



CAUSAL ANALYSIS OF CORRUPTION PRACTICES AND RESISTANCE TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ANTI-CORRUPTION POLICIES IN GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS

Assytha Salsabila¹, Ira Septika Putri², Muhamad Romdoni³

¹ Faculty of Law, Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa University, Indonesia, E-mail: 1111220141@untirta.ac.id

² Faculty of Law, Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa University, Indonesia, E-mail: 1111220261@untirta.ac.id

³ Faculty of Law, Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa University, Indonesia, E-mail: muhamadromdoni@untirta.ac.id

Article	Abstract
Keywords:	This study analyzes the causal relationship between corruption practices and resistance to the implementation of anti-corruption policies within government institutions in Indonesia. The research stems from the ongoing prevalence of corruption among government officials despite the existence of comprehensive legal frameworks, revealing weaknesses in law enforcement, legal interpretation, and societal legal culture. The theoretical foundation integrates Jack Bologna's GONE Theory with Lawrence M. Friedman's Legal System Theory, emphasizing the interplay of legal structure, substance, and culture. Employing a qualitative normative juridical method, this study relies on secondary data derived from statutory regulations, legal journals, and case documentation to examine the legal norms governing corruption eradication. Data collection was conducted through literature review and legal interpretation techniques. The findings reveal that internal factors such as greed and materialistic behavior, combined with external factors including weak political accountability, ambiguous legal norms particularly in Articles 2 and 3 of the Anti-Corruption Law and deficient supervision, significantly hinder the effectiveness of anti-corruption policies. Furthermore, the persistence of a permissive legal culture normalizing bribery reinforces systemic resistance to reform. The study concludes that strengthening the integrity of law enforcement, refining ambiguous legal provisions, and fostering public legal awareness are essential to overcoming resistance to anti-corruption initiatives and achieving good governance in Indonesia.
Corruption, Corruption Government Institutions	Anti-Policy,
DOI: 10.28946/scls.v3i2.5108	

This is an Open Access Research distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original works are appropriately cited.

A. INTRODUCTION

An unlawful act committed by any individual with the aim of enriching themselves or others and causing losses to the state is called corruption.¹ One of the characteristics of corruption is the presence of an element of intent or malicious intent on the part of the perpetrator to commit a crime.² In this case, a person consciously commits a criminal act of corruption with the aim of obtaining personal gain or gain for others, where the method is often illegal, so that corruption often results in huge losses for the state, both in the form of loss of resources, budget waste, and damage to the quality of public services. Money that should be used for development or improving the welfare of the people is instead misused by certain individuals.

Corruption remains a widespread problem in developed and developing countries, including Indonesia. According to a report by Indonesia Corruption Watch (ICW), throughout 2024 there were 364 corruption cases handled by law enforcement officials in Indonesia. From these cases, the potential loss to the state is estimated at Rp279 trillion. The government sector ranks fourth as the sector with the highest number of corruption cases.³ The fact that the government sector ranks fourth as the sector with the highest number of corruption cases indicates weaknesses in internal oversight and governance that are not yet fully effective. Corruption in this sector not only hinders economic development and public services, but also erodes public trust in the government.

Government officials play an important role in running the government and providing services to the community. This makes government officials responsible to the state and the people for managing government affairs in accordance with their respective duties and functions. Government officials are required to perform well as the community's hope for a better government in the future. It would be a serious problem if government officials acted outside the scope of their duties and functions as stipulated in the legislation, as this could hinder the smooth running of the government.⁴ This has been confirmed in Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration, which states that government officials are prohibited from abusing the authority that has been given to them in accordance with their respective roles and functions.⁵ Based on the Corruption Eradication Commission's Performance Summary for the First Quarter of 2024, the perpetrators who committed the most corruption crimes were 38 civil servants in Echelon I, II, III, and IV positions, 27 private employees, and 10 people in other positions.⁶ The prevalence of corruption cases involving government officials has an impact on the smooth running of the government, such as the paralysis of government functions, as corruption can weaken the government's role in maintaining economic and political stability.⁷ Furthermore, corruption cases occurring in Indonesian institutions are often reported in various media outlets, which can lead to a loss of public trust in state institutions. The Indonesian bureaucracy still has many bureaucrats who are arrogant, feel like rulers, and are involved in corruption, collusion, nepotism, and waste at

¹ "Undang-undang (UU) Nomor 31 Tahun 1999 tentang Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi," Pub. L. No. 31 (1999), Pasal 2, <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/45350/uu-no-31-tahun-1999>.

² Amalia Syauket dan Dwi Seno Wijanarko, "Buku ajar tindak pidana korupsi," PT. Literasi Nusantara Abadi Grup, 2024, 76.

³ Nabilah Muhamad, "10 Sektor dengan Kasus Korupsi Terbanyak di Indonesia pada 2024," databoks, n.d., <https://databoks.katadata.co.id/ekonomi-makro/statistik/68dc879b05ee/10-sektor-dengan-kasus-korupsi-terbanyak-di-indonesia-pada-2024>.

⁴ Irfan Setiawan dan Christin Pratami, "Analisis Perilaku Korupsi Aparatur Pemerintah Di Indonesia (Studi pada Pengelolaan Bantuan Sosial Di Era Pandemi Covid-19)," *Jurnal Media Birokrasi*, 2022, 33-50, <https://doi.org/10.33701/jmb.v4i2.2744>.

⁵ "Undang-undang (UU) Nomor 30 Tahun 2014 tentang Administrasi Pemerintahan," Pub. L. No. 30 (2014), Pasal 17.

⁶ "Ringkasan Kinerja KPK Triwulan 1 Tahun 2024," Pelayanan Informasi Publik (Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi), diakses 8 Juni 2025, https://ppid.kpk.go.id/info_detail/329.

⁷ Toto Sugiarto., *Dampak Korupsi dan Hukuman Bagi Pelaku Korupsi: Seri Ensiklopedi Pendidikan Anti Korupsi* (Jakarta Selatan: Hikam Pustaka, 2021), hlm. 8, <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=sA9IEAAAQBAJ>.

the central, provincial, and district or city levels.⁸ Many government officials abuse the authority and power given to them to satisfy themselves and ignore the expectations of the people.

Corruption in the government sector occurs partly due to legal uncertainty and multiple interpretations of certain articles, particularly Articles 2 and 3 of Undang-Undang Nomor 31 tahun 1999 tentang Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi. There are differences between the two articles, whereby Article 2 of the Anti-Corruption Law contains elements of enriching oneself, others, or a corporation, which is essentially an unlawful act that causes losses to the state or the state economy. Meanwhile, Article 3 of the Corruption Eradication Law contains the elements of the intention to benefit oneself, the abuse of authority, opportunities, or means inherent in one's position, and losses to the state finances. The elements in Article 2 and Article 3, especially the phrases "causing losses to state finances" and "or other persons or corporations," appear to contradict the principle of criminal formulation, which should comply with strictly interpreted legal provisions (*lex stricta*) and not give rise to multiple interpretations (*lex certa*).⁹ In this case, the elements of the article are not in line with the principles of *lex stricta* and *lex certa*. Legal certainty itself is interpreted to mean that laws must be based on the principles of *lex scripta* (must be written), *lex certa* (not open to multiple interpretations), and interpreted strictly (*lex stricta*).

Considering the background of this issue, the author will examine the factors that encourage government officials to engage in corruption and the causes of the ineffectiveness of anti-corruption policies in the government sector. It is very important to understand the bluntness of anti-corruption regulations in the government sector because ineffective regulations can weaken efforts to eradicate corruption and have a negative impact on governance. Inadequate or ambiguous regulations can open loopholes for government officials who commit corruption to avoid sanctions, allowing corruption to continue and damage the government system.¹⁰ The bluntness of anti-corruption regulations will thwart efforts to increase transparency and accountability and reduce public trust in the government. Therefore, strengthening and improvements must be made to save state finances and improve the quality of governance.

The novelty of this research lies in its analysis linking the factors causing corrupt practices with resistance to the implementation of anti-corruption policies in government institutions in an integrated manner. In addition, this study integrates the GONE theory with the context of positive law in Indonesia and highlights the ambiguous interpretation of Articles 2 and 3 of the Anti-Corruption Law, which has an impact on the weak effectiveness of anti-corruption policies. Thus, this research not only contributes theoretically to expanding the study of the causality of corruption, but also contributes practically in the form of recommendations for improving regulations and the legal culture of society to close the gap of resistance to anti-corruption policies.

B. RESEARCH METHODS

During the preparation and writing of the article, the author used qualitative research methods with a normative juridical approach based on applicable legal principles and norms to determine the results of the issues based on the cases raised by the author. As stated by Peter Mahmud Marzuki, the normative juridical approach to legal research is a legislative approach

⁸ Nandha Risky Putra dan Rosa Linda, "Korupsi di Indonesia: Tantangan perubahan sosial," *Integritas: Jurnal Antikorupsi* 8, no. 1 (2022): 13–24.

⁹ Windy Pratiwi et al., "Problematika Pengaturan Hukum Tindak Pidana Korupsi: Pasal 2 dan 3 UU RI Nomor 31 Tahun 1999," *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan* 10, no. 13 (2024): 776–86, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12820171>.

¹⁰ Tridian Hariwangsa dan Henny Yuningsih, "Upaya Penguatan Regulasi Untuk Mencegah Tindak Pidana Korupsi," *Disiplin Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 30, no. 4 (2024): 121–30.

that examines several laws and regulations related to the legal issues being discussed.¹¹ The author used a method that examined library materials by collecting data and analyzing legal norms relevant to the author's discussion.

To support the research, the author conducted research using library data or secondary data containing legal terms.¹² This secondary data is sourced from primary legal materials from laws, including Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration; Law Number 31 of 1999 in conjunction with Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Eradication of Corruption; Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission; Law Number 19 of 2019 concerning the Second Amendment to Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission and secondary sources derived from books or literature in the form of legal journals and tertiary sources obtained from the Internet or *research data* to research several data on relevant cases.

C. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Corruption in the government sector can hinder a country's progress and stability. Although governments in many countries have made efforts to minimize this crime, corruption remains a major challenge that harms the economy, undermines public trust, and disrupts the development process. In the government sector, corruption often occurs due to a combination of complex individual, social, political, and economic factors.

1. Factors Causing Corruption in the Government Sector

The factors that encourage government officials to engage in corruption can originate from within the perpetrator or from outside the perpetrator. According to Yamamah, when society has materialistic and consumptive behavior, and the political system still prioritizes material aspects, this can encourage money games and corruption. This is what drives government officials to engage in corruption.

According to Jack Bologne, there are several factors that cause individuals to engage in corruption based on the GONE Theory, namely:¹³

1. *Greed*. Greed is characterized by an individual's dissatisfaction with what they already have, leading them to want more than what they already possess. Even though government officials already have a steady income, greed arises to obtain wealth quickly and abundantly by asking for or receiving bribes because they want to increase their assets or luxurious lifestyle.
2. *Opportunity*. Opportunity can be a situation where someone has the freedom and access to commit fraud. In this case, it can be caused by weak bureaucracy, minimal supervision, or legal loopholes that give perpetrators the opportunity to commit corruption without fear of being caught.
3. *Needs*. Needs are natural drives that every individual has and are often the main reason behind fraudulent acts. For example, when someone is in a desperate situation, they may resort to various means, including deviating from the rules, to fulfill their needs. Although not always in terms of urgent economic needs, government officials commit corruption due to the pressure of needs such as paying debts, financing their children's education, or fulfilling certain social demands.

¹¹ M.H. Dr. Wiwik Sri Widiarty, S.H., *Buku Ajar Metode Penelitian Hukum* (Yogyakarta: Publika Global Media, 2024), 119.

¹² *Ibid.*, 121.

¹³ Ratih Prihatina, "Mengenal Perspektif GONE (*Greed, Opportunity, Needs* dan *Exposure*)," Kementerian Keuangan Direktorat Jenderal Kekayaan Negara, diakses 6 Juni 2025, <https://www.djkn.kemenkeu.go.id/kpknl-tegal/baca-artikel/17410/HAKORDIA-2024-Mengenal-Perspektif-GONE-Greed-Opportunity-Needs-dan-Exposure-Dalam-TindakanKecuranganKorups>.

4. *Exposure.* Exposure refers to two important things, namely the possibility of fraudulent acts being uncovered and the level of punishment imposed on the perpetrator. When the punishment is relatively light and it is difficult to uncover data related to fraud, this often fails to deter perpetrators and other potential perpetrators, and is ineffective in preventing similar acts from recurring in the future. If the risk of being caught for corruption is low, people will be more likely to engage in corruption, such as weak law enforcement or a culture of turning a blind eye, which makes perpetrators feel safe and confident that they will not be exposed. Even if they are caught, perpetrators think that the law can be "bought."

The GONE theory explains that corruption among government officials is not only a moral issue, but also the result of a combination of personal motivation, systematic opportunities, and minimal risk of exposure. In addition to describing the causes of individual acts of corruption, the author links several other factors, as follows:

a. Political Factors

The causes of government officials committing corruption are often triggered by political factors involving power dynamics, political ambition, and competition in achieving strategic positions. According to Susanto, corruption at the government level can take the form of accepting bribes, extortion, providing protection, and stealing public assets for personal gain, including corruption triggered by political situations.¹⁴ In many cases, politics can create situations where government officials are forced to engage in unethical acts, such as accepting bribes or using their power for personal gain. One example of this is the corruption case involving Nyoman Dhamantra, a member of the Indonesian House of Representatives for the 2014-2019 term, who was involved in bribery related to the processing of Import Approval Letters (SPI). Nyoman was proven to have received Rp2 billion out of a total of Rp3.5 billion.¹⁵

One of the main factors is a weak political system, where oversight and accountability are not effective. This is usually characterized by weak control and oversight of policies implemented by government institutions.¹⁶ In addition, the policies made may lack transparency and can be exploited by government officials who have personal interests to enrich themselves. In this situation, government officials often feel that they can abuse their authority without fear of punishment or exposure.

High political demands can also trigger government officials to engage in corruption. For example, in order to win an election or maintain their political position, they are forced to seek sufficient support and funds to conduct their campaign. This can lead to a person resorting to corruption in order to obtain political funds to maintain their position or win an election.¹⁷

b. Legal Factors

The next factor is the weak enforcement of laws against corruption cases. The weak supervision of these legal actions can be seen from internal and external factors. Internal supervision carried out by the Inspectorate General in various institutions tends to be

¹⁴ Toto Sugiarto, *Dampak Korupsi dan Hukuman Bagi Pelaku Korupsi: Seri Ensiklopedi Pendidikan Anti Korupsi* (Jakarta Selatan: Hikam Pustaka, 2021), 14, <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=sA9IEAAAQBAJ>.

¹⁵ "Beberapa Kasus Korupsi di DPR dan Dampaknya," Pusat Edukasi Antikorupsi, diakses 29 Maret 2025, <https://aclc.kpk.go.id/aksi-informasi/Eksplorasi/20231008-beberapa-kasus-korupsi-di-dpr-dan-dampaknya>.

¹⁶ Lefri Mikhael et al., "Hukum Pidana Diluar Kodifikasi Penulis" (Padang: PT. Global Eksekutif Teknologi, 2023), 71.

¹⁷ Buku Pendidikan Anti Korupsi, *Pendidikan Anti Korupsi untuk Perguruan Tinggi*, ed. oleh Yusuf Kurniadi Nanang T. Puspito, Marcella Elwina S., Indah Sri Utari (Senayan, Jakarta: Kemendikbud, 2011), Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan RI ADirektorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi Bagian Hukum Kepergawainan.

administrative in nature and is not thorough enough in evaluating the flow of funds and the efficiency of their use. Meanwhile, external oversight by the Supreme Audit Agency (BPK) and the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) still faces limitations in terms of human resources and political pressure.¹⁸ This has led to corruption in the government sector, as government officials believe that they understand legal tactics and that there is no strict oversight, thereby increasing the risk of abuse of power or authority for personal gain.

In addition, in legal terms, the process of handling corruption cases takes a very long time, causing the public to lose confidence in the judicial system. Many major cases involving high-ranking officials or political figures end with sentences that are much lighter than the losses incurred by the state. Corruption perpetrators often do not receive appropriate punishment, which leads to a cycle of repeated violations of the law and well-organized corruption that can hinder reform and improvement efforts in the legal system.¹⁹ This shows that the legal system in Indonesia is still not strict enough in imposing appropriate sanctions on corruption perpetrators.

It is unfortunate that in the pursuit of prosperity through the enforcement of anti-corruption laws, there are still many law enforcement officials who are perpetrators of criminal acts of corruption. Examples include the cases of DKI Jakarta Attorney General Yanuar Reza Muhammad and Fristo Yan Presanto; former Yogyakarta District Attorney Eka Safitri and Surakarta District Attorney Satriawan Sulaksono; former Central Java Attorney General Kusnin; former DKI Jakarta Attorney General Agus Winoto; and former Rembang District Attorney staff member who embezzled Rp 3 billion in traffic fines.²⁰ Based on these cases, the author draws conclusions from Haryatmoko's opinion and relates them to government officials, because so many people do the same thing in the government sector, even within the law enforcement apparatus itself, that corruptors think this crime is normal.²¹ In addition, it makes government officials think that they can enjoy *impunity* (absence of legal sanctions) due to weak legal supervision, and even if they are caught, it will drag many people into the case, so government officials who commit corruption think that in the end, the matter will be ignored.

c. Social Environment Factors

Many people have certain expectations or social standards regarding the lifestyle that individuals, including government officials, must fulfill. There is pressure from the social environment to appear to have a lifestyle that is considered successful, especially for someone who holds a position as a state official, and the public assumes that state officials are wealthy and successful people. Government officials in this position may feel that they need to conform to these standards of living, even if it means abusing their power to obtain money through illegal means.

The above statement is supported by Nursyam's opinion²² that the cause of someone committing corruption is the temptation of worldly or materialistic wealth that cannot be resisted, giving rise to an uncontrollable urge to become rich. As access to this wealth is obtained through corruption, government officials are easily tempted or driven to commit criminal acts of corruption.

¹⁸ Della Juwita dan Yoserizal Yoserizal, "Faktor Penyebab Meningkatnya Angka Korupsi," *Sanskara Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran* 3, no. 01 (2025): 52.

¹⁹ I Gede Sujana dan I Wayan Kandia, "Indikator lemahnya penegakan hukum di Indonesia," *IJOLARES: Indonesian Journal of Law Research* 2, no. 2 (2024): 14.

²⁰ Yulida Medistiara, "Deretan Jaksa yang Malah Diadili Karena Kasus Korupsi," Detik News, diakses 30 Maret 2025, <https://news.detik.com/berita/d-4994630/deretan-jaksa-yang-malah-diadili-karena-kasus-korupsi>.

²¹ Toni Andrianus Pito, S I P Efriza, dan S I P Kemal Fasyah, *Mengenal Teori-teori Politik: Dari Sistem Politik sampai Korupsi* (Nuansa Cendekia, 2022), hlm. 375, <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=O2ykEAAAQBAJ>.

²² Ola Rongan Wilhelmus, "Korupsi: Teori, faktor penyebab, dampak, dan penanganannya," *JPAK: Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Katolik* 17, no. 9 (2017): 26–42, <https://doi.org/10.34150/jpak.v17i9.44>.

A consumptive lifestyle that is not balanced with adequate income will continue to open opportunities for corruption in order to meet the demands of this consumptive lifestyle. The reason someone is driven to commit corruption is because of their intention and desire to do so. This intention arises from weak faith and morality, which makes a person easily tempted by a consumptive, greedy, or gluttonous lifestyle that leads them to commit corruption.

2. Causes of the Ineffectiveness of Anti-Corruption Policies in the Government Sector

Law enforcement is the process of translating legal ideas and ideals, which contain values of justice and truth, into concrete form. Nur Basuki Minarno argues that the essence of regulations related to corruption eradication concerns two main things, namely regulations as a preventive measure, where the hope is that the existence of regulations on corruption eradication will prevent people from committing criminal acts of corruption. Furthermore, as a repressive measure, severe sanctions are imposed on perpetrators of corruption and every effort is made to recover the state's losses resulting from the corruption.²³

In order to eradicate corruption, Indonesia has created several policies that are implemented with the aim of overcoming corruption in Indonesia. Some of these regulations include:

1. **Law Number 31 of 1999 in conjunction with Law Number 21 of 2001 concerning Eradication of Corruption Crimes (Tipikor Law).** This regulation is the legal basis governing corruption crimes in Indonesia.
2. **Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration.** This law is the legal basis for administering the government in an effort to create *good governance* and to prevent corruption, collusion, and nepotism in the administration of government. In its formulation, this regulation aims to create a bureaucratic process in government that is good, transparent, and efficient in accordance with the principles, culture, and patterns of democratic, objective, and professional administration in creating justice and legal certainty for every Indonesian citizen.²⁴
3. **Law Number 19 of 2019 concerning the Second Amendment to Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission.** This law is one of the efforts to overcome corruption, namely by forming an institution for the eradication of corruption. The Corruption Eradication Commission is an independent institution within the executive branch, which in carrying out its duties and authorities is free from the influence of any power.
4. **Law Number 8 of 2010 concerning the Prevention and Eradication of Money Laundering.** Money laundering is closely related to corruption, as it is often used as a 'tool' by perpetrators of corruption to hide or disguise wealth obtained from corruption.

In addition to the regulations mentioned above, there are several other regulations that directly or indirectly govern policies aimed at eradicating corruption in Indonesia. The prevalence of corruption cases in Indonesia, despite the existence of numerous regulations, raises the question of what is wrong with the existing regulations. Is it the content of the regulations? Or is it their implementation? The Anti-Corruption Law, as the main legal umbrella for Corruption Crimes in Indonesia, has weaknesses in its formulation, including articles that are open to multiple interpretations. This is evident in Articles 2 and 3 of the Anti-Corruption Law, which contain ambiguities that can lead to legal uncertainty in their enforcement. According to Chandra Hamzah, the phrase "every person" in these articles is considered too broad and unspecific, and can be interpreted in multiple ways. This phrase could lead to people who should not be considered corruptors, such as small traders, being prosecuted. Furthermore, the definition of "causing harm to the state" is also problematic. In this case, does the harm to

²³ Dwi Atmoko dan Amalia Syauket, "Penegakan hukum terhadap tindak pidana korupsi ditinjau dari perspektif dampak serta upaya pemberantasan," *Binamulia Hukum* 11, no. 2 (2022): 177-191.

²⁴ "Undang-undang (UU) Nomor 23 Tahun 2014 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah" (2014).

the state have to be proven in real terms, or can the mere potential for harm to the state be considered harm to the state.

The large number of regulations is certainly not enough to overcome corruption. There is a need for good implementation, in-depth supervision, and awareness of corruption itself among the public. Legislation in Indonesia still seems to have problems with its implementation. Corruption crimes easily arise when the implementation of legislation has weaknesses. Weaknesses in the implementation of laws and regulations can take the form of monolithic laws and regulations that only favor relatives, inadequate quality of laws and regulations, sanctions that are too lenient for violators, inconsistent application of sanctions, lack of evaluation of previous laws and regulations, and a lack of dissemination of laws and regulations to the public.²⁵

Corruption is classified as *a white-collar crime*, which is a crime usually committed by individuals with high social status and prestige, and is typically related to their position.²⁶ Corruption is usually committed by people in the bureaucracy who hold positions that they exploit for their own personal gain or that of a group. Corruption has spread to various sectors and can be found in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government. Corruption can be practiced by people from different backgrounds with various interests, including lower-middle-class individuals who engage in corruption due to economic pressures, and upper-middle-class individuals who aspire to higher positions or titles. Corruption perpetrators include politicians who lack a democratic spirit and populists who abuse their authority for personal gain.

The diverse perpetrators of corruption reflect the irony of a democratic country whose people have damaged their morals and integrity in the course of their lives as citizens. Moral damage usually occurs due to the influence of the environment, education, and the culture of the community, which are places that support such criminal acts. In addition, various other factors contribute to these deviations, including the government bureaucratic system itself, the lack of law enforcement and oversight by the government, and even the government itself becoming a perpetrator, which has led to the rampant spread of corruption in Indonesia.

In his book entitled *The Legal System A Social Science Perspective*, Lawrence Meir Friedman reveals that the legal system consists of three components, namely legal structure, legal substance, and legal culture.²⁷ The practice of corruption in Indonesia seems to have become a "culture". Repeated acts of corruption over a long period of time can create a mindset where corruption is considered "normal and harmless"; however, any act that causes even the slightest loss can be categorized as corruption.²⁸ Corruption occurs everywhere and, in the end, giving rewards to officials is considered normal and reasonable, with some parties even considering such rewards a form of gratitude.

The problem of eradicating corruption in Indonesia is closely related to the legal culture of Indonesian society. The legal culture related to corruption has not been properly developed. In Indonesia, some parties react against corruption by cursing corruptors, hating the crimes committed by corruptors, and even declaring war on corruption. However, there is another side where some people in society show support for corrupt practices by giving bribes to government officials. This can be seen in several small things in the bureaucracy, such as the preparation of documents by government officials that are needed by the community, which requires bribes, known as "grease money." Support for corruption can also be seen in the

²⁵ Surita Aprilia dan Islahuddin Islahuddin, "Persepsi Tentang Faktor-faktor yang Mempengaruhi Korupsi (Studi pada Skpd di Kota Banda Aceh)," *urnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Ekonomi Akuntansi Unsyiah* 4, no. 2 (2019): 279-285, <https://doi.org/10.24815/jimeka.v4i2.12238>.

²⁶ Ni Luh Gede Yogi Arthani, "Budaya Hukum dalam Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi," *Jurnal Advokasi* 6, no. 2 (2016).

²⁷ Farida Pahlevi, "Pemberantasan korupsi di Indonesia perspektif legal system Lawrence M. Freidmen," *Jurnal El-Dusturie* 8, no. 1 (2022): 24-47, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21154/eldusturie.v1i1.4097>.

²⁸ Putra dan Linda, "Korupsi di Indonesia: Tantangan perubahan sosial," pp 14-24.

recruitment of employees, both in government and private companies. Many people still consider bribery to be a normal practice, willingly giving large sums of money to "insiders" in order to be accepted.²⁹

Regulations are established as a means to regulate the lives of citizens in order to create order and security in society. The 1945 Constitution states that Indonesia is a country based on the rule of law, but there are still many legal violations occurring in society. The law is considered a guide for behavior that must be followed by the community. The quality of law enforcement can be seen from the behavior patterns of law enforcement officials. Corruption committed by government officials indicates that this occurs due to the abuse of authority, mandate, and trust entrusted by the people, who are the highest authority in a democracy.

The success of law enforcement related to criminal acts of corruption is also determined by the quality of the human resources who carry it out. However, the reality in Indonesia is that most Indonesians have a limited understanding of the law, and some do not even understand the existence of the law. The public's understanding of the law does not arise from awareness, but rather from fear of the punishment that will be received if they violate it.³⁰ In this case, the public is used to assess the effectiveness of law enforcement. However, the public considers corruption cases to be a passing breeze and is indifferent to the law enforcement process. The public views corruption as something that cannot be eradicated, and even considers it to be an inevitable consequence of government administration. This is because the public perceives law enforcement as merely a formality, where the prosecution of corruption is not carried out with the intention of eradicating it.

In addition, the people, as holders of certain powers, are often seen as powerless and unable to influence the power held by officials. As a result, many people feel reluctant to comment on or criticize the misconduct of officials and encourage behavior where the public is obliged to support government policies. There needs to be an increase in public awareness of corruption cases and the involvement of the public is needed to eradicate this crime. The public is needed as a social control over the implementation of government bureaucracy. The role of the public in corruption cases should not only be related to legal protection, but also to transparency in the administration of the state and the granting of rights as an effort to regulate the state. In addition, the parties receiving reports of misconduct must be responsive in controlling the fraud committed.

Furthermore, the substance of the law, whereby the government has the authority to create and compile legal material contained in legislation, must also be in line with the needs of the community in terms of eradicating corruption. Corruption is a complex and systematic crime that involves many parties and is carried out in a well-organized and widespread network, harming the social and economic rights of the wider community. The complexity of the problem in combating criminal acts of corruption must be accompanied by good legal substance that supports the enforcement of the law. This must also be balanced with the reform and development of a comprehensive legal system.

D. CONCLUSION

Corruption remains a challenge for Indonesia to eradicate. Indonesia has adequate regulations related to law enforcement regarding corruption, as well as law enforcement agencies. However, the problem lies in the commitment of the community and law enforcement agencies in enforcing the law on corruption. The legal culture within society is a crucial factor in combating corruption. Even the smallest acts of society, such as giving bribes to officials in public service to obtain something, illustrate that corruption has become commonplace in Indonesia.

²⁹ Arthani, "Budaya Hukum dalam Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi," 189-200.

³⁰ Putra dan Linda, "Korupsi di Indonesia: Tantangan perubahan sosial," 14-24.

E. RECOMMENDATIONS

Efforts to enforce the law without discrimination and in accordance with the principles of good governance are necessary to eradicate corruption. The eradication of corruption can only be successful if it is carried out by qualified law enforcement officials with integrity. In order to create qualified law enforcement officials with integrity, it is necessary to reorganize the human resource management system within the law enforcement environment in a universal manner and implement it properly and evenly across all government agencies with high integrity.

REFERENCES

Aprilia, Surita, dan Islahuddin Islahuddin. "Persepsi Tentang Faktor-faktor yang Mempengaruhi Korupsi (Studi pada Skpd di Kota Banda Aceh)." *urnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Ekonomi Akuntansi Unsyiah* 4, no. 2 (2019): 279–285. <https://doi.org/10.24815/jimeka.v4i2.12238>.

Arthani, Ni Luh Gede Yogi. "Budaya Hukum dalam Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi." *Jurnal Advokasi* 6, no. 2 (2016).

Atmoko, Dwi, dan Amalia Syauket. "Penegakan hukum terhadap tindak pidana korupsi ditinjau dari perspektif dampak serta upaya pemberantasan." *Binamulia Hukum* 11, no. 2 (2022): 177–91.

Buku Pendidikan Anti Korupsi. *Pendidikan Anti Korupsi untuk Perguruan Tinggi*. Diedit oleh Yusuf Kurniadi Nanang T. Puspito, Marcella Elwina S., Indah Sri Utari. Jakarta: Kemendikbud, 2011. Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan RI%0ADirektorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi%0ABagian Hukum Kepegawaian.

Dr. Wiwik Sri Widiarty, S.H., M.H. *Buku Ajar Metode Penelitian Hukum*. Yogyakarta: Publika Global Media, 2024.

Hariwangsa, Tridian, dan Henny Yuningsih. "Upaya Penguatan Regulasi Untuk Mencegah Tindak Pidana Korupsi." *Disiplin Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 30, no. 4 (2024): 121–30.

Juwita, Della, dan Yoserizal Yoserizal. "Faktor Penyebab Meningkatnya Angka Korupsi." *Sanskara Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran* 3, no. 01 (2025): 52–58.

Medistiara, Yulida. "Deretan Jaksa yang Malah Diadili Karena Kasus Korupsi." Detik News. Diakses 30 Maret 2025. <https://news.detik.com/berita/d-4994630/deretan-jaksa-yang-malah-diadili-karena-kasus-korupsi>.

Mikhael, Lefri, Aryono Dian, Eka Kusuma, Wardani Khairul, Riza Muhamad, Romdoni Mia, Amalia Toni, et al. "HUKUM PIDANA DILUAR KODIFIKASI PENULIS," 163–74. Padang: PT. Global Eksekutif Teknologi, 2023.

Muhamad, Nabilah. "10 Sektor dengan Kasus Korupsi Terbanyak di Indonesia pada 2024." databoks, n.d. <https://databoks.katadata.co.id/ekonomi-makro/statistik/68dcd879b05ee/10-sektor-dengan-kasus-korupsi-terbanyak-di-indonesia-pada-2024>.

Pahlevi, Farida. "Pemberantasan korupsi di Indonesia perspektif legal system Lawrence M. Freidmen." *Jurnal El-Dusturie* 8, no. 1 (2022). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21154/eldusturie.v1i1.4097>.

Pelayanan Informasi Publik (Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi). "Ringkasan Kinerja KPK Triwulan 1 Tahun 2024." Diakses 8 Juni 2025. https://ppid.kpk.go.id/info_detail/329.

Pratiwi, Windy, Jessyola Olyvia, Ayu Efritadewi, dan Heni Widiyani. "Problematika Pengaturan Hukum Tindak Pidana Korupsi: Pasal 2 dan 3 UU RI Nomor 31 Tahun 1999." *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan* 10, no. 13 (2024): 776–86. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12820171>.

Prihatina, Ratih. "Mengenal Perspektif GONE (Greed, Opportunity, Needs dan Exposure)." Kementerian Keuangan Direktorat Jenderal Kekayaan Negara. Diakses 6 Juni 2025. <https://www.djkn.kemenkeu.go.id/kpknl-tegal/baca-artikel/17410/HAKORDIA-2024-Mengenal-Perspektif-GONE-Greed-Opportunity-Needs-dan-Exposure-Dalam-TindakanKecuranganKorups>.

Pusat Edukasi Antikorupsi. "Beberapa Kasus Korupsi di DPR dan Dampaknya." Diakses 8 Maret 2025. <https://aclc.kpk.go.id/aksi-informasi/Eksplorasi/20231008-beberapa-kasus-korupsi-di-dpr-dan-dampaknya>.

Putra, Nandha Risky, dan Rosa Linda. "Korupsi di Indonesia: Tantangan perubahan sosial." *Integritas: Jurnal Antikorupsi* 8, no. 1 (2022): 13–24.

Setiawan, Irfan, dan Christin Pratami. "Analisis Perilaku Korupsi Aparatur Pemerintah Di Indonesia (Studi pada Pengelolaan Bantuan Sosial Di Era Pandemi Covid-19)." *Jurnal Media Birokrasi*, 2022, 33–50. <https://doi.org/10.33701/jmb.v4i2.2744>.

Sugiarto., Toto. *Dampak Korupsi dan Hukuman Bagi Pelaku Korupsi: Seri Ensiklopedi Pendidikan Anti Korupsi*. Jakarta Selatan: Hikam Pustaka, 2021. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=sA9lEAAAQBAJ>.

Sujana, I Gede, dan I Wayan Kandia. "Indikator lemahnya penegakan hukum di Indonesia." *IJOLARES: Indonesian Journal of Law Research* 2, no. 2 (2024): 56–62.

Syauket, Amalia, dan Dwi Seno Wijanarko. "Buku ajar tindak pidana korupsi." *PT. Literasi Nusantara Abadi Grup*, 2024.

Toni Andrianus Pito, S I P, S I P Efriza, dan S I P Kemal Fasyah. *Mengenal Teori-teori Politik: Dari Sistem Politik sampai Korupsi. Nuansa Cendekia*, 2022. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=O2ykEAAAQBAJ>.

Toto Sugiarto. *Dampak Korupsi dan Hukuman Bagi Pelaku Korupsi: Seri Ensiklopedi Pendidikan Anti Korupsi*. Jakarta Selatan: Hikam Pustaka, 2021. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=sA9lEAAAQBAJ>.

Undang-undang (UU) Nomor 23 Tahun 2014 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah (2014).

Undang-undang (UU) Nomor 30 Tahun 2014 tentang Administrasi Pemerintahan, Pub. L. No. 30 (2014).

Undang-undang (UU) Nomor 31 Tahun 1999 tentang Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi, Pub. L. No. 31 (1999). <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/45350/uu-no-31-tahun-1999>.

Wilhelmus, Ola Rongan. "Korupsi: Teori, faktor penyebab, dampak, dan penanganannya." *JPAK: Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Katolik* 17, no. 9 (2017): 26–42. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.34150/jpak.v17i9.44>.