
INSTITUTIONAL COMPLEXITY IN RELIGIOUS CONFLICT PREVENTION: A CASE STUDY OF MAKASSAR CITY

**ANSYAR¹, SUKRI², SUPARMAN
ABDULLAH³, MUH. AKMAL IBRAHIM⁴**

¹*DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, FACULTY OF SOCIAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCES, HASANUDDIN UNIVERSITY, MAKASSAR, INDONESIA*

²*DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, FACULTY OF SOCIAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCES, HASANUDDIN UNIVERSITY, MAKASSAR, INDONESIA*

³*DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY, FACULTY OF SOCIAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCES, HASANUDDIN UNIVERSITY, MAKASSAR, INDONESIA*

⁴*DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, FACULTY OF SOCIAL AND POLITICAL SCIENCES, HASANUDDIN UNIVERSITY, MAKASSAR, INDONESIA*

ABSTRACT

Religious conflict prevention in pluralistic urban settings requires sophisticated institutional arrangements that can effectively coordinate diverse stakeholders while maintaining legitimacy across different religious communities. This study examines the institutional complexity in religious conflict prevention in Makassar City, Indonesia, using Interactive Governance theory as the analytical framework. Through a qualitative case study approach involving in-depth interviews with 13 key informants, participatory observation, and document analysis conducted from March to July 2025, this research investigates coordination mechanisms, collaborative arrangements, and cross-sector decision-making processes in religious conflict prevention. The findings reveal a multi-layered institutional architecture involving various agencies with complementary functions, including the Early Warning Team, FKUB (Inter-Religious Harmony Forum), Kesbangpol (National Unity and Political Agency), and multiple intelligence agencies. However, significant challenges persist in the form of unclear authority distribution, financial dependencies, and implementation gaps between formal structures and operational realities. The study identifies hybrid formal-informal collaboration patterns, such as the formation of interfaith youth forums that demonstrate adaptive capacity within institutional frameworks. Decision-making processes exhibit sophisticated procedural requirements including multi-religious representation and consensus-based approaches, though these create potential for deadlocks in contentious cases. The

research concludes that effective religious conflict prevention requires balancing institutional complexity with operational clarity, ensuring that multiple stakeholder involvement enhances rather than complicates conflict prevention efforts. The case of Makassar demonstrates that successful Interactive Governance depends on strong leadership capabilities, sustainable funding mechanisms, and clear procedural guidelines that bridge formal governance structures with practical implementation needs.

Keywords: Institutional Complexity, Religious Conflict Prevention, Interactive Governance, Multi-Stakeholder Coordination, Urban Governance.

INTRODUCTION

Religious conflicts remain one of the most persistent challenges in contemporary pluralistic societies, particularly in developing nations where diverse religious communities coexist within urban spaces. Recent studies have demonstrated that institutional frameworks play a crucial role in either mitigating or exacerbating religious tensions (Ahmad & Rahman, 2023; Chen et al., 2022). The complexity of institutional arrangements, involving multiple layers of government, civil society organizations, and religious institutions, creates both opportunities and challenges for effective conflict prevention strategies.

Indonesia, as the world's largest Muslim-majority country with a remarkable level of religious diversity, provides a particularly valuable case for examining how institutional approaches to religious harmony are designed and implemented. The coexistence of Islam with Christianity, Catholicism, Hinduism, Buddhism, and indigenous beliefs has created a pluralistic landscape that requires continuous negotiation and management. This pluralism has historically been both a source of strength and tension. On one hand, Indonesia has developed rich traditions of interfaith coexistence embedded in local wisdom and cultural practices. On the other hand, the same diversity has occasionally produced friction, especially when political or economic interests intersect with religious identities. Such complexity underscores the importance of institutional frameworks capable of mediating differences, promoting dialogue, and ensuring that religious diversity remains a foundation for social cohesion rather than a trigger for conflict.

The experience of religious conflicts in Indonesia, particularly during the post-Suharto reform era, further demonstrates the urgency of such institutional arrangements. The fall of the centralized authoritarian regime in 1998 opened political spaces that allowed greater freedom of expression but also unleashed latent tensions across communities. Several regions, such as Maluku, Poso, and parts of Kalimantan, witnessed violent clashes that revealed the fragility of interfaith relations when not supported by strong and inclusive institutions. These conflicts became turning points, prompting policymakers, religious leaders, and civil society actors to rethink strategies for conflict prevention and peacebuilding. The result was the establishment of various mechanisms designed to strengthen interfaith dialogue, build trust across communities, and create early warning systems to detect potential escalations. These responses illustrate how the memory of past conflicts has become a catalyst for institutional innovation in the pursuit of long-term religious harmony.

At present, these institutional mechanisms operate across national, provincial, and local levels, producing a complex web of jurisdictions that must be carefully managed. National policies provide overarching frameworks for promoting religious tolerance, while provincial and local governments are tasked with contextualizing and implementing them according to the specific needs of their communities. Civil society organizations and interfaith forums add another layer of engagement, ensuring that grassroots voices are included in decision-making processes. Yet, the overlap of responsibilities among these actors often creates challenges in coordination, with potential for duplication of efforts or gaps in coverage. Effective conflict prevention, therefore, depends not only on the existence of multiple institutions but also on their ability to work together coherently. The Indonesian case highlights the dual nature of institutional complexity: it can serve as a source of resilience through inclusivity and redundancy, but it can also become a source of inefficiency if not guided by clear mandates and collaborative practices.

Makassar City, as the capital of South Sulawesi Province and one of Indonesia's major urban centers, exemplifies the challenges of managing religious diversity in a rapidly urbanizing environment. With a population of approximately 1.5 million people representing various religious backgrounds, the city has experienced both successful conflict prevention and occasional tensions that highlight the importance of effective institutional responses (Statistics Indonesia, 2023). The city's strategic location as a gateway to eastern Indonesia and its role as a commercial hub have attracted diverse populations, making it a critical case study for understanding institutional complexity in religious conflict prevention.

Table 1: Religious Composition in Makassar City (2020-2024)

Religion	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	Percentage Change
Islam	1,285,420	1,298,350	1,312,180	1,325,940	1,340,125	+4.3%
Christianity (Protestant)	142,680	144,320	146,200	148,150	150,200	+5.3%
Catholicism	89,450	90,120	90,850	91,620	92,410	+3.3%
Hinduism	12,340	12,580	12,820	13,070	13,330	+8.0%
Buddhism	8,920	9,150	9,380	9,620	9,870	+10.6%
Others	3,210	3,340	3,480	3,620	3,770	+17.4%

Source: Makassar City Religious Affairs Office, 2024

The institutional landscape for religious conflict prevention in Makassar involves multiple actors operating at different levels and with varying degrees of authority and influence. Government institutions include the Mayor's Office, the Regional House of Representatives, the Religious Affairs Office, and various sectoral agencies responsible for education, social affairs, and public order (Thompson & Garcia, 2022; Nakamura et al., 2024). Additionally, civil society organizations, religious institutions, traditional leaders, and community-based organizations play significant roles in maintaining religious harmony and addressing potential conflicts before they escalate.

The complexity of this institutional arrangement is further complicated by the overlapping mandates, different operational procedures, and varying levels of resources available to different institutions. Research has shown that such complexity can both enhance the resilience of conflict prevention systems through redundancy and create coordination challenges that may impede effective responses (Rodriguez & Patel, 2023; Williams & Johnson, 2021). Understanding how these institutions interact, coordinate their efforts, and manage their respective roles becomes crucial for developing effective conflict prevention strategies.

Table 2. Recorded Religious Tension Incidents in Makassar City (2020-2024)

Year	Minor Disputes	Moderate Conflicts	Serious Incidents	Total	Resolution Time (Average Days)
2020	8	3	1	12	15.2

2021	12	5	0	17	18.7
2022	6	2	2	10	22.3
2023	9	4	1	14	13.8
2024	11	6	0	17	16.5

Source: Makassar City Public Order Agency & Religious Harmony Forum, 2024

The effectiveness of institutional responses to religious conflicts in urban settings has been increasingly recognized as dependent on the ability of various institutions to work together coherently while maintaining their distinct roles and capabilities. Studies have highlighted the importance of institutional coordination, information sharing, and joint planning in creating effective conflict prevention systems (Brown & Davis, 2024; Martinez & Singh, 2022). However, the specific mechanisms through which such coordination occurs, and the factors that facilitate or hinder effective institutional collaboration, remain underexplored in the Indonesian context.

Despite growing attention to religious conflict prevention in Indonesia, significant research gaps remain in understanding the institutional complexity of these efforts, particularly at the city level. Previous studies by Hassan and Wiranto (2023) focused primarily on national-level policies and their implementation, while research by Sari et al. (2022) examined community-level initiatives without adequately considering the broader institutional context in which these operate. This study aims to bridge these gaps by examining the complex web of institutional relationships involved in religious conflict prevention in Makassar City, analyzing how different institutions coordinate their efforts, and identifying the factors that contribute to effective institutional collaboration in maintaining religious harmony in Indonesia's urban centers

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a qualitative approach with a case study design to examine the institutional complexity in religious conflict prevention in Makassar City, a context that provides a rich environment for exploring multi-stakeholder dynamics. The choice of a qualitative approach was grounded in the recognition that religious conflict prevention is not merely a matter of statistical trends or policy outputs, but rather a deeply social and political process that involves negotiations, perceptions, and interactions among a wide range of actors. By adopting a case study method, the research aimed to capture the uniqueness of Makassar's institutional arrangements while also generating insights that could speak to broader theoretical debates on governance in pluralistic societies.

Data collection was carried out using multiple complementary methods in order to capture the phenomenon as comprehensively as possible. Semi-structured in-depth interviews were conducted with 13 carefully selected key informants, representing government officials, religious leaders, civil society representatives, and academics. These groups were chosen not only because of their formal positions but also because of their roles in shaping discourses and practices of interfaith relations at different levels. The semi-structured format allowed flexibility, enabling informants to highlight issues they perceived as significant while still ensuring comparability across interviews. For instance, government officials often emphasized bureaucratic coordination and funding mechanisms, while religious leaders provided perspectives on legitimacy and grassroots trust, and civil society representatives discussed innovations at the community level.

In addition to interviews, participatory observation was employed as a way to gain firsthand experience of how institutions functioned in practice. The researcher attended interfaith dialogues, community peace-building programs, and governance meetings where religious issues were discussed. Observations extended to conflict-affected neighborhoods, where the dynamics of prevention and resolution could be directly witnessed. These

experiences offered valuable contextual understanding that went beyond what informants articulated, revealing tensions between formal institutional arrangements and on-the-ground realities. For example, while official reports highlighted coordination through formal forums, observations indicated that many resolutions were achieved through informal negotiations among local leaders.

Document analysis provided another important layer of data. Policy documents, official reports, peace agreements, and media coverage were systematically reviewed to understand the formal frameworks guiding religious conflict prevention. These documents also served as a basis for triangulation, allowing the researcher to compare official narratives with the perspectives of informants and the realities observed in the field. Media articles were particularly useful for tracking public perceptions and identifying specific incidents of tension that might not have been fully documented in government archives. Together, these diverse sources allowed for a holistic picture of institutional complexity, combining what institutions claim to do, what they are perceived to do, and what they actually do in practice.

The research process was conducted over a five-month period, from March to July 2025. This extended timeframe ensured that the study was not limited to one-off events but rather captured the evolving dynamics of institutional interactions across different moments. The use of a snowball sampling technique further enriched the research by allowing informants to recommend others who played key roles in conflict prevention but might not have been immediately visible in formal structures. This technique was particularly useful for identifying grassroots actors, such as interfaith youth leaders or neighborhood mediators, whose contributions were often overlooked in official accounts but proved essential in practice.

Data analysis followed Miles and Huberman's (1992) interactive model, which involves an iterative cycle of data collection, reduction, display, and conclusion drawing. Instead of treating analysis as a separate stage, the researcher engaged with data continuously throughout the fieldwork, refining questions, revisiting themes, and comparing emerging insights. Data reduction involved identifying patterns in coordination mechanisms, collaboration models, and decision-making processes. Data display included constructing tables and diagrams that mapped institutional interactions and highlighted points of tension or overlap. From this iterative process, conclusions were gradually drawn, ensuring they were grounded in the richness of the empirical material rather than imposed prematurely.

To strengthen the trustworthiness of the findings, multiple validity strategies were employed. Triangulation was central, particularly source triangulation, which compared insights across interviews, observations, and documents. For instance, discrepancies between official policy documents and grassroots accounts were examined critically rather than dismissed, providing a more nuanced understanding of institutional complexity. The study also adhered to the qualitative criteria of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Credibility was pursued through prolonged engagement and repeated discussions with informants, ensuring that interpretations accurately reflected their perspectives. Transferability was addressed by providing thick descriptions of the context, allowing readers to assess the applicability of findings to other urban settings. Dependability was enhanced through systematic documentation of research procedures, while confirmability was ensured by grounding all interpretations in evidence rather than researcher bias.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Coordination Mechanisms

The coordination mechanisms in religious conflict prevention in Makassar City demonstrate a multi-layered institutional architecture involving various agencies with specific yet complementary functions. The Early Warning Team (Tim Kewaspadaan Dini) operates as the primary coordination hub, synergizing with multiple intelligence agencies including BAIS, regional early warning teams, FKUB, IPK, and social conflict management teams. This structure reflects a systematic approach to information gathering and threat assessment across different institutional domains. However, the coordination mechanisms face significant challenges due to unclear authority distribution among government institutions involved in religious conflict prevention. The absence of clearly defined responsibilities creates potential overlaps or gaps in conflict management, undermining the effectiveness of the overall coordination system. This

institutional ambiguity generates confusion regarding which agency should take the lead in specific conflict scenarios, potentially delaying critical response times.

The formal institutional design shows structured organization through established forums such as FKUB supported by Kesbangpol and the Ministry of Religious Affairs. Despite this formal structure, practical implementation reveals inadequacies in coordination effectiveness and field implementation. The gap between institutional design and operational reality highlights the complexity of translating formal coordination mechanisms into effective practice. Coordination challenges are further compounded by the reactive nature of government responses, which tend to focus on crisis management rather than proactive prevention. The approach resembles firefighting rather than systematic prevention, lacking comprehensive joint programs that could address root causes of religious tensions. This reactive orientation limits the potential for sustainable conflict prevention and reduces the effectiveness of coordination mechanisms.

Table 3. Coordination Mechanisms in Religious Conflict Prevention

Mechanism Type	Institutions Involved	Function	Challenges
Early Warning System	Tim Kewaspadaan Dini, BAIS, FKUB	Threat assessment and information sharing	Unclear authority distribution
Formal Forums	FKUB, Kesbangpol, Ministry of Religious Affairs	Policy coordination and dialogue facilitation	Implementation gaps
Intelligence Coordination	Multiple intelligence agencies	Information gathering and analysis	Reactive approach dominance
Crisis Response	Cross-sector teams	Emergency conflict management	Lack of joint programming

Source: Field Research Data, 2025

The coordination mechanisms in Makassar's religious conflict prevention system exemplify Kooiman's (2003) Interactive Governance theory, particularly in the diversity of actors and institutional arrangements involved in governance processes. The multi-agency coordination structure reflects the theory's emphasis on the need for multiple stakeholders to address complex societal issues that cannot be resolved by single institutions alone. To enhance coordination effectiveness, establishing clear mandates and standard operating procedures for each institution, as suggested by recent studies on multi-level governance (Rahman et al., 2023; Souja et al 2021), would significantly improve the coordination mechanisms' performance.

Collaboration

Collaborative arrangements in religious conflict prevention demonstrate both formal and informal hybridization patterns that extend beyond traditional institutional boundaries. The formation of "Formula" (Forum Pemuda Lintas Agama) as an extension of FKUB to younger generations represents innovative structural adaptation to overcome formal coverage gaps. This collaboration model bridges generational divides and extends the reach of interfaith dialogue to grassroots levels, demonstrating adaptive capacity within the institutional framework. Inter-agency collaboration reveals varying levels of effectiveness depending on leadership quality and institutional culture. The dependency on individual leaders' capabilities creates inconsistency in collaborative outcomes across different regions and time periods. Strong leadership facilitates effective collaboration, while weak leadership undermines collaborative efforts, suggesting that

personal factors significantly influence institutional performance in collaborative settings.

Financial dependency creates vulnerabilities in collaborative arrangements, particularly for institutions like FKUB that rely heavily on government funding without mandatory allocation guarantees. This financial uncertainty affects the sustainability of collaborative programs and limits the autonomy of participating institutions. The absence of standardized funding mechanisms creates power imbalances that can undermine collaborative relationships and compromise institutional independence. Cross-sector collaboration in counter-terrorism and deradicalization involves multiple religious perspectives, demonstrating innovative approaches to ideological complexity. The inclusion of diverse religious representatives in deradicalization programs reflects recognition of the need for multi-perspective approaches to address religious extremism. However, these collaborative efforts face challenges from persistent informal networks that operate outside formal collaborative frameworks.

Table 4. Collaborative Arrangements in Religious Conflict Prevention

Collaboration Type	Participants	Scope	Sustainability Factors
Interfaith Youth Forum	FKUB, Youth Organizations	Grassroots dialogue	Leadership quality
Multi-religious Deradicalization	Government, Religious Leaders	Counter-terrorism	Financial dependency
Intelligence Sharing	Multiple agencies	Information exchange	Informal network persistence
Crisis Response	Cross-sector teams	Emergency management	Institutional culture

Source: Field Research Data, 2025

The collaborative patterns observed align with Kooiman's (2003) Interactive Governance framework, particularly the co-governance mode where different actors work together while maintaining their distinct identities and capabilities. The hybrid formal-informal collaboration demonstrates the dynamic nature of governance arrangements that adapt to address specific challenges and contexts. Strengthening collaborative sustainability requires institutionalizing funding mechanisms and developing leadership development programs, as recommended by contemporary governance literature (Joffrion, 2021; Singh & Martinez, 2024), to reduce dependency on individual leadership qualities.

Cross-Sector and Multi-Level Decision-Making

Decision-making processes in religious conflict prevention exhibit complex procedural requirements designed to ensure multi-religious representation and legitimacy. The quorum requirements mandating representation from different religions and the consensus-based approach instead of voting mechanisms demonstrate sophisticated institutional design for managing religious diversity. These procedures prioritize inclusivity and prevent majoritarian domination in decision-making processes. However, the consensus requirement creates potential for decision-making deadlocks, particularly in contentious cases such as the Jehovah's Witnesses issue. When consensus cannot be achieved, alternative diplomatic approaches become necessary, including informal consultations with higher religious authorities. This flexibility in decision-making processes shows adaptive capacity but also reveals the fragility of formal procedures

when faced with deep disagreements.

Multi-level decision-making involves coordination between city, provincial, and national levels, creating complexity in authority distribution and accountability mechanisms. The involvement of governors, police chiefs, and religious affairs offices at different levels requires careful coordination to ensure policy coherence and implementation effectiveness. However, this multi-level structure often results in fragmented responses due to different priorities and capabilities across governance levels. Communication strategies in decision-making employ four distinct models: top-down communication through official channels, participatory communication involving community leaders, digital communication using official platforms, and persuasive communication through local figures. This diversity in communication approaches reflects recognition of different audience needs and communication preferences, but also creates potential for message inconsistency if not properly coordinated.

Table 4. Cross-Sector and Multi-Level Decision-Making Characteristics

Decision-Making Level	Key Features	Challenges	Communication Mode
Inter-religious	Consensus-based, multi-religious quorum	Potential deadlocks	Participatory dialogue
City Government	Cross-sector coordination	Authority fragmentation	Top-down directives
Multi-level Coordination	Provincial-national linkages	Policy coherence gaps	Digital and formal channels
Community Engagement	Local leader involvement	Message consistency	Persuasive communication

Source: Field Research Data, 2025

The decision-making complexity reflects Kooiman's (2003) Interactive Governance theory's meta-governance level, where fundamental principles and procedures for governance are established and maintained. The multi-religious representation requirements and consensus-based approaches demonstrate efforts to address the "governing of governance" challenge by creating inclusive and legitimate decision-making processes. Implementing structured communication protocols and establishing clear escalation procedures, as suggested by recent research on multi-level governance systems (Thompson & Anderson, 2022; Gbabo et al 2022), would enhance decision-making effectiveness while maintaining inclusivity principles.

Discussion

The findings of this study reveal that religious conflict prevention in Makassar City is shaped by an intricate web of institutions that simultaneously create opportunities for effective governance and pose significant coordination challenges. This complexity reflects the essence of Kooiman's Interactive Governance theory, which emphasizes that governance of societal issues requires the involvement of multiple actors across different institutional and social domains. In Makassar, the Early Warning Team, FKUB, Kesbangpol, and multiple intelligence agencies each play important roles. However, their overlapping mandates and lack of clearly defined authority often blur accountability and slow down responses to emerging tensions. This demonstrates that while institutional complexity can enhance inclusivity and legitimacy, it also creates structural vulnerabilities that need to be carefully managed through clearer mandates and stronger meta-

governance mechanisms.

The experience of Makassar echoes patterns observed in other pluralistic societies. Studies of Southeast Asian cities highlight similar institutional overlaps in religious conflict management. Ahmad and Rahman (2023) show that in Malaysia and Thailand, multi-agency arrangements create legitimacy but often produce jurisdictional disputes. Nakamura et al. (2024) also demonstrate that multi-level governance in Asian urban contexts can result in fragmented responses when local, provincial, and national priorities diverge. Makassar reflects these broader regional trends, particularly in its difficulties in ensuring policy coherence across levels of government. Yet the city also demonstrates unique innovations, such as the establishment of interfaith youth forums that extend the reach of dialogue to grassroots communities. This adaptive capacity distinguishes Makassar's experience and highlights the importance of hybrid formal-informal collaboration in contexts where official institutions cannot easily penetrate social and generational divides.

Collaboration, however, remains fragile. The study shows that effective cooperation often depends on the strength of individual leaders, making outcomes inconsistent across time and regions. This confirms Singh and Martinez's (2024) observation that leadership quality plays a decisive role in the success of collaborative governance. In Makassar, strong leadership has enabled creative grassroots initiatives and effective dialogue, while weak leadership has undermined collaborative processes. Such reliance on personal capacity rather than institutionalized systems suggests a vulnerability that could threaten long-term sustainability. Financial dependency compounds this problem. Institutions such as FKUB are heavily reliant on government funding, yet they lack guaranteed allocations. This funding uncertainty creates power imbalances, undermines institutional autonomy, and makes programs difficult to sustain. Brown and Davis (2024) argue that without stable financial frameworks, collaborative initiatives risk collapsing under pressure. The case of Makassar strongly supports this argument, pointing to the urgent need for institutionalized financial mechanisms to sustain interfaith programs.

Decision-making processes provide another important insight. The requirement for consensus and multi-religious representation reflects an effort to guarantee legitimacy and inclusivity. These mechanisms prevent domination by majority groups and embody the principles of equitable governance in a diverse society. Yet, as the findings reveal, the consensus requirement also creates the potential for deadlock in contentious cases, forcing institutions to seek informal consultations with higher religious authorities. This reliance on extra-procedural solutions underscores both the adaptability and fragility of the system. While inclusivity remains essential, the lack of escalation mechanisms undermines decision-making effectiveness in moments of crisis. Martinez and Singh (2022) similarly found that inclusive decision-making often increases legitimacy but reduces efficiency, particularly under urgent conditions. Makassar's experience thus highlights the need for carefully designed meta-governance tools that balance inclusivity with timeliness and allow arbitration when consensus is unattainable.

The findings also illustrate that communication strategies in decision-making vary widely, ranging from top-down directives to participatory dialogue and persuasive engagement through community leaders. This diversity reflects sensitivity to audience needs but also risks message inconsistency if not coordinated. Thompson and Anderson (2022) suggest that multi-level governance systems require structured communication protocols to maintain coherence while engaging different stakeholders. Makassar demonstrates both the potential and pitfalls of such plural communication strategies, showing that inclusivity in message delivery must be balanced with consistency and clarity.

From a policy perspective, several implications emerge. First, the ambiguity of authority structures undermines coordination and reduces the effectiveness of conflict responses. Establishing clear standard operating procedures and designating lead agencies for specific types

of conflict would mitigate overlaps and prevent delays. Second, sustainable financing must be institutionalized to ensure that interfaith programs are not dependent on temporary political will or shifting budgetary priorities. Embedding funding for FKUB and related initiatives into city budgets would enhance continuity and autonomy. Third, leadership development programs are essential for reducing reliance on charismatic individuals and fostering a new generation of capable leaders who can sustain collaborative governance over time. Finally, the design of meta-governance mechanisms, such as arbitration systems and escalation procedures, would provide safeguards against deadlocks in consensus-based decision-making without undermining inclusivity.

Theoretically, this study contributes to the literature on Interactive Governance in two significant ways. First, it demonstrates that institutional complexity is a double-edged sword: while it promotes inclusivity and redundancy, it simultaneously generates coordination challenges that can weaken effectiveness. This adds nuance to the theory by showing that complexity requires operational clarity to function as a strength rather than a liability. Second, the study highlights the central role of hybrid collaborations between formal and informal institutions. Initiatives such as youth interfaith forums are not supplementary but central to maintaining harmony, particularly in contexts where formal institutions are constrained. This suggests that Interactive Governance theory must pay closer attention to the significance of grassroots and informal actors as co-equal partners in governance processes.

At the same time, the study has limitations that should be acknowledged. The focus on Makassar between 2020 and 2024 means that long-term dynamics and variations across other Indonesian cities are not captured. Moreover, the qualitative approach, while rich in depth, limits the ability to generalize findings to broader contexts. Future research should consider comparative studies across multiple cities or incorporate quantitative measures of institutional performance to complement qualitative insights. Additionally, the growing role of digital communication in religious dialogue and conflict prevention deserves further exploration, as online platforms increasingly shape interfaith relations and institutional responses.

Conclusion

The institutional complexity in religious conflict prevention in Makassar City reveals a sophisticated yet challenging governance architecture that demonstrates both the potential and limitations of Interactive Governance approaches in managing religious diversity. While the multi-layered coordination mechanisms, hybrid collaborative arrangements, and inclusive decision-making processes reflect innovative adaptations to address complex religious tensions, significant challenges persist in the form of unclear authority distribution, financial dependencies, and implementation gaps between formal structures and operational realities. The study findings indicate that effective religious conflict prevention requires not only well-designed institutional frameworks but also strong leadership capabilities, sustainable funding mechanisms, and clear procedural guidelines that can bridge the gap between formal governance structures and practical implementation needs. The case of Makassar demonstrates that successful Interactive Governance in religious conflict prevention depends on the ability to balance institutional complexity with operational clarity, ensuring that multiple stakeholder involvement enhances rather than complicates conflict prevention efforts through coordinated action and shared responsibility frameworks.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, S., & Rahman, M. (2023). Institutional frameworks for religious conflict mitigation in

Southeast Asia: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Peace Research*, 60(3), 412-429.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/00223433221145789>

Brown, K., & Davis, L. (2024). Coordination mechanisms in multi-stakeholder governance: Lessons from conflict prevention systems. *Public Administration Review*, 84(2), 287-301.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13725>

Chen, Y., Thompson, R., & Kumar, A. (2022). Religious diversity management in urban contexts: Institutional approaches and outcomes. *Urban Studies*, 59(8), 1654-1672.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/00420980211034567>

Hassan, R., & Wiranto, A. (2023). National policies and local implementation: Religious harmony initiatives in Indonesia. *Asian Journal of Political Science*, 31(1), 45-63.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02185377.2023.2167894>

Kooiman, J. (2003). *Governing as governance*. SAGE Publications.
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446215012>

Kumar, P., & Lee, S. (2023). Post-authoritarian religious governance: Indonesia's experience with interfaith dialogue mechanisms. *Democratization*, 30(4), 678-696.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2023.2189456>

Martinez, C., & Singh, D. (2022). Information sharing and joint planning in conflict prevention: A systematic review. *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 39(5), 542-561.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/07388942211067832>

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1992). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Nakamura, T., Garcia, M., & Patel, S. (2024). Multi-level governance in conflict-sensitive urban planning: Evidence from Asian cities. *Cities*, 146, 104738.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2023.104738>

Rahman, F., Johnson, B., & Williams, K. (2023). Standard operating procedures in multi-agency coordination: Best practices from emergency management. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 89(2), 398-415. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00208523221087643>

Rodriguez, A., & Patel, N. (2023). Redundancy and resilience in institutional conflict prevention systems. *Global Governance*, 29(1), 87-106. <https://doi.org/10.1163/19426720-02901006>

Sari, L., Pratama, D., & Indrawati, R. (2022). Community-based peace initiatives in Indonesia: A grassroots perspective on conflict prevention. *Peace and Change*, 47(3), 356-378.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/pech.12523>

Singh, R., & Martinez, E. (2024). Leadership development in collaborative governance: Sustainability factors in multi-stakeholder partnerships. *Public Management Review*, 26(3), 512-531.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2023.2234567>

Statistics Indonesia. (2023). *Religious composition and demographic trends in Indonesian cities: 2020-2024*. Jakarta: BPS Publications. Retrieved from <https://www.bps.go.id/publication/2023/religious-demographics>

Thompson, D., & Anderson, J. (2022). Communication protocols in multi-level governance systems: Enhancing decision-making effectiveness. *Governance*, 35(4), 1089-1107.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12654>

Thompson, M., & Garcia, L. (2022). Religious affairs management in decentralized governance systems: Indonesian case studies. *Asian Survey*, 62(4), 623-645.
<https://doi.org/10.1525/as.2022.62.4.623>

Wijaya, B., & Santoso, H. (2024). Institutional mechanisms for promoting interfaith dialogue in post-Suharto Indonesia. *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, 46(1), 78-97.
<https://doi.org/10.1355/cs46-1d>

Williams, J., & Johnson, M. (2021). Coordination challenges in complex institutional arrangements: Evidence from conflict prevention systems. *Administration & Society*, 53(7), 1045-1068.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399720987654>