risk.

Where the analysis instead identifies social influence, limited resistance skills, or deficits in decision-making and coping abilities, school-based preventive interventions may be more appropriate. Evidence from life-skills and social-competence approaches suggests that programmes addressing these mechanisms may provide advantages over interventions focused primarily on communicating the dangers of drugs. This does not imply that Indonesia should replicate a particular international programme such as Life Skills Training. Rather, the underlying mechanisms—social competence, resistance skills, decision-making, and coping—can inform the design or refinement of locally appropriate prevention.

The mixed evidence concerning DARE, PROERD, and other police-delivered programmes also has an important implication. Police participation in schools should not be treated as an intervention whose effectiveness can be assumed from the presence of officers or the number of educational sessions delivered. The appropriate role of police should depend on the identified problem and the expertise required. Officers may contribute valuable knowledge concerning drug markets, legal consequences,

safety, reporting, and referral while educators or prevention specialists may be better positioned to deliver developmental and skills-based components. This division of responsibility is consistent with UNODC guidance that situates law enforcement within a broader evidence-informed school prevention system.

Where students exhibit problematic drug use or dependence, treatment and rehabilitation may constitute a more appropriate response than reliance on punishment. In these circumstances, the police role may involve identification, lawful referral, coordination, and action against suppliers, while health and rehabilitation services address treatment needs. Conversely, where analysis identifies organised actors deliberately supplying drugs to young people, a strong enforcement response may be both appropriate and necessary.

5.4 Assessment: Measuring Problem Reduction and Adapting Responses

The fourth stage of SARA addresses one of the most important weaknesses identified across the reviewed prevention literature: the distinction between implementing an intervention and demonstrating that it works. Assessment should determine whether the specific problem identified during scanning has been reduced and whether the mechanisms targeted by the response have changed.

This requires distinguishing between **outputs and outcomes**. Arrests, seizures, enforcement operations, prevention seminars, participating students, referrals, or community meetings may provide important information about implementation. However, these indicators primarily demonstrate what agencies have done. They do not independently establish whether student drug use, access to drugs, repeat involvement, or associated harms have declined.

Outcome measures should therefore correspond to the problem and response. A targeted intervention against drug distribution around an educational environment might assess changes in drug availability, recurring incidents, or identified distribution activity. A social-competence

intervention might assess relevant skills and attitudes as intermediate outcomes alongside subsequent drug-use behaviour. A referral and rehabilitation response might consider treatment engagement, completion, continued support, and repeat drug involvement. School-based responses may additionally examine perceived safety, help-seeking, and other indicators relevant to the particular problem.

Most importantly, assessment should feed back into the problem-solving process. Where a response produces limited effects, agencies should reconsider whether the original problem was accurately defined, whether the analysis identified the relevant conditions, whether the intervention mechanism was appropriate, and whether implementation occurred as intended. SARA should therefore be understood as an iterative process of **scanning, analysis, response, assessment, learning, and adaptation**, rather than as a one-off sequence completed after an intervention has been delivered.

5.5 A SARA-Based Framework for Indonesian Student Drug Prevention

Based on the synthesis above, this article proposes a SARA-based framework for organising police involvement in student drug prevention in Indonesia. The framework does not prescribe a particular intervention. Instead, it connects five elements of problem solving:

In practical terms, the framework links a specific problem to its underlying conditions, an appropriate response, the actor or actors responsible for delivering that response, and measurable outcomes.

Within this framework, **Scanning** defines a recurring local problem using multiple information sources. **Analysis** identifies the conditions sustaining that problem and determines which actors possess the authority, expertise, and capacity to address them. **Response** matches evidence-informed interventions to those conditions rather than defaulting to a predetermined programme. **Assessment** measures whether the original

problem and relevant harms have changed and provides evidence for continuing, modifying, or discontinuing the response.

The framework consequently positions Polri as an important but differentiated participant in student drug prevention. Depending on the problem, police may operate as **enforcers, problem analysts, partners and coordinators, or referral actors**. This recognises both the legitimate role of law enforcement in disrupting drug supply and the limitations of policing as a response to conditions requiring educational, health, family, or social interventions.

The proposed framework applies the four stages of SARA as an iterative problem-solving process. Scanning begins by defining a specific recurring student drug problem through evidence concerning its patterns, affected populations, locations, harms, and recurrence. Analysis then examines the individual and behavioural, peer and social, family, environmental or opportunity, and institutional conditions that may sustain the identified problem. Based on this diagnosis, the Response stage matches appropriate interventions and responsible actors to those conditions. Depending on the nature of the problem, responses may include targeted enforcement, educational or social-competence interventions, family and community measures, environmental interventions, or treatment and rehabilitation. Assessment subsequently examines whether the response has produced meaningful changes in the problem, using indicators such as drug-use behaviour, drug availability, repeat involvement, safety, help-seeking, or treatment engagement rather than relying solely on measures of institutional activity. Findings from assessment should then inform renewed scanning and analysis, allowing interventions to be adapted where necessary. Across all four stages, problem solving should involve collaboration among Polri, BNN, educational institutions, health and rehabilitation services, families, and communities according to their respective responsibilities and expertise.

6. Conclusion

This article examined how Problem-Oriented Policing (POP) can strengthen the prevention of drug abuse among students in Indonesia. The review indicates that POP is most useful not as a new prevention programme, but as a structured process for defining specific problems, analysing the conditions that sustain them, selecting responses and responsible actors, and assessing whether the problem has been reduced. This is particularly relevant because student drug abuse is heterogeneous and associated with interacting behavioural, peer, family, environmental, and institutional conditions.

Indonesia already employs law enforcement, school-based prevention, community initiatives, and rehabilitation. International evidence likewise offers multiple intervention options, but does not support a single universally effective model. The central implication is therefore one of problem-response alignment: targeted enforcement may be appropriate where drug supply or distribution is the principal problem; social-competence and school-based approaches may be more relevant where peer influence or resistance skills are central; and treatment or rehabilitation may be required where problematic use or dependence is present. Responsibility should similarly be allocated according to institutional competence, with Polri acting as enforcer, problem analyst, partner, coordinator, or referral actor as circumstances require.

The article contributes a SARA-based framework linking five elements: specific problem, underlying conditions, appropriate response, responsible actor, and measurable outcome. For policing, this implies that success should not be judged solely through outputs such as arrests, seizures, seminars, or participant numbers. Assessment should consider whether relevant harms, drug availability, repeat involvement, behaviour, treatment engagement, or other problem-specific outcomes have changed. SARA should therefore operate iteratively, allowing responses to be maintained, modified, or discontinued on the basis of evidence.

The review has important limitations. It does not empirically test the proposed framework in an

Indonesian policing or educational setting, and part of the intervention evidence comes from countries with different legal, educational, and policing systems. Indonesian evidence on the longer-term behavioural effectiveness of specific student drug-prevention programmes also remains limited. The framework should therefore be understood as an evidence-informed conceptual application rather than a validated intervention model.

Future research should test the framework in selected Indonesian settings by defining a recurring local student drug problem, analysing it with multiple data sources, implementing responses matched to the identified conditions, and evaluating outcomes over time. Such research would help establish how POP can translate a common problem-solving process into locally tailored, multi-agency, and evidence-informed drug prevention.

References

- Astuti, N.H., Utomo, B., Damayanti, R. and Anshari, D. 2022. Illicit drug use pattern, health-risk behaviors, and social contexts among Indonesian students. *Journal of Drug Issues*. 52(1), pp.915-929. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00220426211045018>.
- Badan Narkotika Nasional Republik Indonesia (BNN). 2023. *Survei Nasional Penyalahgunaan Narkotika Tahun 2023*. Jakarta: Pusat Penelitian, Data, dan Informasi, Badan Narkotika Nasional Republik Indonesia.
- Botvin, G.J. and Griffin, K.W. 2004. Life skills training: empirical findings and future directions. *Journal of Primary Prevention*. 25(2), pp.915-929.
- Brownsberger, W.N., Aromaa, S.E., Brownsberger, C.N. and Brownsberger, S.C. 2004. An empirical study of the school zone anti-drug law in three cities in Massachusetts. *Journal of Drug Issues*. 34(4), pp.915-929.
- Clayton, R.R., Cattarello, A.M. and Johnstone, B.M. 1996. The effectiveness of Drug Abuse Resistance Education (Project DARE): 5-year follow-up results. *Preventive Medicine*. 25(3), pp.915-929.
- Devlin, D.N. and Gottfredson, D.C. 2018. The roles of police officers in schools: effects on the recording and reporting of crime. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*. 16(2), pp.915-929.
- Eck, J.E. and Spelman, W. 1987. *Problem-solving: problem-oriented policing in Newport News*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Fisher, B.W. and Hennessy, E.A. 2016. School resource officers and exclusionary discipline in US high schools: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Adolescent Research Review*. 1, pp.915-929.
- Freer, E. and Keefer, Q. 2021. Are drug-free school zones effective? Evidence from matching schools and schools-like entities. *Journal of Drug Issues*. 52(3), pp.915-929.
- Goldstein, H. 1979. Improving policing: a problem-oriented approach. *Crime & Delinquency*. 25(2), pp.915-929.
- Gonzalez, R.M., Komisarow, S. and Jabri, R. 2022. When does crime respond to punishment? Evidence from drug-free school zones. SSRN working paper.
- Griffin, K.W., Botvin, G.J., Scheier, L.M. and Williams, C. 2023. Long-term behavioral effects of a school-based prevention program on illicit drug use among young adults. *Journal of Public Health Research*. 12(1), 22799036221146914.
- Hinkle, J.C., Weisburd, D., Telep, C.W. and Petersen, K. 2020. Problem-oriented policing for reducing crime and disorder: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*. 16(2), e1089. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1089>.
- Nawi, A.M., Ismail, R., Ibrahim, F., Hassan, M.R., Manaf, M.R.A., Amit, N., Ibrahim, N. and Shafurdin, N.S. 2021. Risk and protective factors of drug abuse among adolescents: a systematic review. *BMC Public Health*. 21.
- Pina, N. and Soedirham, O. 2015. Dukungan pemerintah dalam mencegah penyalahgunaan narkoba di Kota Surabaya. *Jurnal Promkes*. 3(2), pp.915-929.
- Republic of Indonesia. 2009. Law No. 35 of 2009 on Narcotics (Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 35 Tahun 2009 tentang Narkotika). Jakarta.

- Rasul, D. 2013. Pencegahan penyalahgunaan narkoba di kurikulum sekolah menengah kejuruan. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan*. 19(4), pp.915-929.
- Romadlona, N.A., Utomo, B., Sucahya, P.K. and Monalisa, M. 2021. Family environment factors in alcohol and drug misuse among Indonesian students: Indonesia National Narcotics Survey of Students. Preprints. <https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202109.0020.v2>.
- Sanchez, Z.M., Valente, J.Y., Gusmoes, J.D.P., Ferreira-Junior, V., Caetano, S.C., Cogo-Moreira, H. and Andreoni, S. 2021. Effectiveness of a school-based substance use prevention program taught by police officers in Brazil: two cluster randomized controlled trials of the PROERD. *International Journal of Drug Policy*. 98, 103413.
- Saptanti, N., Dewi, A. K., Wirawan, V., Julca-Guerrero, F., Balaka, K. I., & Achmad, W. (2023). Claim of rehabilitation and treatment of narcotic patients in Article 53 and Article 54 of Law Number 35 of 2009 concerning narcotics. *Journal of Drug and Alcohol Research*, 12, 236219. <https://doi.org/10.4303/JDAR/236219>
- Snyder, H. 2019. Literature review as a research methodology: an overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*. 104, pp.915-929.
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). 2023. The Role of Law Enforcement Officers in Drug Use Prevention within School Settings: A Guiding Document. Vienna: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime.
- Weisburd, D., Telep, C.W., Hinkle, J.C. and Eck, J.E. 2008. The effects of problem-oriented policing on crime and disorder. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*. 4(1), pp.915-929.
- West, S.L. and O'Neal, K.K. 2004. Project DARE outcome effectiveness revisited. *American Journal of Public Health*. 94(6), pp.915-929.