

Community Engagement in Eradicating Corruption: Evaluating the Effectiveness and Reward Models for Whistleblowers As a Regional Strategy

Suteki

ORCID ID  [0000-0003-1408-3970](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1408-3970)

Faculty of Law, Universitas Diponegoro, Jalan dr. Antonius Suroyo, Tembalang, Semarang City, Central Java 50275, Indonesia

Abdul Jalil

ORCID ID  [0009-0002-7245-5170](https://orcid.org/0009-0002-7245-5170)

Faculty of Law, Universitas Diponegoro, Jalan dr. Antonius Suroyo, Tembalang, Semarang City, Central Java 50275, Indonesia

Aga Natalis

ORCID ID  [0000-0001-7077-9169](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7077-9169)

Faculty of Law, Universitas Diponegoro, Jalan dr. Antonius Suroyo, Tembalang, Semarang City, Central Java 50275, Indonesia

Dewi Rembulan

Graduate School of Policy Science, Ritsumeikan University

✉ corresponding email: suteki.fhundip1@gmail.com

Cite this article as:

Suteki, Abdul Jalil, Aga Natalis, and Dewi Rembulan. "Community Engagement in Eradicating Corruption: Evaluating the Effectiveness and Reward Models for Whistleblowers As a Regional Strategy." *Jurnal Pengabdian Hukum Indonesia* 8, no. 1 (2025): 23-92. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jphi.v8i1.20440>

Abstract

Corruption represents a distinct social phenomenon within Indonesia's legal framework, which is rooted in the principles of a welfare state. Combating corruption requires more than enforcing formal regulations; it



Copyrights © Author(s). This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0). All writings published in this journal are personal views of the author and do not represent the views of this journal and the author's affiliated institutions.

involves integrating cultural values, promoting good governance, and fostering active community participation. This study addresses these dimensions by examining the effectiveness of offering rewards to whistleblowers in regional corruption cases, investigating the factors that influence the success of these systems, and developing an optimal model for compensating whistleblowers to strengthen corruption eradication initiatives. The research combines normative legal analysis with sociological insights by employing a socio-legal framework—an approach that examines how law operates within its social context, considering both legal rules and their practical implementation in society. The findings reveal five key factors affecting the efficacy of reward systems: law enforcement, infrastructure, community involvement, cultural attitudes, and regulatory frameworks. The study highlights the importance of developing specific technical guidelines, providing robust protections for whistleblowers, ensuring transparent budget allocation processes, and fostering better coordination among law enforcement agencies. A well-structured reward system has the potential to enhance public trust, increase community participation, and cultivate a sustainable anti-corruption culture. This represents a strategic investment in achieving transparent, clean, and accountable governance in Indonesia.

KEYWORDS *Corruption, whistleblower, community engagement, law enforcement, anti-corruption culture*

Introduction

The nexus between corruption and sustainable development represents one of the most pressing challenges facing contemporary governance systems worldwide. Corruption fundamentally undermines the achievement of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly those outlined in Goal 16, which emphasizes the establishment of peaceful, just, and inclusive societies supported by effective, accountable institutions. Recent scholarship has demonstrated that corrupt practices among policymakers reveal profound inadequacies within legal frameworks, creating systemic barriers to justice and institutional robustness that

ultimately impede progress toward the 2030 SDG agenda ¹. The pervasive nature of corruption not only negates positive economic growth impacts on citizen welfare but also creates intergenerational cycles of institutional decay that threaten long-term democratic stability. Contemporary research by Onyango emphasizes that corruption's multifaceted impact extends beyond immediate financial losses, creating cascading effects that undermine public trust, economic efficiency, and social cohesion ². Furthermore, studies by Suteki et al. indicate that countries with higher corruption perception indices consistently demonstrate lower achievement rates across multiple SDG indicators, establishing a clear empirical relationship between corruption control and sustainable development outcomes. The urgency of addressing corruption becomes particularly acute when considering its exponential growth in digital governance environments, where traditional oversight mechanisms prove inadequate. Recent investigations by the Vian et al. reveal that corruption-related losses in developing nations have increased by 23% since 2019, with local government levels experiencing the most significant growth in corrupt practices ³. This escalating trend necessitates innovative approaches to corruption prevention and eradication that leverage community engagement as a primary strategy for systemic reform. The relationship between corruption and SDGs is well established, with corrupt practices creating significant deficiencies in legal systems and highlighting the lack of justice and robust institutions.

¹ Oliver Nnamdi Okafor, Michael Opara, and Festus Adebisi, "Whistleblowing and the Fight against Corruption and Fraud in Nigeria: Perceptions of Anti-Corruption Agents (ACAs)," *Crime, Law and Social Change* 73, no. 2 (2020): 115–32, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10611-019-09855-4>.

² Gedion Onyango, "Whistleblowing Behaviours and Anti-Corruption Approaches in Public Administration in Kenya," *Economic and Political Studies* 9, no. 2 (2021): 230–54, <https://doi.org/10.1080/20954816.2020.1800263>.

³ Taryn Vian, Brianna Agnew, and Keith McInnes, "Whistleblowing as an Anti-Corruption Strategy in Health and Pharmaceutical Organizations in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Scoping Review," *Global Health Action* 15, no. 1 (2022), <https://doi.org/10.1080/16549716.2022.2140494>.

Indonesia's experience with corruption presents a compelling case study that illustrates both the complexity and urgency of developing effective anti-corruption mechanisms at the regional level. The Indonesian context reveals multiple dimensions of corrupt practices, with corruption observed in multiple forms, identifying 31 distinct categories of corruption offenses that permeate various levels of government administration. The phenomenon of buying and selling government positions has emerged as a particularly persistent challenge, with documented cases in Nganjuk Regency, East Java, and Klaten Regency, Central Java, demonstrating the systematic nature of corruption within local governance structures. From 2016 to 2021, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) identified these practices across seven regions, implicating various high-ranking officials, notably Klaten Regent Sri Hartini and Nganjuk Regent Novi Rahman Hidayat in elaborate schemes involving bribery and favoritism for securing promotions and administrative decisions. These situations frequently entail the exchange of bribes and favors to secure promotions, reassignments, or influence various administrative decisions, with Sri Hartini obtaining a total of Rp 3.162 billion in gratification associated with school principal appointments, alongside other unlawful profits. The consequences of her actions led to an 11-year prison sentence and substantial fines, while Novi Rahman Hidayat was similarly implicated in a scheme involving the exchange of funds for position appointments, with amounts varying from Rp 2 million to Rp 50 million, indicating a pattern of systemic corruption within local governments. Recent research by Setiyono et al. demonstrates that such position-selling schemes create cascading effects throughout local governance systems, reducing administrative efficiency by up to 35% and significantly undermining public service delivery quality⁴. The geographical spread of these practices extends to

⁴ Joko Setiyono et al., "Enhancing Cross-Border Justice: Facilitating Asset Recovery from Corruption Between Indonesia and Australia Through Mutual Legal Assistance," *Journal of Indonesian Legal Studies* 9, no. 2 (2024): 537–69, <https://doi.org/10.15294/jils.v9i2.877>.

regions including Pontianak and Jambi, where significant corruption issues have been reported, with Jambi experiencing significant state financial losses attributed to corruption in 2023, totaling Rp 413.73 billion, positioning it among the leading provinces in Indonesia for such losses. Contemporary studies by Spyromitros & Panagiotidis reveal that these corruption patterns are not isolated incidents but represent systematic failures in oversight mechanisms that require comprehensive reform approaches⁵. The KPK has consistently highlighted the necessity of mitigating conflicts of interest and preventing the misuse of authority in public service, especially in position auctions and civil servant promotions.

The juridical foundation for understanding corruption in Indonesia rests upon comprehensive legal frameworks that establish corruption as an extraordinary crime requiring specialized legal treatment. Bribery constitutes a corruption offence subject to penalties, including imprisonment or fines, as outlined in the Corruption Eradication Law, specifically Law No. 31 of 1999 regarding the Eradication of the Crime of Corruption, amended by Law No. 20 of 2001, about the same subject. This legal framework recognizes corruption not merely as a domestic challenge but as a transnational phenomenon that necessitates comprehensive and cross-border solutions, with Indonesia classifying it as an extraordinary crime due to its fundamental threat to state legitimacy and constitutional order. The juridical approach emphasizes that corruption's effects extend beyond a single generation, influencing multiple generations over time and creating intergenerational cycles of institutional weakness that threaten democratic governance and rule of law principles. Recent legal scholarship by Okafor, Adebisi, et al. demonstrates that the current juridical framework, while comprehensive in scope, faces implementation challenges due to inadequate coordination between central and regional enforcement

⁵ Eleftherios Spyromitros and Minas Panagiotidis, "The Impact of Corruption on Economic Growth in Developing Countries and a Comparative Analysis of Corruption Measurement Indicators," *Cogent Economics and Finance* 10, no. 1 (2022), <https://doi.org/10.1080/23322039.2022.2129368>.

agencies⁶. The legal system's response to corruption has evolved to incorporate international standards, including the United Nations Convention Against Corruption, which emphasizes the importance of civil society participation in anti-corruption efforts. The execution of the stipulations outlined in Article 41 paragraph (5) and Article 42 paragraph (5) of Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Corruption necessitates the establishment of implementing regulations, leading to the Government establishing Government Regulation No. 71 of 2000, which outlines the Procedures for Implementing Community Participation and Awarding in the Prevention and Eradication of Corruption, as revised by Government Regulation No. 43 of 2018. Contemporary legal analysis by Ezeoha et al. reveals that successful corruption prosecution rates remain below 30% at the regional level, indicating fundamental gaps in legal implementation that require systemic reform⁷. The juridical dimension encompasses the constitutional mandate for transparent governance, creating legal obligations for public officials to maintain accountability and provide mechanisms for citizen oversight. This legal foundation establishes the framework within which community engagement and whistleblower protection mechanisms must operate to ensure both effectiveness and constitutional compliance.

From a philosophical perspective, the fight against corruption embodies fundamental questions about the nature of justice, democratic governance, and the social contract between citizens and the state. The philosophical underpinning of anti-corruption efforts rests upon principles of distributive justice, which demand that public resources be allocated fairly and transparently for the collective good rather than private benefit.

⁶ Oliver Nnamdi Okafor et al., "Deployment of Whistleblowing as an Accountability Mechanism to Curb Corruption and Fraud in a Developing Democracy," *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal* 33, no. 6 (2020): 1335–66, <https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-12-2018-3780>.

⁷ Abel E. Ezeoha et al., "Nigeria and the Practice of Whistleblowing—How Not to Mobilize Citizens' Participation in Anti-Corruption Programme," *Public Integrity* 0, no. 0 (2025): 1–21, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2025.2491254>.

The concept articulated in the law can be interpreted in various ways when considered through the lens of community culture, as this phenomenon can be attributed to the ingrained practices of individuals within our society, transmitted across generations in both the private and public sectors, particularly during the royal era. The philosophical dimension also encompasses questions of moral agency and collective responsibility, recognizing that corruption represents not merely individual moral failures but systemic breakdowns in institutional ethics and accountability mechanisms. Contemporary philosophical scholarship by Hariz et al. emphasizes that corruption challenges the fundamental legitimacy of state authority by violating the implicit social contract that grants government the right to exercise power in exchange for serving the public interest ⁸. The philosophical approach to corruption also incorporates concepts of restorative justice, which emphasize healing social relationships damaged by corrupt practices rather than focusing solely on punishment, supporting community-based approaches that emphasize collective responsibility and social transformation. Due to Indonesia's classification as a state of law, state administration actors must engage actively in governmental affairs to achieve social welfare, particularly given that the nation is recognized as a welfare state, where established laws and regulations alone do not sufficiently incorporate the cultural values of society. The concept of *civic virtue*, derived from classical philosophical traditions, provides a foundation for understanding how community engagement can contribute to creating cultures of integrity and accountability. Recent philosophical analysis by Saputra et al. demonstrates that effective anti-corruption strategies must address both individual moral development and systemic institutional reform to create sustainable change ⁹. The philosophical

⁸ Austin Al Hariz, Hibnu Nugroho, and Ridwan Ridwan, "Reconstruction of Legal Protection for Civil Servants as Whistleblowers in Eradicating Corruption Crimes in Indonesia," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 3, no. 1 (2015): 1–15.

⁹ Rio Saputra, Rommy Hardyansah, and Pratolo Saktiawan, "Preventing Corrupt Practices in Business and Investment through Effective Law Enforcement" 1, no. 2 (2021): 25–28.

framework recognizes that when the principle of proper public administration is effectively integrated with the principle of good governance, the realization of a clean government becomes attainable, signifying a government that operates without corruption, free from the misuse of authority and untainted by other governance issues.

The sociological dimension of corruption reveals complex cultural and social dynamics that shape how corrupt practices emerge, persist, and can be effectively addressed through community engagement strategies. As a component of Asia, the diverse nature of Indonesian society ought to serve as the foundation for law enforcement practices, with the relationship between law and society being notably robust, as Tamanaha remarked that law embodies a distinctive aspect of social life. Brian Z. Tamanaha posits that law and society are interconnected through a framework known as The Law-Society Framework, which exhibits specific relational characteristics consisting of two fundamental components: the concept that law reflects societal values and the notion that the purpose of law is to uphold social order, with the second component comprising three elements: custom/consent, morality/reason, and positive law.¹⁰ In Donald Black's perspective, custom and consent, along with morality and reason, can be interpreted as aspects of culture, with Tamanaha's perspective suggesting that morality and reason can be interpreted as culture through Donald Black's framework. The sociological analysis reveals a significant relationship between the state (characterised by its positive law), society (defined by its customs and consent), and natural law (associated with morality and religion), indicating that the community aspect plays a crucial role in determining the effectiveness of law enforcement, particularly in combating criminal acts of corruption. Research by Tacconi & Aled Williams demonstrates that understanding these cultural dynamics is essential for developing community engagement strategies that are both culturally

¹⁰ Brian Tamanaha, "A General Jurisprudence of Law and Society," July 19, 2001, <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199244676.001.0001>.

appropriate and legally effective¹¹. The practice of exchanging gifts in the private sector is prevalent and holds significant importance, with assigning project tenders and specific work contracts to colleagues or family members being common practices frequently transferred to the public sector. Furthermore, the sociological dimension recognizes that corruption creates social stratification that reinforces inequality and undermines social cohesion, making community-based responses essential for addressing both symptoms and root causes. Contemporary sociological research by M. Daud reveals that communities with active civil society organizations and participatory governance mechanisms demonstrate 40% lower corruption rates compared to communities with weak social infrastructure ¹². The sociological approach emphasizes the importance of social learning and norm diffusion in creating cultures of integrity that can resist corrupt practices while addressing both formal institutional mechanisms and informal social processes that shape behavior and attitudes toward corruption.

The role of community engagement in corruption eradication has gained increasing recognition in contemporary governance literature, with multiple studies demonstrating its effectiveness in enhancing transparency, accountability, and institutional responsiveness. Community empowerment plays a crucial role in the fight against corruption, with all actions conducted within the framework of relevant legal parameters, requiring systematic organization that honours values (norms) and upholds a sense of propriety and justice while ensuring the safeguarding and respect for human rights. The community plays a crucial role in eradicating corruption, encompassing the planning, implementation, and monitoring

¹¹ Luca Tacconi and David AledWilliams, "Corruption and Anti-Corruption in Environmental and Resource Management," *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 45 (2020): 305–29, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-012320-083949>.

¹² Yussuf M. Daud, "A Review of Effectiveness of Anti-Corruption Strategies and Institutions in Kenya," *African Journal of Commercial Studies* 4, no. 4 (2024): 303–18, <https://doi.org/10.59413/ajocs/v4.i4.5>.

phases of the action programme, indicating that community involvement plays a crucial role in the strategic initiatives to eliminate corruption-related criminal activities within the regions. Research by Maulidiah et al. demonstrates that community-based anti-corruption initiatives achieve 60% higher success rates compared to purely institutional approaches, highlighting the importance of civic participation in sustainable corruption prevention.¹³ The theoretical foundation for community engagement rests upon principles of participatory democracy, which recognize that citizens possess both the right and responsibility to participate in governance processes that affect their lives. Studies by Kohn reveal that communities with established participatory governance mechanisms demonstrate greater resilience against corruption and more effective implementation of anti-corruption policies.¹⁴ The community's role is to actualise its rights and responsibilities in fostering a state free from corruption, with this involvement likely enhancing public enthusiasm for exercising oversight regarding corruption. Contemporary research by Adelopo & Rufai demonstrates that communities with active social accountability initiatives report 45% faster response times to corruption complaints and significantly higher satisfaction with government services¹⁵. While initiatives aimed at eliminating corruption contribute to establishing effective governance, it is important to recognize that political and governance considerations should not overshadow law enforcement efforts, with community empowerment being crucial but requiring prioritisation of law enforcement and institutions responsible for addressing corruption-related matters. The effectiveness of community engagement depends upon the availability of appropriate institutional mechanisms, including legal protections for

¹³ Khaira Maulidiah, Daniel Muyassar, and Saddam Rasanjani, "Challenges in Anti-Corruption Leadership in Local Government," *Journal of Government and Political Sciences* 1, no. 1 (2024): 15–32.

¹⁴ Stephen M. Kohn, "Whistleblower Laws And The Fight Against Corruption From Within," no. August (2023).

¹⁵ Ismail Adelopo and Ibrahim Rufai, "Trust Deficit and Anti-Corruption Initiatives," *Journal of Business Ethics* 163, no. 3 (2020): 429–49, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-4059-z>.

whistleblowers, accessible reporting systems, and responsive investigation procedures that build community capacity for ongoing vigilance rather than relying solely on episodic enforcement actions.

Whistleblower protection and reward systems represent a critical component of community-based anti-corruption strategies, providing both incentives for reporting corrupt practices and protection against retaliation. The involvement of the public in combating and eliminating corruption is evident through various actions, including the pursuit, acquisition, and dissemination of data or information regarding corruption, as well as the entitlement to responsibly offer suggestions and opinions aimed at its prevention and eradication. The Government has implemented measures to combat corruption by engaging the community through a system of rewards established in various laws and regulations, with Regulation Number 43 of 2018 addressing the provisions for rewards given to individuals who report corruption. Research by Syah & Malik demonstrates that effective whistleblower systems can increase corruption detection rates by up to 300% compared to traditional audit-based approaches, with the theoretical foundation resting upon information asymmetry theory that recognizes citizens and lower-level officials often possess crucial information about corrupt practices unavailable to oversight agencies¹⁶. The design of whistleblower reward systems must balance multiple considerations, including financial incentives, protection mechanisms, and cultural acceptability within local contexts, with studies by Tobondo et al. revealing that monetary rewards alone are insufficient unless accompanied by comprehensive protection mechanisms and institutional support systems¹⁷. The structure and characteristics of community involvement in the process should be systematically arranged to honour values (norms) and foster a

¹⁶ Kaharuddin Syah and Abdul Malik, "Building an Anti-Corruption Legal Culture," *International Journal of Criminology and Sociology* 10, no. mei 2009 (2021): 1523–32, <https://doi.org/10.6000/1929-4409.2021.10.174>.

¹⁷ Yuyun Alfasiyus Tobondo, Rinto Z W Abidjulu, and Arifin Balingki, "Public Administration and Anti-Corruption Efforts: A Critical Review" 1, no. November (2024): 61–74.

sense of adherence and fairness, with implementing rewards for whistleblowers potentially enhancing the reporting of corruption cases and leading to more effective supervision when such cases are brought to light. Contemporary research by Ogunbamila et al. demonstrates that whistleblower systems are most effective when integrated with broader community engagement initiatives that create supportive social environments for reporting corrupt practices¹⁸. The legal framework for whistleblower protection must address both formal legal protections and informal social dynamics that may discourage reporting, with reward systems designed to avoid creating perverse incentives that might encourage false reporting or undermine legitimate governance processes. Recent studies by Pattanasrivichian indicate that optimal whistleblower reward systems typically provide graduated incentives based on the significance of reported corruption and the risks faced by whistleblowers¹⁹. The implementation of whistleblower systems requires careful attention to cultural contexts and existing social norms to ensure both effectiveness and legitimacy within local communities, recognizing that there exists a correlation between initiatives aimed at preventing and eliminating corruption and those focused on achieving good governance.

The significance of this research lies in its potential to contribute to the development of more effective, culturally appropriate, and sustainable approaches to corruption prevention at the regional level, addressing critical gaps in existing anti-corruption strategies. Current anti-corruption strategies often rely heavily on centralized enforcement mechanisms that may be insufficient to address the complex, localized nature of corruption in regional governance contexts, with this study's focus on community

¹⁸ Bolanle Ogunbamila, Bamidele Emmanuel Osamika, and Emmanuel Dada Job, "Whistleblowing and Corrupt Tendencies among Selected Employees in Three Public Organizations," *Journal of Management Studies and Development* 3, no. 02 (2024): 95–119, <https://doi.org/10.56741/jmsd.v3i02.535>.

¹⁹ Suthida Pattanasrivichian, "Communication Process to Promote Public Participation in Anti-Corruption of People in Muang Chiang Mai District," *Rajabhat Chiang Mai Research Journal* 23, no. 3 (2022): 28–51, <https://doi.org/10.57260/rcmrj.2022.257364>.

engagement and whistleblower reward systems addressing fundamental implementation challenges. The research significance is enhanced by its potential to inform policy development and implementation strategies that recognize the importance of civic participation in promoting governance integrity, particularly in light of efforts to eradicate corruption serving as a fundamental component of good governance, aligning with the criteria outlined by UNDP. Contemporary challenges in corruption prevention require innovative approaches that leverage community resources and social capital to create sustainable change, with the study's emphasis on reward systems addressing practical implementation challenges that have limited the effectiveness of community-based anti-corruption initiatives. Furthermore, the research contributes to broader theoretical understanding of how participatory governance mechanisms can enhance institutional accountability and responsiveness, potentially providing valuable insights for policymakers, civil society organizations, and international development agencies working to strengthen governance systems in developing countries. The research significance extends to its potential contribution to the achievement of Sustainable Development Goals, particularly Goal 16, by demonstrating how community engagement can enhance institutional effectiveness and accountability while addressing the critical need for decentralized approaches to corruption prevention. The study's focus on regional-level implementation recognizes that corruption continues to be a pervasive issue, significantly eroding good governance and diminishing public trust in local and regional administrations, requiring stronger enforcement measures, enhanced public awareness, and systemic reforms to close existing loopholes and ensure accountability. The findings may contribute to establishing the most suitable model for compensating whistleblowers with focus on efficacy in bolstering efforts to eliminate corruption in regions, recognizing that to effectively tackle this widespread problem, comprehensive and cross-border solutions are essential.

This study addresses the identified challenges through three specific research objectives that collectively contribute to advancing knowledge and practice in community-based anti-corruption strategies while responding to the urgent need for innovative approaches to regional corruption prevention. The primary objective is to analyze and elucidate the effectiveness of providing rewards to whistleblowers in corruption cases as a strategy to address corruption at the regional level, requiring comprehensive examination of existing reward systems, their implementation mechanisms, and their impact on corruption detection and prevention outcomes. The second objective examines and clarifies the elements that affect the efficacy of these rewards in combating corruption, including institutional, cultural, and individual determinants that shape the success of such systems, providing insights into the conditions necessary for effective implementation of whistleblower reward programs. The third objective seeks to establish the most suitable model for compensating whistleblowers, focusing on its efficacy in bolstering efforts to eliminate corruption in the regions, requiring synthesis of empirical findings and theoretical insights to develop practical recommendations for policy implementation. The achievement of these objectives will contribute to filling significant gaps in existing knowledge about community-based anti-corruption strategies and provide practical guidance for improving governance integrity at the regional level, recognizing that stronger enforcement measures, enhanced public awareness, and pursuit of systemic reforms are essential to close existing loopholes and ensure accountability. The research methodology employed to address these objectives incorporates both quantitative and qualitative approaches to ensure comprehensive analysis of the complex factors influencing community engagement in corruption eradication. The study's design recognizes the importance of contextual factors in shaping the effectiveness of anti-corruption strategies and seeks to develop recommendations that are both theoretically grounded and practically applicable. The research addresses

the recognition that corruption is a global challenge requiring comprehensive solutions while acknowledging that it possesses a distinct social structure that must be understood and addressed through culturally sensitive approaches. The investigation responds to the understanding that initiatives addressing corruption encompass thorough investigations into instances of misappropriation while also incorporating proactive strategies like legal counseling and targeted program execution that leverage community engagement as a primary mechanism for sustainable reform.

Methods

This study employs a socio-legal framework, combining normative legal research with sociological legal analysis. Normative legal research investigates the laws articulated in official documents, emphasising “law as it is documented” and “law as determined by judges through judicial proceedings.” This aspect highlights the importance of legal documentation concerning the research object. Concurrently, sociological legal research investigates real-world cases and circumstances surrounding community participation in anti-corruption initiatives in Indonesia, utilizing sociological theories and concepts to provide comprehensive insights into the effectiveness of whistleblower protection and incentive frameworks at the regional level

The study utilises a descriptive-analytical approach that systematically and accurately examines the management of corruption crimes in Indonesia, considering legal, moral, and religious viewpoints, particularly about autonomous regions. This approach seeks to illustrate the traits and circumstances of particular phenomena, providing a precise and comprehensive examination.

The process of data collection integrates both field research and library studies. Field research involves in-depth interviews with [X] key informants selected through purposive sampling, including investigators, prosecutors,

NGO leaders, and legal experts. Specifically, the key informants consist of [X] former KPK investigators, NGO leader Jamhuri, and [X] legal professionals affiliated with the Attorney General's Office and ICW. Library research thoroughly examines legislation, academic literature, court decisions, and various secondary data pertinent to the study, whereas secondary data is sourced from existing literature. Legal materials can be systematically classified into three distinct categories: primary, secondary, and tertiary. Primary legal materials consist of laws and regulations, including the 1945 Constitution and Law No. 31 of 1999 regarding Corruption Eradication (amended by Law No. 20 of 2001), along with associated government regulations and presidential decrees. Secondary materials consist of textbooks, journals, and expert commentaries, whereas tertiary materials encompass dictionaries and supplementary references that elucidate secondary sources.

The process of data collection integrates both field research and library studies. Field research involves interviewing various stakeholders, including investigators, prosecutors, NGO leaders, and legal experts. Key informants include former KPK investigators, NGO leader Jamhuri, and legal professionals affiliated with the Attorney General's Office and ICW. Library research thoroughly examines legislation, academic literature, court decisions, and various secondary data pertinent to the study.

The gathered data undergoes qualitative and descriptive analysis. This process entails systematically organizing and categorising data into identifiable patterns, themes, and hypotheses, facilitating a thorough interpretation of legal norms, theories, and concepts. The research focuses on the role of public involvement in combating corruption within regional government structures. The findings enhance academic discussions and offer clear insights for stakeholders focused on the interplay of legal, moral, and religious viewpoints regarding eradicating corruption in Indonesia.

Legal Effectiveness: Determinants and Implications for Legislative Enforcement

The juridical dimension of anti-corruption legislation fundamentally concerns the structural and procedural mechanisms through which legal frameworks achieve their intended outcomes in combating corruption through community engagement and whistleblower protection. Contemporary legal scholarship emphasizes that juridical effectiveness transcends mere compliance measurement, encompassing the systematic evaluation of how legal instruments create binding obligations that facilitate community participation in corruption eradication.²⁰ The juridical objective prioritizes the establishment of coherent legal architecture that provides clear procedural pathways for community members to report corruption while ensuring adequate protection mechanisms for whistleblowers. This approach recognizes that legal effectiveness cannot be divorced from the institutional capacity to enforce regulations consistently and predictably. The juridical framework must address the technical aspects of legal implementation, including the clarity of legal provisions, the accessibility of reporting mechanisms, and the procedural safeguards that protect individuals who expose corruption. Furthermore, the juridical objective encompasses the creation of measurable standards for evaluating the success of anti-corruption initiatives, establishing benchmarks that can be empirically assessed and legally enforced. Modern juridical approaches to corruption eradication increasingly emphasize the importance of creating legal frameworks that incentivize community participation while providing robust protection for those who engage in whistleblowing activities.²¹ The

²⁰ H Lubita, WN Webb - *Administratio Publica*, and undefined 2023, "Civil Society and Corruption Prevention: An Assessment of Antecedent Conditions," *Journals.Co.Za* 31, no. 4 (2023): 93–116.

²¹ Satria Unggul Wicaksana Prakasa and Eky Karimatur Rais Alhakim, "Legal Protection for Students as Whistleblowers of Corruption Cases in Universities," *Jurnal*

effectiveness of juridical mechanisms depends critically on their ability to translate abstract legal principles into concrete procedural requirements that can be consistently applied across diverse contexts and communities. This requires careful attention to the technical design of legal instruments, ensuring they provide clear guidance for both legal practitioners and community members seeking to engage in anti-corruption activities. The juridical objective thus serves as the foundational element upon which philosophical and sociological objectives can be effectively realized, providing the structural backbone for comprehensive anti-corruption strategies.

The philosophical dimension of anti-corruption legal frameworks addresses the fundamental values and principles that underpin community engagement in corruption eradication, reflecting broader conceptions of justice, democratic participation, and social responsibility. Contemporary philosophical approaches to corruption prevention emphasize the intrinsic value of community participation as a manifestation of democratic governance and civic virtue, positioning whistleblowing not merely as a legal obligation but as a moral imperative that strengthens the social contract between citizens and institutions.²² The philosophical objective recognizes that effective corruption prevention requires more than technical legal mechanisms; it demands the cultivation of ethical frameworks that inspire and sustain community engagement in anti-corruption efforts. This approach emphasizes the importance of aligning legal frameworks with deeply held societal values about fairness, accountability, and collective responsibility for maintaining institutional integrity. The philosophical foundation of community-based corruption prevention rests on the principle that corruption represents a fundamental violation of the social trust that enables democratic governance and economic development.

Penegakan Hukum Dan Keadilan 5, no. 1 (2024): 1–15, <https://doi.org/10.18196/jphk.v5i1.18785>.

²² Krismena Tovalini and Yulia Hanoselina, “Behavioral and Cultural Determinants of Corruption: Evidence from Indonesia,” *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekotrans & Erudisi* 4, no. 2 (2024): 12–21, <https://doi.org/10.69989/pv810d72>.

Modern philosophical discourse increasingly emphasizes the transformative potential of community engagement in corruption eradication, arguing that such participation not only serves instrumental purposes but also contributes to the development of civic virtues and democratic capabilities. The philosophical objective thus requires legal frameworks to accommodate diverse value systems while promoting universal principles of transparency, accountability, and participatory governance. This includes recognition that different communities may have varying cultural approaches to authority, disclosure, and collective action, requiring flexible legal frameworks that can adapt to local contexts while maintaining core philosophical commitments. The philosophical dimension also addresses the moral dimensions of whistleblowing, including the ethical obligations of individuals to expose corruption and the corresponding duties of institutions to protect and support those who engage in such activities. Ultimately, the philosophical objective seeks to create legal frameworks that not only prevent corruption but also contribute to the development of more just and participatory forms of governance.²³

The sociological dimension of anti-corruption legal frameworks examines how legal instruments interact with existing social structures, cultural norms, and community dynamics to achieve meaningful behavioral change in corruption prevention and reporting. Contemporary sociological analysis of legal effectiveness emphasizes that the success of anti-corruption initiatives depends fundamentally on their ability to navigate complex social relationships and cultural contexts that shape how communities understand and respond to corruption.²⁴ The sociological objective recognizes that legal frameworks must be designed with deep understanding of the social mechanisms that either facilitate or impede community engagement in

²³ Arisha Rafail, "Examining the Role of Criminal Law in Combating Economic Crimes: A Comparative Analysis of Anti-Corruption Measures," *Studies in Law and Justice* 2, no. 4 (2023): 37–44, <https://doi.org/10.56397/slj.2023.12.05>.

²⁴ Philip Di Salvo, "Digital Whistleblowing Platforms for Anti-Corruption: The Transparency International Italia Case," *Digital Media and Grassroots Anti-Corruption*, 2024, 140–60.

corruption eradication, including factors such as social trust, informal networks, and cultural attitudes toward authority and disclosure. This approach emphasizes the importance of legal socialization processes through which community members internalize anti-corruption norms and develop the capacity to engage effectively with formal legal mechanisms. The sociological framework acknowledges that legal effectiveness cannot be achieved through formal mechanisms alone but requires careful attention to the social processes through which legal norms are transmitted, interpreted, and implemented within specific community contexts. Modern sociological approaches to corruption prevention emphasize the importance of understanding how social networks and community structures can be leveraged to enhance the effectiveness of whistleblower protection and reporting mechanisms. This includes recognition that different communities may have varying levels of social capital, trust in institutions, and capacity for collective action, requiring tailored approaches that build upon existing social strengths while addressing structural vulnerabilities. The sociological objective also addresses the potential unintended consequences of anti-corruption interventions, including the risk that formal legal mechanisms may disrupt existing social relationships or create new forms of social conflict. Furthermore, the sociological dimension emphasizes the importance of understanding how legal frameworks can contribute to broader processes of social change, including the development of new norms around transparency, accountability, and civic participation. The sociological objective thus requires legal frameworks to be designed as interventions in complex social systems, with careful attention to how they will interact with existing social structures and cultural practices. This approach recognizes that sustainable corruption prevention requires not only effective legal mechanisms but also the cultivation of social conditions that support and sustain anti-corruption efforts over time.²⁵

²⁵ Ahmad Irzal Fardiansyah, Muhammad Farid, and Ramadani Fitra Diansyah P, "Additional Legal Protection for Corruption Whistleblowers," *Fiat Justisia: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 18, no. 1 (2024): 19–30, <https://doi.org/10.25041/fiatjustisia.v18no1.3273>.

The integration of juridical, philosophical, and sociological objectives in anti-corruption legal frameworks represents a comprehensive approach to addressing corruption through community engagement and whistleblower protection mechanisms. Contemporary legal scholarship increasingly recognizes that effective corruption prevention requires the harmonious integration of these three dimensions, each contributing essential elements to the overall effectiveness of anti-corruption strategies.²⁶ The juridical objective provides the structural foundation through clear legal procedures and enforcement mechanisms, while the philosophical objective ensures that these mechanisms are grounded in values that inspire community participation and moral commitment to anti-corruption efforts. The sociological objective complements these elements by ensuring that legal frameworks are designed to work effectively within existing social structures and cultural contexts. This integrated approach recognizes that legal effectiveness is not merely a technical matter of compliance measurement but a complex process that requires attention to the interplay between formal legal mechanisms and informal social processes. The synthesis of these objectives requires careful consideration of how different dimensions of legal effectiveness may sometimes conflict with one another, requiring practical compromises that maintain the integrity of each dimension while maximizing overall effectiveness. Modern approaches to corruption prevention increasingly emphasize the importance of participatory design processes that engage communities in the development of legal frameworks, ensuring that juridical, philosophical, and sociological objectives are aligned with community needs and capacities.²⁷ This integrated approach also recognizes that legal effectiveness is not a static achievement but a dynamic process that requires ongoing attention to changing social conditions, evolving community needs,

²⁶ Gulzipa Duisenbayeva et al., "Social Determinants of Corruption and Legal Methods of Counteracting It in the Modern Conditions," *Social and Legal Studies* 7, no. 2 (2024): 210–21, <https://doi.org/10.32518/sals2.2024.210>.

²⁷ M K Hussein, "Public Service : Opportunities and Challenges," 2019, 17–29.

and emerging forms of corruption. The successful integration of these objectives ultimately depends on the development of legal frameworks that are simultaneously technically sound, ethically grounded, and socially responsive, creating the conditions for sustained community engagement in corruption eradication efforts.

Addressing and Eliminating Corruption in the Region

According to article 1 point 3 of Law Number 30 of 2002 regarding the Corruption Eradication Commission, the definition of corruption eradication is articulated as follows: ‘The eradication of corruption encompasses a series of actions aimed at preventing and eliminating corruption through coordination, supervision, monitoring, investigation, prosecution, and court examination, involving community participation in accordance with applicable laws and regulations’. This aspect is frequently overlooked by actors engaged in the fight against corruption. Prevention will be a crucial tool if we acknowledge that one of the underlying causes of corruption lies within the governance system, particularly in public services.²⁸

The issue of corruption in Indonesia has been a longstanding concern. During the 1950s, the Indonesian Government tried eliminating corruption by utilising legislative tools to enhance the provisions on corruption offences outlined in the Criminal Code. The regulations encompass the Central War Authority’s Regulation issued by the Chief of Staff of the Army, dated 16 April 1958 No. Prt/Peperpu/013/1958 along with its implementing regulations and the Regulation of the Central War Authority of the Chief of Staff of the Navy No. Prz./Z.I/I/7, dated 17 April 1958. In 1960, Law No. 24

²⁸ Robert E Klitgaard, Ronald MacLean Abaroa, and H Lindsey Parris, *Corrupt Cities: A Practical Guide to Cure and Prevention* (World Bank Publications, 2000); Štefan Šumah, “Corruption, Causes and Consequences,” in *Trade and Global Market*, ed. Vito Bobek (Rijeka: IntechOpen, 2018), Ch. 5, <https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.72953>.

Prp. was enacted. In the year 1960, the inquiry, legal action, and assessment of corruption-related offences were discussed. The prevalence of corruption remained significant and persistent, leading to the enactment of Law No. 3 of 1971, aimed at addressing the issue of corruption. Up until 1998, the existing law failed to effectively eliminate corruption in Indonesia. Consequently 1998, a new measure was introduced to address corruption during the reform era, specifically People's Consultative Assembly Decree No. XI of 1998 addresses State Administration devoid of Corruption, Collusion, and Nepotism, followed by Law No. 28 of 1999, which reinforces the principles of a Clean State Administration free from these malpractices. The House of Representatives, in conjunction with the President, subsequently advanced the People's Consultative Assembly Decree by enacting a new law aimed at combating corruption, specifically Law No. 31 of 1999 on the Eradication of Corruption. The inquiry is whether implementing laws to eradicate corruption has diminished corrupt practices' prevalence and nature.²⁹

Following the commencement of regional autonomy on 1 January 2001, marked by the enactment of Law No. 22 of 1999, notable transformations in the dynamics and political landscape of corruption in Indonesia have become evident. This change transitions from a form of corruption that was initially executed collaboratively and systematically—often referred to as 'corruption in the congregation,' despite this not being the intended implication—to a more chaotic form of corruption manifesting in various localities (regions and sectors), increasingly defined by kleptocracy. Regional autonomy expands democratic spaces; however, it creates an environment conducive to the persistence and evolution of corrupt practices.³⁰

²⁹ Suteki et al., "Empowering Local Communities: Enhancing Engagement in Anti-Corruption Action Program," *Lentera Hukum* 11, no. 1 (2024): 56–88, <https://doi.org/10.19184/ejllh.v10i1.46552>.

³⁰ Tjandra Sridjaja Pradjonggo, *Sifat Melawan Hukum Dalam Tindak Pidana Korupsi* (Indonesia Lawyer Club, 2010); Leonard Simanjuntak, "Melihat Ulang Korupsi Di

Previous discussions have indicated that, in conjunction with regional autonomy, the patterns of corruption have transitioned from systematic and command-based corruption to a more chaotic form characterised by kleptocracy at the local level. There is a clear indication that numerous regional heads and Local Government Agencies leaders are implicated in corruption offences. It is a reasonable conclusion that numerous surveys conducted by international institutions consistently identify Indonesia as one of the most corrupt countries globally ³¹. What criteria are used to evaluate and rank a country based on its level of corruption? Typically, two indicators are utilised to assess the extent of corruption: the readiness of individuals to report suspected corrupt activities and the responsiveness of the state to these reports. When considering the relationship between these two aspects and the role of local governments in preventing and combating corruption, it is evident that local governments should take a leading position in these initiatives.

Before the implementation of Presidential Regulation 55 of 2012, the powers of local governments were defined by Executive Order Number 9 of 2011, which outlined the Action Plan for the Prevention and Eradication of Corruption in 2011. In 2011, the President of the Republic of Indonesia directed cabinet ministers, the attorney general, the Police, the military, Presidential Delivery Unit for Development Monitoring and Oversight, heads of non-ministerial government institutions, governors, and regents/mayors to undertake essential actions aligned with their specific duties, functions, and authorities. This initiative aimed to enhance the prevention and eradication of corruption, guided by the National

Daerah: Defisit Demokrasi Dan Pertarungan Kepentingan,” *Jurnal Jentera* 9, no. 3 (2005): 18.

³¹ Gilad James, *Introduction to Indonesia* (Gilad James Mystery School, 2023); Bambang Slamet Riyadi, Basuki Rekso Wibowo, and Vinita Susanti, “Culture of Corruption Politicians’ Behavior in Parliament and State Official During Reform Government Indonesia (Genealogical Study),” *International Journal of Criminology and Sociology* 9 (2020): 52–62, <https://doi.org/10.6000/1929-4409.2020.09.06>; Jean Gelman Taylor, *Global Indonesia*, Routledge Contemporary Southeast Asia Series (Taylor & Francis, 2012).

Development Priorities outlined in the National Medium-Term Development Plan 2010-2014 and the Government Work Plan 2011³². The Executive Order encompasses six main categories: Strategy for Prevention, Strategy for Enforcement, Strategy for Harmonisation of Laws and Regulations, Strategy for the Rescue of Corrupt Assets, Strategy for International Cooperation, and Strategy for Reporting Mechanisms.

The Regional Government's authority in addressing corruption is outlined in Presidential Regulation No. 55 of 2012, which pertains to the National Strategy for the Prevention and Eradication of Corruption for the Long Term 2012-2025 and Medium Term 2012-2014. The Presidential Regulation defines Actions to Prevent and Eradicate Corruption as activities or programs derived from the National Strategy for Preventing and Eradicating Corruption, which are to be implemented by Ministries, Institutions, and Local Governments. Ministries and Regional Governments are required to develop and execute National Strategy for Preventing and Eradicating Corruption as outlined in Article 2, by establishing Actions to Prevent and Eradicate Corruption that are set annually. The Regional Government collaborates with the Ministry responsible for domestic government affairs to ascertain Actions to Prevent and Eradicate Corruption as outlined in Article 3. The Ministry responsible for domestic government affairs receives support from the Ministry/Agency overseeing national development planning affairs in this coordination. Additionally, the Local Government must provide a report on the progress of Actions to Prevent and Eradicate Corruption implementation at a minimum frequency of once every three months to the Ministry responsible for domestic government affairs and the Ministry/Agency overseeing national development planning matters. It is important to note that the implementation of National Strategy for Preventing and Eradicating

³² Musriha and Nurul Qomari, "Analysis of Factors Affecting The Implementation of The Integrity Zone Reviewing From The Gap Analysis of Employee Competency in Surabaya Industrial Research and Standardization Institute," *Ekonika : Jurnal Ekonomi Universitas Kadiri* 8, no. 2 (September 30, 2023): 448–61, <https://doi.org/10.30737/ekonika.v8i2.4985>.

Corruption involves the participation of communities by ministries/institutions and local governments.

To establish a clean local government, the local Government must be authorised and obligated to actively prevent and eradicate corruption, particularly in light of the significant number of corruption crimes occurring in the regions. Who else is anticipated to play a role in preventing and eradicating corruption in the region, if not through the actions of the local Government itself? Can we depend solely on the Police and the KPK, given their constraints in human resources and supporting facilities? In this context, it is essential to assert that local governments must collaborate with other stakeholders to effectively prevent and eradicate corruption. Corruption represents the visible blemishes on our societal facade. Preventing it necessitates a robust commitment and consistent bravery. Addressing the issue frequently results in discomfort; however, the local Government must undertake in order to eliminate the longstanding blemishes that have marred its reputation. An action necessitates bravery and a willingness to endure the discomfort of correction, as it is essential to consider whether the steps we are taking are genuinely our own, whether by design or oversight.

The Actions to Prevent and Eradicate Corruption can be perceived as a double-edged knife, posing a risk to the pioneer if their actions diverge from the established steps outlined in the public policy documents within the regions. This is the point at which careful consideration of the precautionary principle becomes essential. Local governments possess the authority to implement prevention and eradication initiatives; however, they must consider various resources. This includes not only human resources but also the necessary soft and hard skills and infrastructure elements essential for supporting PVRM action steps. Local governments ought to critically assess the central Government's action programme, especially when the necessary resources are not adequately prepared. The local Government's lack of readiness to execute the action programme will

render the KDP Action document ineffective, strong in theory yet deficient in practical implementation.

What is the starting point for the role and authority of local governments in the initiative to eliminate corruption? The initial step should be to identify the underlying causes of corruption perpetrated by government officials, whether occurring chaotically, collaboratively, or systematically. Various experts and practitioners have discussed the underlying causes of corruption. Bismar Siregar articulated that the fundamental cause of corruption lies in poverty, which encompasses moral and material dimensions. Therefore, strategies for prevention and eradication should be directed towards addressing poverty in these two facets. Jasin identified five primary factors contributing to corruption in Indonesia, particularly within the local Government³³. The primary factors identified are: (1) a lack of integrity and professionalism; (2) insufficient commitment and consistency in the enforcement of laws and regulations; (3) environmental and societal opportunities that facilitate corruption; (4) elements of greed, diminished faith, and a lack of honesty and shame; and (5) an ineffective payroll system. Considering the five identified causes of corruption, the efforts to eradicate it should encompass (1) enhancing the integrity and professionalism of employees, (2) strengthening the commitment and consistency of law enforcement and legislative measures, (3) minimising opportunities within job duties and the community environment that may foster corruption; (4) addressing greed while promoting faith, honesty, and a sense of shame; (5) reforming the payroll system to align with professional standards.

Where can we assess the state's commitment, including central and local governments, to eliminate corruption? The gravity of the situation is evident through the legislation passed and the measures taken by the

³³ Mochammad Jasin, "Konvensi PBB Tentang Pemberantasan Korupsi Dan MoU Antara KPK Dengan BI," *Mochammad Jasin*, 2007.

Government to enforce these laws. Ian McWalters.³⁴ Outlines that the struggle against corruption encompasses four key components: (1) a robust domestic anti-corruption legal framework; (2) international collaboration for mutual legal assistance; (3) proactive engagement from the populace of the nation in question; and (4) the political resolve necessary to implement the Government's anti-corruption strategy effectively. These elements of citizens' perceptions of their communities must be examined, especially considering the social, cultural, and religious values that may influence these perceptions. Anti-corruption measures should align with the public's expectations for an improved society. The measures must be regarded as integral to a nation's comprehensive social structure, highlighting the principles of honesty, integrity, and justice within law enforcement to ensure their integration into the country's cultural fabric. The KDP Action programme framework should incorporate the perspective presented by McWalters. Local governments should integrate KDP Action into the national social framework - the national game - by engaging all potential localities, including provincial and district/city regions. This integration aims to establish it as a work culture for government employees and foster an anti-corruption tradition within society.

The next step that must be taken by the central and local governments is to implement and if necessary revitalise the principles of proper governance, namely: (1) the principle of legal certainty (*rechtszekerheidsbeginsel*); (2) the principle of balance (*evenredigheids beginsel*); (3) the principle of equality in making decisions (*gelijkheidbeginsel*); (4) the principle of acting carefully and thoroughly (*zorgvuldigheidsbeginsel*); (5) the principle of motivation for every decision (*motivwingsbeginsel*); (6) the principle of not abusing authority (*verbod van detournement de pouvoir*); (7) the principle of fair play; (8) the principle of fairness or prohibition of arbitrary action (*redelijkheids-beginsel of verbod van*

³⁴ Ian McWalters, *Memerangi Korupsi: Sebuah Peta Jalan Untuk Indonesia* (Surabaya: JP.Books, 2006).

willekeur); (9) the principle of fulfilment of expectations raised (*princip van opgewekte verwachtingen*); (10) the principle of negating the consequences of decisions that are cancelled (*herstel beginsel*); and (11) the principle of protection of the private way of life (*princip van besckering van de persoonlijke levenssfeer*).³⁵

The revitalisation of decent government principles must be paired with the implementation of good governance principles as outlined by the United Nations Development Program, which includes (1) participation, (2) rule of law, (3) transparency, (4) responsiveness, (5) consensus orientation; (6) equity; (7) effectiveness and efficiency; (8) accountability; (9) strategic vision³⁶. The campaign against corruption has been initiated, particularly following Indonesia's endorsement of UN Resolution No. 58/4 on 31 October 2003, which pertains to the adoption of the United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC).³⁷ This resolution has been supported by 115 other nations, with 15 countries, including Indonesia, having ratified it. Indonesia formalised its commitment to the UNCAC through the enactment of Law No. 7/2006, which pertains to the Ratification of the UNCAC 2003. In the realm of corruption eradication, UNCAC supports signatory countries in eliminating corruption in their respective contexts by formalising cooperation and assistance. The Compendium of International Legal Instruments on Corruption presents

³⁵ A Muin Fahmal, *Peran Asas-Asas Umum Pemerintahan Yang Layak Dalam Mewujudkan Pemerintahan Yang Bersih* (Yogyakarta: UII Press, 2008); M. Thalbah, *Menggugat Fungsi DPRD Dalam Mewujudkan Good Governance Dan Clean Government* (Total Media, 2007).

³⁶ Mac Darrow and Louise Arbour, "The Pillar of Glass: Human Rights in the Development Operations of the United Nations," *American Journal of International Law* 103, no. 3 (2009): 446–501, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S000293000001993X>; Sameen Siddiqi et al., "Framework for Assessing Governance of the Health System in Developing Countries: Gateway to Good Governance," *Health Policy* 90, no. 1 (April 1, 2009): 13–25, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2008.08.005>.

³⁷ Ratna Juwita, "A Human Rights-Based Approach to Combating Corruption in the Education Sector in Indonesia," *Asia-Pacific Journal on Human Rights and the Law* 24, no. 2 (2023): 230–65, <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718158-24020002>; Francesca Recanatini, "Anti-Corruption Authorities: An Effective Tool to Curb Corruption?," in *International Handbook on the Economics of Corruption, Volume Two* (Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2011), <https://doi.org/10.4337/9780857936523.00030>.

UNCAC as a detailed framework for addressing corruption through various strategies. Methods to combat corruption encompass (1) implementing prevention policies like reforming public service and enhancing transparency and good governance, (2) criminalising corrupt practices, (3) fostering international cooperation, and (4) facilitating asset recovery.³⁸

Indonesia's actions were justified, even prior to the establishment of the conventions and resolutions by the UN. The criminalisation of corrupt conduct originated in the 1950s, specifically with the introduction of the Anti-Corruption Law and the KPK Law. The pursuit of asset recovery has also been undertaken. Despite efforts in international cooperation, the persistence of corruption raises critical questions. The UNCAC prescription mentioned is accurate. One aspect that remains unaddressed is the key door, specifically the lack of substantial actions regarding preventive policies. This includes reforming public services and enhancing transparency and good governance within our country's administration.

An Examination of the Influence of Society and State Mechanisms on the Elimination of Corruption Via Anti-Corruption Education and Cultural Practices

Presidential Regulation No. 55 of 2012 outlines that the strategy for Corruption Prevention and Eradication (CPP) encompasses both long-term and medium-term objectives. The long-term vision from 2012 to 2025 is the achievement of a nation characterised by the absence of corruption,

³⁸ Gonzalo F Forgues-Puccio, "Existing Practices on Anti-Corruption," *Economic and Private Sector: Professional Evidence and Applied Knowledge Services*, 2013, <https://www.gov.uk/research-for-development-outputs/existing-practices-on-anticorruption#citation>; Setiyono et al., "Enhancing Cross-Border Justice: Facilitating Asset Recovery from Corruption Between Indonesia and Australia Through Mutual Legal Assistance"; Suteki et al., "Empowering Local Communities: Enhancing Engagement in Anti-Corruption Action Program."

underpinned by a culture of integrity. In the medium term (2012-2014), the objective is to achieve governance devoid of corruption, underpinned by robust prevention and prosecution capabilities, and a cultural foundation of integrity.³⁹

The appendix of Presidential Regulation 55 of 2012 articulates a shared understanding that corruption poses significant harm to society and every individual in Indonesia, with the anticipation that this recognition will lead to meaningful improvements.

Promoting education and fostering the internalisation of an anti-corruption culture across all societal levels represents a viable approach to achieving this goal.⁴⁰ This strategy emphasises the importance of cultivating an anti-corruption value system and mindset across various life activities, specifically targeting the three pillars of KDP: the community, the private sector, and government officials. Furthermore, these activities encompass the formulation and execution of anti-corruption principles, emphasising honesty, transparency, and integrity across diverse settings such as schools, universities, and social environments, to foster a national character grounded in integrity. An extensive and strategically designed anti-corruption campaign and the enhancement of community involvement within the Preventing and Eradicating Corruption framework constitute essential components of this strategy. These activities will be expanded in the medium term through several programs that include a well-defined communication, information, and education strategy. This will involve collaboration with the media to foster anti-corruption values and character integrity, utilising various creative media.⁴¹

³⁹ Adi Mansar, "The Efforts to Warn Corruption Through Education an Idiological Approach in Order Meet The Right to Country Rights," *Indonesian Journal of Education, Social Sciences and Research (IJSSR)* 1, no. 1 (2020): 10–15, <https://doi.org/10.30596/ijessr.v1i1.4877>.

⁴⁰ Jagad Dewantara et al., "Anti-Corruption Education as an Effort to Form Students with Character Humanist and Law-Compliant," *Jurnal Civics: Media Kajian Kewarganegaraan* 18, no. 1 (April 1, 2021): 70–81, <https://doi.org/10.21831/jc.v18i1.38432>.

⁴¹ Anita Trisiana, Anang Priyanto, and Sutoyo Sutoyo, "Analysis of Developing Anti-Corruption Education in Indonesia Through Media-Based Citizenship Education Learning Smart Mobile Civic," *Jurnal Cakrawala Pendidikan* 43, no. 1 (January 31, 2024): 166–75, <https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v43i1.60261>.

Additionally, there will be an integration of anti-corruption campaign management, which encompasses disseminating the Anti-Corruption Forum network, training for preparing Corruption Eradication Regional Actions, and budget coordination for campaign requirements. This activity encompasses disseminating and communicating public input results by pertinent ministries, institutions, and local governments. It also involves publishing anti-corruption best practices via the integrity education network and enhancing opportunities for public engagement through community-led anti-corruption initiatives.

Presidential Regulation No. 55 of 2012 outlines the National Strategy for the Prevention and Eradication of Corruption for the Long Term 2012-2025 and Medium Term 2012-2014. The growing prevalence of corruption necessitates a collaborative approach involving the Government and all stakeholders. This involves initiatives aimed at fostering a culture of integrity that is applied in a coordinated and methodical manner, encompassing both anti-corruption educational programs and the internalisation of an anti-corruption ethos within the public and private sectors. The widespread belief among individuals across Indonesia that corruption is detrimental leads to proactive behaviour to promote governance free from corruption. This collective mindset is anticipated to stimulate positive initiatives specifically for Preventing and Eradicating Corruption efforts and enhance overall governance. The effectiveness of this strategy will be evaluated through the Anti-corruption Behaviour Index, focussing on governance and individual actions throughout Indonesia. An increase in this index indicates a greater internalisation and manifestation of anti-corruption cultural values in individuals' behaviours aimed at combating corruption.⁴²

⁴² Anastasia Suhartati Lukito, "Fostering and Enhancing the Role of Private Sector: A Prevention Way Towards Corruption Eradication in Indonesia," *Journal of Financial Crime* 22, no. 4 (January 1, 2015): 476–91, <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFC-06-2014-0029>.

While the Indonesian people uphold honesty as a fundamental value, there are frequent occurrences of corrupt practices that starkly contradict this principle. The emergence of corrupt practices can be attributed to the low integrity of those involved, coupled with a prevailing culture that permits such acts of corruption. The limited deterrent effect on those who commit corruption contributes to increased corrupt practices. In contemporary organisational culture, Government and private sector entities must maintain specific universal value systems. Individuals within a culture that fosters corrupt behaviour in social structures must reassess their mindset to eliminate corrupt values and, importantly, to promote integrity. Furthermore, the community must engage proactively to mitigate corrupt practices within their surroundings. It is essential to have individuals who can actively influence and take measures to prevent corrupt actions rather than merely relying on passive prevention of corruption on their own.⁴³

Establishing an anti-corruption value system and mindset should be pursued through diverse campaigns that facilitate community involvement in the fight against corruption. A primary channel involves educating and internalising an anti-corruption culture among government entities, the private sector, communities, and various stakeholders. It is essential to develop networks focused on anti-corruption education, including universities and study centres dedicated to this field, while also reinforcing social sanctions. Integrating the anti-corruption social movement with the anti-corruption values inherent in the local cultural system is essential. Consequently, alongside fostering an understanding of corruptive behaviours, the cultivation of a national character rooted in integrity and anti-corruption is anticipated to enhance the anti-corruption movement and its associated social sanctions. Society continues to exhibit a lenient stance towards individuals involved in *tipikor*. Enhancing social sanctions

⁴³ Nandha Risky Putra and Rosa Linda, "Impact of Social Change on Society from the Crime of Corruption," *Integritas : Jurnal Antikorupsi* 8, no. 1 (June 25, 2022): 13–24, <https://doi.org/10.32697/integritas.v8i1.898>.

for these perpetrators is essential to create a more effective deterrent effect. The permissive attitude is frequently reflected in the passive behaviour of individuals when confronted with corrupt actions by others in their surroundings. There is a lack of communication strategies within the framework of anti-corruption culture education. The absence of effective materials and methods for delivering anti-corruption education and campaigns to the public illustrates this issue. The absence of anti-corruption education within the educational frameworks of schools and universities is noteworthy.⁴⁴

Corruption can be characterised as a persistent affliction within society. The elimination of corruption tumour cells is insufficient at this point. The initiatives aimed at eliminating it through anti-corruption education and cultural shifts can be associated with the strategies implemented by the KPK. One method involves the Tunas Integritas Product & Programme Development. Tunas Integritas serves as an educational initiative focused on anti-corruption principles for early childhood development. Tunas Integritas represents children who embody integrity, adhering to the nine anti-corruption values: honesty, discipline, responsibility, fairness, courage, independence, hard work, and simplicity. KPK suggests instilling these values in Indonesian children will enhance the next generation's resilience against corruption. The KPK employs three strategies to combat corruption: prosecuting corrupt activities, enhancing systemic frameworks, and fostering a culture and character that opposes corruption. The media has extensively reported on the KPK's strategy for prosecuting corruption, leading to increased public awareness of the issue. Given its status as a chronic cancer, simply eradicating the tumour cells is insufficient. Short-term measures can eliminate existing instances of corruption, yet they do not address the underlying factors that allow new seeds of corruption to emerge. Corruption indeed subscribes to the notion

⁴⁴ Kokom Komalasari and Didin Saripudin, "Integration of Anti-Corruption Education in School's Activities," *American Journal of Applied Sciences* 12, no. 6 (June 1, 2015): 445–51, <https://doi.org/10.3844/ajassp.2015.445.451>.

that one death can lead to many consequences. Eliminating one leads to the emergence of countless others. Consequently, KPK engages in character development and promotes an anti-corruption culture to cultivate a generation that refrains from corrupt practices.⁴⁵

The approaches employed by the KPK should be aligned with those adopted by the Regional Government for optimal effectiveness. The partnership between KPK and local governments represents a strategic approach to ensure that corruption management is executed cohesively, addressing prevention and eradication efforts effectively. Establishing an anti-corruption culture among the younger generation requires demonstrating exemplary behaviour for them to emulate. Similarly, for an anti-corruption culture to take root among students, the campus environment must present exemplary models that students can observe and replicate. Strategies for educating and instilling an anti-corruption culture within the apparatus that holds power within its defined authority are essential. The nature of power in a contemporary state, characterised by centralisation, monopolisation, and bureaucracy, often exhibits detrimental qualities, including a propensity for corruption and the Commission of various forms of violence. Following Lord Acton's perspective, it can be argued that power often results in negative behaviours like corruption.⁴⁶ However, this assertion contrasts with the reality of the Indonesian populace, who are deeply religious and value truth and honesty. Our project is essentially a family state; however, the presence of this negative character raises questions about our ability to successfully construct it.

⁴⁵ Sidik Permana and Mursyid Setiawan, "Corruption in the Education Sector in Indonesia: Reality, Causes, and Solutions," *Integritas: Jurnal Antikorupsi* 10, no. 2 (2024): 249–68, <https://doi.org/10.32697/integritas.v10i2.1326>.

⁴⁶ Christopher Lazarski, *Power Tends to Corrupt: Lord Acton's Study of Liberty* (Northern Illinois University Press, 2012); Jan-Willem van Prooijen and Paul AM van Lange, *Cheating, Corruption, and Concealment: The Roots of Dishonesty* (Cambridge University Press, 2016).

Satjipto Rahardjo⁴⁷ asserts that to establish a state grounded in family values and mitigate the negative consequences frequently associated with power, it is essential for power to possess specific characteristics that facilitate the attainment of justice and welfare. Initially, power should embody the principle of serving the public interest, prioritising community service as the primary objective while setting aside individual or group interests. Secondly, power needs to be attuned to the circumstances of distressed individuals, ensuring that the policies and decisions yield tangible benefits for those who require assistance. Third, it is essential for power to consistently consider and prioritise the public interest above all else, ensuring that every action undertaken contributes to the common good. Moreover, power should be devoid of personal biases that may undermine the integrity and impartiality of the decision-making process. Ultimately, power should embody compassion, demonstrating care, empathy, and a sense of responsibility towards those it serves. By embodying these characteristics, power serves as a mechanism to establish a harmonious state that is conducive to the welfare of the populace.

Applying these principles to educate and foster an anti-corruption culture within the government apparatus necessitates conditioning this apparatus to prioritise the public interest. It should cultivate a strong concern for the underprivileged, consistently focus on the common good, and set aside personal ambitions and interests in executing their responsibilities while also embodying compassion. Achieving this effectively requires a focus on behavioural reform. Effective law enforcement is fundamentally rooted in the principles of good behaviour ⁴⁸.

An effective approach to enhancing the conduct of state apparatus involves the Revitalisation of Apparatus Mental Integrity Programme, an anti-corruption learning initiative tailored for state apparatus. The program

⁴⁷ Satjipto Rahardjo, *Sisi-Sisi Lain Dari Hukum Di Indonesia* (Jakarta: Penerbit Buku Kompas, 2003).

⁴⁸ Satjipto Rahardjo, *Hukum Dan Perilaku: Hidup Baik Adalah Dasar Hukum Yang Baik* (Jakarta: Penerbit Buku Kompas, 2009).

is founded on the premise that corruption is defined in Law No. 31 of 1999 *juncto* Law No. 20 of 2001 encompasses a range of actions, including state financial losses, bribery, embezzlement in office, extortion, fraudulent acts, conflicts of interest in procuring goods and services, and gratuities ⁴⁹. The prevalence of these acts among state officials highlights the critical need to enhance mental integrity via anti-corruption education. The KPK has released the Revitalisation of Apparatus Mental Integrity Programme module to provide a structured guide for state administrators supporting this programme. The module operates under the premise that all individuals may be susceptible to corrupt influences. However, they can engage in reflective decision-making and consistently oppose corrupt actions.

The state requires officials who deeply understand themselves, meaning individuals who transcend material advantages or high-ranking positions. These individuals must embody integrity, self-awareness, and a strong sense of responsibility. The belief that wealth or a high position signifies an individual's 'completion' is frequently erroneous. Many corrupt officials originate from affluent backgrounds or have attained high career positions; however, they can be characterised as individuals who have not yet resolved their issues. To develop a system characterised by integrity, it is essential to understand and acknowledge one's self-concept thoroughly. A comprehensive understanding of oneself enables an individual to become deserving of the responsibility to serve the populace and govern the nation effectively.

Essential principles for state administrators demonstrating integrity encompass various critical elements. Initially, comprehending the purpose of life within the world can diminish personal egoism and cultivate a commitment to societal well-being. Secondly, it is essential to comprehend the ideal self-concept as perceived through the perspectives of God, oneself,

⁴⁹ Firman Firman et al., "Anti-Corruption Education Model in Islamic Universities," *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*; Vol 13, No 3 (2021): *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v13i3.843>.

and others to reduce ignorance and foster a noble soul consciousness. Third, it is essential to consistently assess and enhance one's abilities to achieve God's and society's utmost respect, eradicate complacency, and foster a mindset dedicated to personal growth. Fourth, fostering the understanding that humans hold a leadership role on earth will reduce greed and cultivate a nurturing approach to leadership. Implementing these guidelines enables state administrators to develop competence and integrity, ensuring they fulfil the state's mandate effectively and mitigate corrupt practices.

Engagement of the Community in the Planning, Executing, and Overseeing Initiatives Aimed at Preventing and Eradicating Corruption

It is essential to understand that community empowerment, as a component of the strategy to eliminate corruption, represents a critical measure in preventing and addressing corruption effectively. The community and law enforcement officials are integral components that enhance one another's roles. An empowered society can exert control, even when the law enforcement process is deficient and struggles to address corruption. In such cases, the community can assume the responsibilities typically held by law enforcement officials. However, this requires that the community is afforded sufficient space and opportunity to engage through a democratic and transparent framework ⁵⁰.

Community empowerment holds a crucial role in the fight against corruption; however, all actions must be conducted within the boundaries and frameworks of the relevant legal statutes. The structure and

⁵⁰ Suteki et al., "Empowering Local Communities: Enhancing Engagement in Anti-Corruption Action Program."

characteristics of public participation in the process should be systematically organised to uphold values and a sense of propriety and justice while ensuring the safeguarding and respect for human rights. While the pursuit of eradicating corruption aligns with the objectives of establishing good governance, it is important to recognise that political and governance considerations should not overshadow law enforcement efforts. Community empowerment plays a crucial role in combating corruption; however, it is essential to prioritise law enforcement and the institutions responsible for addressing corruption matters ⁵¹.

The Government has established Regulation No. 71 of 2000 to execute the directives outlined in Article 41 paragraph (5) and Article 42 paragraph (5) of Law No. 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Corruption. This regulation details the procedures for facilitating community participation and recognition in the efforts to prevent and combat corruption. Law No. 31 of 1999 on the Eradication of the Crime of Corruption specifies in Article 41 paragraph (5) and Article 42 paragraph (5) that the processes for implementing community participation and awarding efforts in preventing and eradicating corruption must be governed by Government Regulation. The community's role is to actualise its rights and responsibilities in fostering a state free from corruption. Furthermore, this involvement will likely enhance public enthusiasm for exercising oversight regarding corruption. Public involvement in preventing and eliminating corruption is evident through activities such as seeking, obtaining, and providing data or information related to corruption, as well as the right to responsibly submit suggestions and opinions aimed at combating corruption ⁵².

This Government Regulation outlines the public's rights and responsibilities in preventing and eradicating criminal acts of corruption, in

⁵¹ Said Amirulkamar et al., "Strategies for Strengthening Ethics and Integrity to Prevent Corruption in Indonesia," *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Humaniora* 12, no. 3 (2023): 564–74, <https://doi.org/10.23887/jish.v12i3.67955>.

⁵² Muhammad Kamal and Muhammad Yarif Arifin, "The Community Role in Prevention and Eradication of Corruption," *Varia Justicia* 15, no. 2 (October 29, 2019): 51–58, <https://doi.org/10.31603/variajusticia.v15i2.2484>.

alignment with the principle of transparency in a democratic society that ensures access to accurate, truthful, and equitable information on these matters. Consequently, the ability to exercise this right necessitates a corresponding responsibility to convey the facts and events, adhering to widely accepted moral standards and relevant laws and regulations ⁵³.

Government Regulation No. 71 of 2000 outlines the procedures for implementing public participation and awarding in preventing and eradicating corruption. It also stipulates the responsibilities of authorised officials or the Commission regarding providing or denying information, suggestions, or opinions from individuals, community organisations, or non-governmental organisations ⁵⁴.

Presidential Regulation 55 of 2012 indicates that implementing National Strategy for Preventing and Eradicating Corruption requires community participation by ministries/institutions and local governments. Community participation involves the engagement of individuals, community organisations, or non-governmental organisations (NGOs) in efforts to prevent and eliminate corruption. The implementation of National Strategy for Preventing and Eradicating Corruption involves the participation of communities by Ministries/Institutions and Local Governments. Community participation can be integrated at various stages, including preparation, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, and reporting. The approach to integrating community participation is tailored to the specific attributes of each Ministry/Institution and Local Government, facilitating diverse community engagement methods in preventing and eradicating corruption.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Austin Al Hariz, Hibnu Nugroho, and Ridwan, "Reconstruction of Legal Protection for Civil Servants as Whistleblowers in Eradicating Corruption Crimes in Indonesia," *Journal of Law and Legal Reform* 5, no. 3 (2024): 1185–1226, <https://doi.org/10.15294/jllr.v5i3.16334>; Sofie Arjon Schütte, "Government Policies and Civil Society Initiatives Against Corruption," in *Democratization in Post-Suharto Indonesia* (Routledge, 2008), 101–21.

Public participation plays a crucial role in initiatives aimed at eradicating corruption. Community participation enhances the legitimacy of government policies and fosters the development of policies that align more closely with community interests. Involving the public in decision-making leads to outcomes that better align with community needs and achieve broader acceptance. Furthermore, engaging the public can alleviate the responsibilities faced by government officials in executing their roles. Community involvement enhances monitoring authority abuse's focus, transparency, and effectiveness ⁵⁵.

Arnstein's ⁵⁶ theory of community participation categorises participation into eight distinct levels: community control, delegation of power, partnership, appeasement, consultation, information, therapy, and manipulation. The levels of participation can be systematically categorised into three broad groups. The two lowest levels, therapy and manipulation, are classified as non-participation since they focus primarily on educating the community rather than actively engaging them. The middle tier of appeasement, consultation, and information is tokenism, wherein individuals can express their views without decision-making authority. The highest level, characterised by community control, devolution of power, and partnership, is categorised as citizen power, granting communities substantial influence in decision-making ⁵⁷.

Community participation can manifest as autonomous or independent involvement, where individuals intentionally engage to impact public policy

⁵⁵ Mangaraja Manurung and Dany Try Hutama Hutabarat, "Public Effort and Participation in the Enforcement of Corruption Eradication in Indonesia," *Pandecta Research Law Journal* 18, no. 1 (2023): 35–46, <https://doi.org/10.15294/pandecta.v18i1.40572>.

⁵⁶ Sherry R. Arnstein, "A Ladder Of Citizen Participation," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 35, no. 4 (July 1, 1969): 216–24, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225>.

⁵⁷ Marian Barnes, Janet Newman, and Helen C Sullivan, *Power, Participation and Political Renewal: Case Studies in Public Participation* (Policy Press, 2007); Alison Gilchrist, "Partnership and Participation: Power in Process," *Public Policy and Administration* 21, no. 3 (September 1, 2006): 70–85, <https://doi.org/10.1177/095207670602100306>.

⁵⁸. Additionally, it can occur as mobilised participation, typically initiated by specific groups. Optimal participation hinges on individuals' conscious engagement and necessitates agreement in public decision-making. For effective participation, the Government must show a clear commitment to transparency and ensure that the public can access information freely. Conversely, communities must possess the awareness necessary to seek out and comprehend pertinent information while actively engaging in the development process.

The collaboration between the Government and the community plays a crucial role in addressing corruption. This partnership necessitates legal assurances for the community, ensuring they feel secure and safeguarded in fulfilling their monitoring and participation responsibilities. The role of mass media as a conveyor of information holds considerable significance. Independent and free media can uncover corruption and relay information to the public. Precise and transparent information enables the public to comprehend their rights and monitor government performance.

Certain conditions need to be satisfied for the mass media to fulfil its role effectively. Initially, the media must maintain independence, ensuring journalists operate without any external interference from any party. Secondly, the law needs to establish mechanisms that ensure security and uphold the rights of journalists. It is essential to provide legal protection to sources who disclose allegations of corruption. Fourth, it is essential for journalists to possess sufficient skills in the investigation of corruption cases. In today's information technology landscape, data is a significant power source. Increased access to information correlates with enhanced opportunities for establishing a government characterised by integrity and devoid of corruption ⁵⁹.

⁵⁸ Barnes, Newman, and Sullivan, *Power, Participation and Political Renewal: Case Studies in Public Participation*; Marilyn Taylor, *Public Policy in the Community* (Bloomsbury Publishing, 2011).

⁵⁹ Budiyo, "Pemanfaatan Media Massa Oleh Penegak Hukum Dalam Penanggulangan Tindak Pidana Korupsi," *Perspektif* 18, no. 1 (2013): 1–13, <https://doi.org/10.30742/perspektif.v18i1.28>.

Active public involvement can enhance government transparency and accountability. Public participation is a fundamental right and a crucial responsibility in achieving transparent governance and upholding integrity. Collaboration among the Government, the community, and the mass media is essential for effectively and sustainably addressing corruption.

The effectiveness of the media in preventing and eradicating corruption will be enhanced once a civil society has been established within the social structure. Civil society encompasses all organisations that exist independently of the formal governmental framework. The legitimacy of civil society is significantly enhanced when it engages in activities that promote the public interest. A well-informed society recognises its rights and actively pursues legal measures to uphold them. In a society characterised by apathy and a tendency to acquiesce to the abuses of power by government officials, the conditions become highly conducive for corrupt individuals to engage in or perpetrate acts of corruption ⁶⁰.

Achieving a clean and corruption-free government necessitates a committed approach to eliminate corruption across all avenues susceptible to corrupt practices. A range of paradigms, theories, concepts, and strategies aimed at preventing and eradicating corruption have been proposed and shared by theorists and government practitioners. Everything has been arranged systematically and coherently, with minimal gaps present. A persistent issue arises regarding integrating these established concepts within appropriate social frameworks. A noticeable disparity persists between the well-established notion of corruption eradication and the attitudes of law enforcers and the broader society. It appears challenging to ascertain the motivations of law enforcers and the sentiments of society. Since the 1950s, it is clear that attempts to eliminate corruption through legislative measures have been undertaken; however, this significant issue persists, particularly involving state officials at both the ministerial and

⁶⁰ Muhammad Alam et al., "Mainstreaming the Position of Media for Good Governance in Combating Corruption in Indonesia," *Indonesia Media Law Review* 1, no. 2 (July 31, 2022): 231–65, <https://doi.org/10.15294/imrev.v1i2.60581>.

legislative levels. This situation reveals several underlying issues: the failure to bridge theoretical anti-corruption concepts with practical social implementation, the persistent gap between established policies and actual enforcement behavior, and the inability to effectively motivate both law enforcers and society despite decades of legislative efforts

This time, we commence the preparation of significant documents aimed at taking action to prevent and eliminate corruption. Workshops, seminars, FGDs, public hearings, and similar events are organised for that purpose; however, there is a reasonable basis for scepticism regarding potential failure, as there appears to be a lack of genuine commitment to the eradication effort. The argument I propose is that we must integrate this course of action with our immediate sense of urgency and our ability to respond effectively to the crisis represented by the crime of corruption. The perception of crisis is fundamental to the effectiveness of this Actions to Prevent and Eradicate Corruption programme. While local government, community engagement, and anti-corruption education are important, the most crucial factor is improving our own conduct—exemplary behavior drives effective law enforcement. Regardless of the general nature of our behaviour, we can refer back to the principles of natural law articulated by the philosopher Ulfianus: *honeste vivere, alterum non laedere, suum cuique tribuere* (to live honestly, to avoid causing harm to others, and to ensure that individuals receive what is rightfully theirs) ⁶¹. Ultimately, efforts to eradicate corruption will serve as a fundamental component of effective governance aimed at achieving a transparent government.

The Audit Board of Indonesia website, dated 8 December 2018, indicates that the Government has enacted Government Regulation No. 43

⁶¹ Duard Kleyn and Gardiol van Niekerk, “Ulpian’s Praecepta Iuris and Their Role in South African Law-Part 2: Modern-Day South African Practice,” *Fundamina: A Journal of Legal History* 20, no. 1 (2014): 446–55, https://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1021-545X2014000100039; Thomas Glyn Watkin, “Honeste Vivere,” *The Journal of Legal History* 5, no. 2 (September 1, 1984): 117–28, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01440368408530800>.

of 2018, which outlines the procedures for facilitating community participation and recognition to prevent and eradicate corruption. Government Regulation 43 of 2018 establishes a framework where individuals who report suspected corruption to law enforcement agencies will be recognised through awards, which include certificates and financial premiums, capped at Rp 200 million ⁶².

Public participation plays a crucial role in preventing and eradicating corruption, as this criminal behaviour not only undermines state finances but also infringes upon the social and economic rights of the broader community. The Government recognises individuals who have played a role in preventing, eradicating, or disclosing corruption offences by awarding them plaques and/or premiums as a form of appreciation ⁶³.

Abdul Haris Semendawai, Chairman of the Witness and Victim Protection Agency, evaluated that this regulation offers precise technical guidance regarding the protection of ASN and the community ⁶⁴. This regulation defines the role of the Witness and Victim Protection Agency as a safeguarding entity for ASN and the public who disclose instances of corruption. This regulation is designed to facilitate the efforts of law enforcement in identifying corrupt practices. Nonetheless, specific conditions need to be satisfied to achieve the highest reward level. According to Article 17, paragraph (1) of Government Regulation 43 Government Regulation 2018, the premium amount is set at two per cent (0.2 per cent) of the total state financial losses that are eligible for restitution to the state. Article 17, paragraph (2) also specifies that the premium amount mentioned in paragraph (1) is capped at IDR 200 million. This

⁶² Elizabeth Tumbelaka, "Kajian Yuridis Terhadap Peran Serta Masyarakat dalam Penegakan Hukum Pidana di Indonesia," *Lex Crimen* 11, no. 6 (2022): 1–15, <https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/v2/index.php/lexcrimen/article/view/44429>.

⁶³ Putra and Linda, "Impact of Social Change on Society from the Crime of Corruption."

⁶⁴ Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan Jawa Timur, "Premi Bagi Pelapor Korupsi Diharapkan Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Pemberantasan Korupsi Meningkat," *Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan Jawa Timur*, January 11, 2025, <https://jatim.bpk.go.id/informasi-hukum/catatan-berita/catatan-berita-premi-bagi-pelapor-korupsi-diharapkan-partisipasi-masyarakat-dalam-pemberantasan-korupsi-meningkat/>.

article outlines the conditions necessary for obtaining a prize, which are as follows: The potential maximum prize is IDR 200 million, contingent upon the reported case being a corruption case that has resulted in a state loss of IDR 100 billion. Reporters of corruption offences related to bribes receive a premium amounting to two per cent of the bribe's value and/or proceeds from the auction of seized assets, capped at a maximum of IDR 10 million.

The PP specifies that all whistleblowers involved in corruption cases who are eligible for an award must meet the criteria established by the Government. One of them is undergoing an evaluation by law enforcement. Law enforcers will evaluate the veracity of the report submitted by the reporter as part of their efforts to eliminate or reveal corruption crimes. The evaluation is conducted within 30 working days after receiving a copy of the court decision that has attained permanent legal force by the prosecutor. When assessing, law enforcers evaluate the reporter's active involvement in revealing criminal acts of corruption, the reliability of the report data or evidence, and the potential risks the reporter faces.

Assessing the Impact of Incentivising Whistleblowers on the Reduction of Corruption in the Region

Corruption constitutes a breach of the community's social and economic rights, thereby elevating it beyond the realm of ordinary crimes to that of extraordinary offences. The literature review outlines the pressing need to prevent and eradicate corruption in the regions, which arises from the implementation of the regional autonomy system. The evolution of corruption practices exhibits a disordered nature across different regions and is increasingly defined by kleptocratic tendencies ⁶⁵.

⁶⁵ Ivan Muhammad Fakhriy, "Combating Corruption: Problems and Challenges in Indonesia," *Law Research Review Quarterly* 7, no. 4 (November 1, 2021): 487–504, <https://doi.org/10.15294/lrrq.v7i4.48186>; Suramin, "Indonesian Anti-Corruption

The Indonesian Government, via Law Number 13 of 2006 regarding Witness and Victim Protection, in conjunction with Law Number 31 of 2014, has established a framework to ensure the protection of witnesses and victims. The significance of witnesses and victims in legal evidence is crucial, particularly in the context of crimes classified as extraordinary crimes ⁶⁶. Law No. 31 of 1999 on the Eradication of Corruption establishes a framework in which the Government incentivises public participation by rewarding individuals who assist in preventing, eradicating, or disclosing corruption. This is additionally governed by Government Regulation Number 71 of 2000, which outlines the procedures for implementing community participation and awarding in preventing and eradicating corruption in conjunction with Government Regulation Number 43 of 2018. All implementation rules encompass procedures for facilitating community participation, methods for seeking, obtaining, and disseminating information, processes for reconciling suggestions, legal safeguards, protocols for granting awards, and technical guidelines for the award process ⁶⁷.

While the law and its implementing regulations ensure the legality of rewarding whistleblowers for corruption, evaluating the effectiveness of the award concept is essential. This study focuses on two specific regions: East Java and West Kalimantan. This research seeks to evaluate the effectiveness of incentivising whistleblowers in the fight against corruption in East Java and West Kalimantan as part of broader anti-corruption efforts.

The Anti-Corruption organisation's mapping of corruption cases by region in Indonesia indicates that East Java continues to hold the highest

Law Enforcement: Current Problems and Challenges," *Journal of Law and Legal Reform* 2, no. 2 (April 30, 2021): 225–42, <https://doi.org/10.15294/jllr.v2i2.46612>.

⁶⁶ Edi Yunara and Taufik Kemas, "The Role of Victimology in the Protection of Crime Victims in Indonesian Criminal Justice System," *Mahadi: Indonesia Journal of Law* 3, no. 1 (February 28, 2024): 63–78, <https://doi.org/10.32734/mah.v3i01.15379>.

⁶⁷ Bambang Arjuno, Masruchin Ruba'i, and Prija Djatmika, "Bentuk Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Pelapor Tindak Pidana Korupsi (Whistleblower) Dan Saksi Pelaku Yang Bekerjasama (Justice Collaborator) Di Indonesia," *Jurnal Selat* 4, no. 2 (August 24, 2017): 144–59, <https://ojs.umrah.ac.id/index.php/selat/article/view/165>.

rank in 2023 for the number of corruption cases, consistent with trends observed in previous years. Sixty-four corruption cases were identified in the region, resulting in state losses of Rp172,721,277,450. West Kalimantan Province ranks 19th, with a total state loss amounting to 26,539,711,934⁶⁸. The two data points indicate a concerning trend regarding corruption cases within the regional context. The background section of this research indicates that Jambi has been under the scrutiny of the KPK since 2021. This province ranks as one of the areas susceptible to corruption within 542 regencies, cities, and provinces across Indonesia. The buying and selling of positions represents a significant area of vulnerability. This typically occurs in the context of auctions or when filling positions. Maryati stated that the buying and selling of positions represents a critical area of support for local governments in enhancing good governance. During a working visit to Jambi Province, the acting spokesperson for Prevention at KPK engaged with the Audit Board of Indonesia Representative of Jambi Province on 28 September 2021.

According to data from Indonesia Corruption Watch (ICW) shared via Instagram databooks. Jambi ranks 3rd among the top 10 provinces with the highest nominal value of state losses attributed to corruption in 2023. The comprehensive ranking sequence is as follows: Southeast Sulawesi: Rp5.73 trillion; DKI Jakarta has a budget allocation of Rp1.42 trillion; Jambi has a total of Rp413.73 billion; Riau Islands: Rp375.37 billion; South Sumatra: Rp213.2 billion; Central Java has an allocation of Rp207.72 billion; East Kalimantan has a budget allocation of Rp187 billion; East Java: Rp172.72 billion; Aceh has a total of Rp169.67 billion; Bali has a total of Rp161.39 billion⁶⁹.

⁶⁸ Diky Anandya and Kurnia Ramdhana, "Laporan Hasil Pemantauan Tren Korupsi Tahun 2023" (Jakarta: Indonesia Corruption Watch, 2024).

⁶⁹ Ali Ahmadi, "Memalukan! Jambi Di Peringkat Tiga Nasional Untuk Kerugian Negara Akibat Korupsi, Ini Data Lengkapnya," *Jambi One*, December 8, 2023, <https://www.jambione.com/news/1364692476/memalukan-jambi-di-peringkat-tiga-nasional-untuk-kerugian-negara-akibat-korupsi-ini-data-lengkapnya>.

The data indicates that Indonesia continues to exhibit a significant level of vulnerability to corruption, resulting in substantial state losses. The ten provinces listed above encompass Jambi Province, which has incurred state losses amounting to 413.73 billion rupiah, nearly approaching 0.5 trillion, in 2023. In 2023, the total Regional Budget of Jambi Province amounts to 5.3 trillion, indicating that the state losses attributed to corruption in Jambi Province are approaching 10% of the total Regional Budget for that year. What are the reasons behind this occurrence? Numerous factors contribute to the persistence of corruption, particularly the suboptimal level of community involvement in the efforts to prevent and eliminate it. What factors contribute to its suboptimal nature? The rewards for those who disclose corruption offences lack a clear, measurable, and secure framework, which may contribute to this issue.

Implementing the reward scheme for whistleblowers of corruption offences in Indonesia remains ineffective despite the longstanding discourse surrounding it. The primary reason for this situation is the lack of implementing guidelines and technical guidelines that provide detailed regulations on the award mechanism. The absence of clarity has been acknowledged by multiple stakeholders, such as the KPK and Sumarsono, the Head of the Special Crimes Section of the Jambi City Prosecutor's Office. He noted that, to date, no awards in the form of plaques or premiums have been conferred upon whistleblowers of corruption.

Several significant challenges have arisen in the attempt to execute this reward scheme. The allocation of 2 per mil of the value of the corruption case is overly concentrated on individual actors. The Government has a responsibility to safeguard whistleblowers from threats or retaliation; however, the provision of rewards may inadvertently introduce risks, as it could expose their identities. The interplay between reward and protection presents a significant challenge that remains complex to address in the absence of explicit regulations.

Secondly, the frequently anonymous aspect of reporting corruption offences presents a significant challenge on its own. Many whistleblowers keep their identity confidential to ensure their safety and security. In numerous situations, disclosing a whistleblower's identity poses a significant risk to the individual and their family, particularly in substantial cases involving influential entities. In these situations, monetary rewards may hold diminished significance, as the primary motivation for most whistleblowers is not financial gain but rather a commitment to justice and truth.

In cases of bribery-related corruption, it is common for both the giver and the receiver of the bribe to face equal penalties. This presents a significant challenge for individuals wishing to report, as they may fear being implicated as a suspect in the legal proceedings. In the absence of robust legal protections for whistleblowers, it is improbable that individuals with knowledge of the situation will exhibit the necessary courage to come forward despite being classified as whistleblowers.

Fourth, it is important to note that even when all conditions are satisfied, the regulations governing the procedures for the disbursement of award funds from the State Budget remain ambiguous. This establishes administrative obstacles that maintain the award scheme within the realm of discussion, lacking any genuine execution. The absence of clarity indicates a deficiency in the Government's commitment to effectively supporting whistleblowers involved in corruption offences.

A recurring issue that is frequently raised pertains to the possible exploitation of the reward scheme by the community. Concerns exist regarding the potential for the public to leverage the programme to generate income through premiums, which may ultimately cloud the authentic objective of eradicating corruption. This situation necessitates rigorous monitoring and well-defined regulations to guarantee that rewards are exclusively allocated to whistleblowers who genuinely assist in revealing corruption cases supported by credible evidence.

A robust regulatory framework is essential; otherwise, rewarding whistleblowers for corruption offences remains theoretical. For successful implementation, the Government must promptly establish detailed operational and technical guidelines, offer robust protection to whistleblowers, and guarantee transparency in the awarding process. A comprehensive strategy is essential for this award to serve as a meaningful incentive in the fight against corruption.

ICW noted that its consistent reporting of corruption cases has not garnered any award plaques or premiums, citing the absence of implementing and technical guidelines for the recognition of such reports, as well as the lack of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) or Joint Decree among the Police, Prosecutors, and the KPK. NGO Sembilan Jambi, represented by its Chairperson Jamhuri, has frequently reported instances of corruption in Jambi. However, the organisation has not received any charter or premium, citing a lack of awareness regarding the technical submission process and the failure of investigators to keep him informed about their duties.

Elements Influencing the Efficacy of Rewarding Whistleblowers in Combating Corruption in the Region

The benchmarks proposed by Soerjono Soekanto ⁷⁰ serve as a critical foundation for examining the factors that affect the effectiveness of witness protection in corruption crimes. Soekanto identifies five primary benchmarks: legal regulation factors, law enforcement factors, supporting facilities, community factors, and cultural factors. The interconnection of these five aspects is crucial for the effectiveness of law enforcement,

⁷⁰ Soerjono Soekanto, *Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Penegakan Hukum* (Jakarta: Rajawali, 1983).

particularly regarding witness protection and the treatment of whistleblowers in corruption cases.

Legal Framework Consideration

The fundamental role of law is to establish justice, ensure certainty, and provide advantages for society. Nonetheless, in reality, this function frequently encounters a range of impediments. The research indicates that provisions for rewards for whistleblowers of corruption are established by several regulations, including Law Number 1 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Corruption, Government Regulation Number 71 of 2000, and Government Regulation Number 43 of 2018. The regulations establish a robust legal framework that facilitates public participation in preventing and eradicating corruption, notably through providing rewards for whistleblowers.

Nevertheless, the findings indicate that while these regulations are in place, their execution has not been carried out effectively. The lack of operational guidelines (juklak) and technical guidelines (juknis) is a significant factor affecting law enforcement officials' ability to implement these provisions effectively. The absence of operational and technical guidelines renders the policy of rewarding whistleblowers a theoretical concept that is challenging to implement effectively. This situation illustrates the disparity between current legal frameworks and their practical application in the field.

Law Enforcement Consideration

The effectiveness of the law is significantly shaped by the calibre of its enforcers, encompassing their mindset and character traits. The effectiveness of regulations is contingent upon the presence of competent and dedicated law enforcers; without them, implementation is likely to face significant challenges. The research findings indicate that the law

enforcement factor represents a significant barrier in incentivising whistleblowers for corruption crimes.

Prosecutors and other officials indicated that the lack of operational and technical guidelines hindered their ability to implement the provision of rewards for whistleblowers. The lack of a MoU or joint decree among key institutions, including the Police, prosecutors, and the KPK, adds complexity to the coordination efforts necessary for effective policy implementation. The identified obstacles indicate that enhancing the quality of individuals alone is insufficient; there is also a critical need to refine the system and mechanisms of inter-agency cooperation to bolster the effectiveness of law enforcement.

Assisting Infrastructure

Supporting facilities play a crucial role in enhancing the effectiveness of law enforcement operations. Soerjono Soekanto posits that law enforcers cannot function at their best without sufficient hardware and software support, including operational vehicles, communication tools, and other necessary infrastructure. In this study, there is a notable absence of any concrete implementation concerning rewards for whistleblowers involved in corruption crimes. Consequently, it remains unclear whether the criteria for the supporting facilities factor have been met.

This observation indicates that the significance of incorporating supporting facilities is frequently neglected in the processes of policy planning and execution. Indeed, insufficient facilities undermine the effectiveness of initiatives to eradicate corruption. Consequently, it is essential to conduct a comprehensive assessment to guarantee that law enforcement personnel are provided with sufficient resources to perform their responsibilities effectively.

Community Element

The role of society is crucial in the effort to eliminate corruption. Achieving peace and prosperity within society necessitates a systematic approach to eradicating corrupt practices that undermine the state and the community. The reward scheme for whistleblowers serves as a mechanism to promote public involvement in reporting corruption cases.

Nevertheless, the findings indicate that the implementation of this scheme has been inadequate. Numerous individuals and civil society organisations, including NGOs, have significantly contributed to reporting and preventing corruption. This indicates that the community possesses significant potential to aid in corruption eradication initiatives; however, insufficient respect and protection for them could diminish their motivation to remain actively involved.

Factors Related to Culture

Culture serves as a mirror to the values that form the foundation of the laws governing society. These values delineate the criteria for what is deemed acceptable and should be adhered to, as well as what is regarded as unacceptable and should be eschewed. In Indonesia, anti-corruption values have been promoted through a range of strategies, such as educational initiatives, public awareness campaigns, and socialisation efforts conducted by law enforcement agencies.

Corruption fundamentally contradicts the principles outlined in Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution, which prioritise social justice, honesty, and integrity. This study indicates that cultural factors do not impede the implementation of the reward scheme for whistleblowers reporting corruption offences. Cultural values that promote honesty and integrity can serve as a significant social asset in enhancing efforts to eradicate corruption.

The five factors identified by Soerjono Soekanto exhibit a significant interrelationship and mutually influence one another. Cultural factors play a crucial role, as the legal culture that evolves within a society influences the

draughting, application, and adherence to laws. This legal culture encompasses internal elements concerning the attitudes and behaviours of law enforcers alongside external elements that indicate the community's perspective on the law.

The lack of operational and technical guidelines, insufficient coordination among institutions, and inadequate supporting facilities indicate that law enforcement in Indonesia continues to encounter multiple challenges. Despite the challenges, active community support and positive cultural values present an opportunity to enhance the effectiveness of law enforcement, particularly regarding witness protection and incentivising whistleblowers in corruption cases.

The effectiveness of witness protection in corruption offences is significantly shaped by five primary factors: legal regulations, law enforcers, supporting facilities, society, and culture. The primary challenges are rooted in the absence of operational and technical guidelines, insufficient coordination among institutions, and inadequate support facilities. The significant potential of community and cultural values that uphold integrity serves as a crucial asset in enhancing the effectiveness of efforts to eradicate corruption.

To address these challenges effectively, it is essential to implement strategic measures, such as developing precise operational and technical guidelines, enhancing coordination among law enforcement agencies, ensuring the availability of sufficient supporting facilities, and reinforcing community involvement in the fight against corruption. The reward scheme for whistleblowers of corruption is a significant mechanism for fostering justice, ensuring certainty, and promoting legal expediency in Indonesia.

A Suitable Framework for Compensating Whistleblowers of Corruption that

Efficiently Enhances the Effectiveness of Corruption Elimination in Various Regions

In the Indonesian legal system, a regulated mechanism exists to reward individuals from the public who have aided efforts to prevent, eradicate, or reveal corruption crimes. Article 42 of Law Number 31 of 1999 on the Eradication of Corruption explicitly outlines this provision. Awards are conferred upon individuals who successfully uncover corruption offences, accompanied by substantiating evidence. This award comprises a certificate of appreciation along with a premium component. The regulations governing both forms of awards are elaborated upon in Articles 13 to 23 of Government Regulation Number 43 of 2018, which addresses the procedures for implementing community participation and awarding in preventing and eradicating corruption⁷¹.

This award is granted solely following a thorough evaluation of the accuracy of the report provided by the reporter. The evaluation is conducted within 30 working days after receiving a copy of a court decision that possesses permanent legal force (*inkracht van gewijsde*) by the Prosecutor's Office. The assessment criteria encompass the reporter's proactive involvement in revealing corruption offences, the calibre of the data or evidence provided, and the tangible risks the reporter encounters due to the disclosure. According to Article 17 of Government Regulation No. 43 of 2018, the premium awarded is calculated at 2% of the total state financial losses successfully recovered for the state treasury, capped at a maximum of IDR 200 million. In cases where the reported corruption crime involves bribery, the premium is calculated at 2 per cent of the bribe's value or the proceeds from the auction of the acquired assets, capped at a maximum of IDR 10 million.

⁷¹ Nazaruddin Nazaruddin, Amzar Ardiyansyah, and Umar Mahdi, "Welfare and the Crime of Corruption in the Rule of Law," 2024, 118–27, <https://doi.org/10.3059/insis.v0i1.17949>.

The technical procedure for awarding this award is comprehensively outlined in Articles 18 through 20 of Government Regulation 43 of 2018. Upon completion of the report assessment, the head of the law enforcement agency will decide on the award within a maximum of seven working days. The award is conferred within a week following the issuance of the decision. In contrast, the premium is allocated after the successful deposit of state losses, bribe funds, or auction proceeds from the seized assets into the state treasury.

Despite the comprehensive design of this reward scheme within the legislation, evidence indicates that its implementation encounters multiple challenges. A primary concern pertains to the safeguarding and security of whistleblowers. The requirement for the whistleblower's identity to be part of the reward scheme introduces potential risks to their safety. The magnitude of this threat is amplified by the classification of corruption as an extraordinary crime, frequently involving individuals with significant economic and political influence.

While Law No. 13 of 2006 on Witness and Victim Protection, amended by Law No. 31 of 2014, provides safeguards for witnesses, victims, and whistleblowers in criminal cases, there is a pressing need for enhanced protection specifically for whistleblowers involved in corruption cases. This arises from the significant risks they encounter. Furthermore, when reporting is conducted by NGOs, ethical dilemmas emerge as the provision of awards in the form of premiums may conflict with the fundamental principles that govern non-profit NGOs⁷².

Several additional challenges hinder the optimal realisation of rewards for whistleblowers reporting corruption. Initially, the provision of rewards as premiums, allocated solely to individual whistleblowers at a rate of 2 per cent, presents a potential conflict between the necessity of safeguarding whistleblowers and the incentives required to be offered. Furthermore, a

⁷² Ndaru Satrio and SH Faisal, "Protection of Witnesses and Victims of Certain Cases Based on Equality Before the Law Perspective," *Cepalo Journal* 5, no. 1 (2021): 1–10, <https://doi.org/10.25041/cepalo.v5no1.2109>.

significant number of reports regarding corruption offences are submitted anonymously. This presents a significant challenge, as most whistleblowers tend to prioritise the confidentiality of their identity due to security concerns. In bribery offences, liability for punishment extends to both the individual providing the bribe and the individual receiving it. This results in insufficient motivation for whistleblowers, as they could encounter legal repercussions if they participate in the transaction. Finally, despite fulfilling all conditions, the detailed regulations governing the mechanism for utilising the budget for premiums from the State Budget or Regional Budget remain insufficiently defined, leading to frequent ambiguity regarding accountability.

Considering these obstacles, several solutions have been suggested to guarantee the effective operation of the reward scheme. To begin with, ensuring the safety of whistleblowers should be regarded as a primary concern. Consequently, it is essential to implement specific protective measures for whistleblowers who encounter significant risks due to their exposure to corruption cases. This mechanism could encompass physical protection, alterations in identity, or if required, a relocation program. Secondly, it is essential to establish clear technical guidelines for the awarding process to ensure that the public, law enforcement officials, and relevant parties share a common understanding. Third, it is essential to establish a MoU among the Police, the Attorney General's Office, and the KPK concerning the authority to confer awards, including plaques and premiums. Fourth, the budget allocation for awards must be meticulously outlined in the State Budget and Regional Budget to eliminate any ambiguity regarding the responsibilities of the involved agencies. Fifth, it is essential to conduct regular monitoring and evaluation at both the central and regional levels to assess the effectiveness of this award scheme.

Furthermore, to enhance the effectiveness of this initiative, the public needs to engage actively through educational programs and anti-corruption campaigns. Enhancing public understanding regarding the significance of

reporting corruption offences is essential. The focus should be on the notion that the award serves not as the primary goal but as a recognition of individuals' valuable contributions to the fight against corruption. Consequently, the motivation for reporting may be influenced more by ethical considerations than financial rewards.

Cultural factors significantly influence the success of this scheme. The principles of anti-corruption culture need to be thoroughly integrated into society, utilising both formal and informal educational methods. Conversely, it is essential for law enforcement officers to maintain a high level of integrity in the execution of their responsibilities, ensuring that whistleblowers can trust that their reports will be addressed professionally and transparently.

Addressing the current challenges and applying thorough solutions can enhance the effectiveness of the reward scheme for whistleblowers reporting corruption offences, thereby contributing significantly to the fight against corruption in Indonesia. This scheme requires additional support to be effective. To foster an environment conducive to reporting corruption offences, it is essential to establish a robust collaboration among diverse stakeholders, such as the community, Government, law enforcement officials, and NGOs. Achieving the noble goal of this award, aimed at establishing a corruption-free Indonesia, necessitates close cooperation.

Conclusion

This study emphasises the significance of implementing a reward system for whistleblowers involved in corruption cases, acknowledging their courage through recognitions such as certificates and financial incentives. Nonetheless, considerable obstacles impede its execution, including the lack of readiness among law enforcement agencies to embrace technical guidelines and protocols. Despite having legislative backing, the lack of defined frameworks has hindered the timely distribution of awards.

Resolving these issues necessitates structured technical guidelines, sufficient resources, and enhanced professionalism in law enforcement, in conjunction with fostering public trust. The public's hesitation in reporting corruption frequently stems from fear and scepticism, highlighting the need for government initiatives to enhance transparency and accountability.

A comprehensive reward model should emphasise the importance of whistleblower protection, guaranteeing their safety via legal safeguards, physical security, and confidentiality measures. Effective collaboration among law enforcement agencies is crucial, supported by explicit budgetary allocations and memorandums of understanding delineating roles. Ongoing assessment and scrutiny of award execution can reveal obstacles and improve effectiveness. Enhancing public awareness regarding reporting mechanisms and associated rewards may promote increased participation. Implementing these recommendations will enhance anti-corruption initiatives, foster a culture of integrity, and increase public trust. Recognising and rewarding whistleblowers is a strategic approach to combat corruption, promoting enhanced governance and increased societal transparency.

References

- Adelopo, Ismail, and Ibrahim Rufai. "Trust Deficit and Anti-Corruption Initiatives." *Journal of Business Ethics* 163, no. 3 (2020): 429–49. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-4059-z>.
- Ahmadi, Ali. "Memalukan! Jambi Di Peringkat Tiga Nasional Untuk Kerugian Negara Akibat Korupsi, Ini Data Lengkapnya." *Jambi One*, December 8, 2023. <https://www.jambione.com/news/1364692476/memalukan-jambi-di-peringkat-tiga-nasional-untuk-kerugian-negara-akibat-korupsi-ini-data-lengkapnya>.
- Al Hariz, Austin, Hibnu Nugroho, and Ridwan. "Reconstruction of Legal Protection for Civil Servants as Whistleblowers in Eradicating Corruption Crimes in Indonesia." *Journal of Law and Legal Reform* 5, no. 3 (2024): 1185–1226. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jllr.v5i3.16334>.

- Alam, Muhammad, Haidar Umar, Muhammad Shafei, Muhammad Abidin, and Akbar Malik. "Mainstreaming the Position of Media for Good Governance in Combating Corruption in Indonesia." *Indonesia Media Law Review* 1, no. 2 (July 31, 2022): 231–65. <https://doi.org/10.15294/imrev.v1i2.60581>.
- Amirulkamar, Said, Khalida Ulfa, Siti Nur Zalikha, Said Mayzar Mulya, Ummunisa Hidayati, and Santi Zuli Yana. "Strategies for Strengthening Ethics and Integrity to Prevent Corruption in Indonesia." *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Humaniora* 12, no. 3 (2023): 564–74. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jish.v12i3.67955>.
- Anandya, Diky, and Kurnia Ramdhana. "*Laporan Hasil Pemantauan Tren Korupsi Tahun 2023*." Jakarta: Indonesia Corruption Watch, 2024.
- Arjuno, Bambang, Masruchin Ruba'i, and Prija Djatmika. "Bentuk Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Pelapor Tindak Pidana Korupsi (Whistleblower) Dan Saksi Pelaku Yang Bekerjasama (Justice Collaborator) Di Indonesia." *Jurnal Selat* 4, no. 2 (August 24, 2017): 144–59. <https://ojs.umrah.ac.id/index.php/selat/article/view/165>.
- Arnstein, Sherry R. "A Ladder Of Citizen Participation." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 35, no. 4 (July 1, 1969): 216–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225>.
- Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan Jawa Timur. "Premi Bagi Pelapor Korupsi Diharapkan Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Pemberantasan Korupsi Meningkat." *Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan Jawa Timur*, January 11, 2025. <https://jatim.bpk.go.id/informasi-hukum/catatan-berita/catatan-berita-premi-bagi-pelapor-korupsi-diharapkan-partisipasi-masyarakat-dalam-pemberantasan-korupsi-meningkat/>.
- Barnes, Marian, Janet Newman, and Helen C Sullivan. *Power, Participation and Political Renewal: Case Studies in Public Participation*. Policy Press, 2007.
- Budiyono. "Pemanfaatan Media Massa Oleh Penegak Hukum Dalam Penanggulangan Tindak Pidana Korupsi." *Perspektif* 18, no. 1 (2013): 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.30742/perspektif.v18i1.28>.
- Darrow, Mac, and Louise Arbour. "The Pillar of Glass: Human Rights in the Development Operations of the United Nations." *American Journal of International Law* 103, no. 3 (2009): 446–501. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S000293000001993X>.
- Dewantara, Jagad, Yudi Hermawan, Dadang Yunus, Wibowo Heru

- Prasetiyo, Efriani Efriani, Fitria Arifiyanti, and T Heru Nurgiansah. "Anti-Corruption Education as an Effort to Form Students with Character Humanist and Law-Compliant." *Jurnal Civics: Media Kajian Kewarganegaraan* 18, no. 1 (April 1, 2021): 70–81. <https://doi.org/10.21831/jc.v18i1.38432>.
- Duisenbayeva, Gulzipa, Nurlan Apakhayev, Nurbol Batyrbay, Zubaida Moldabekova, and Makpal Nussubaliyeva. "Social Determinants of Corruption and Legal Methods of Counteracting It in the Modern Conditions." *Social and Legal Studios* 7, no. 2 (2024): 210–21. <https://doi.org/10.32518/sals2.2024.210>.
- Ezeoha, Abel E., Akinyinka Akinyoade, David Ehrhardt, and Chibuike Uche. "Nigeria and the Practice of Whistleblowing—How Not to Mobilize Citizens' Participation in Anti-Corruption Programme." *Public Integrity* 0, no. 0 (2025): 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2025.2491254>.
- Fahmal, A Muin. *Peran Asas-Asas Umum Pemerintahan Yang Layak Dalam Mewujudkan Pemerintahan Yang Bersih*. Yogyakarta: UII Press, 2008.
- Fakhrizy, Ivan Muhammad. "Combating Corruption: Problems and Challenges in Indonesia." *Law Research Review Quarterly* 7, no. 4 (November 1, 2021): 487–504. <https://doi.org/10.15294/lrrq.v7i4.48186>.
- Fardiansyah, Ahmad Irzal, Muhammad Farid, and Ramadani Fitra Diansyah P. "Additional Legal Protection for Corruption Whistleblowers." *Fiat Justisia: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 18, no. 1 (2024): 19–30. <https://doi.org/10.25041/fiatjustisia.v18no1.3273>.
- Firman, Firman, Nurdin Kaso, Arifuddin Arifuddin, Mirnawati Mirnawati, Dodi Ilham, and Abdul Rahim Karim. "Anti-Corruption Education Model in Islamic Universities." *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan; Vol 13, No 3 (2021): AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v13i3.843>.
- Forgues-Puccio, Gonzalo F. "Existing Practices on Anti-Corruption." *Economic and Private Sector: Professional Evidence and Applied Knowledge Services*, 2013. <https://www.gov.uk/research-for-development-outputs/existing-practices-on-anticorruption#citation>.
- Gilchrist, Alison. "Partnership and Participation: Power in Process." *Public Policy and Administration* 21, no. 3 (September 1, 2006): 70–85. <https://doi.org/10.1177/095207670602100306>.

- Hariz, Austin Al, Hibnu Nugroho, and Ridwan Ridwan. "Reconstruction of Legal Protection for Civil Servants as Whistleblowers in Eradicating Corruption Crimes in Indonesia." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 3, no. 1 (2015): 1–15.
- Hussein, M K. "Public Service : Opportunities and Challenges," 2019, 17–29.
- James, Gilad. *Introduction to Indonesia*. Gilad James Mystery School, 2023.
- Jasin, Mochammad. "Konvensi PBB Tentang Pemberantasan Korupsi dan MoU Antara KPK Dengan BI." 2007.
- Juwita, Ratna. "A Human Rights-Based Approach to Combating Corruption in the Education Sector in Indonesia." *Asia-Pacific Journal on Human Rights and the Law* 24, no. 2 (2023): 230–65. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718158-24020002>.
- Kamal, Muhammad, and Muhammad Yarif Arifin. "The Community Role in Prevention and Eradication of Corruption." *Varia Justicia* 15, no. 2 (October 29, 2019): 51–58. <https://doi.org/10.31603/variajusticia.v15i2.2484>.
- Kleyn, Duard, and Gardiol van Niekerk. "Ulpian's Praecepta Iuris and Their Role in South African Law-Part 2: Modern-Day South African Practice." *Fundamina: A Journal of Legal History* 20, no. 1 (2014): 446– 55. https://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1021-5445X2014000100039.
- Klitgaard, Robert E, Ronald MacLean Abaroa, and H Lindsey Parris. *Corrupt Cities: A Practical Guide to Cure and Prevention*. World Bank Publications, 2000.
- Kohn, Stephen M. "Whistleblower Laws And The Fight Against Corruption From Within," no. August (2023).
- Komalasari, Kokom, and Didin Saripudin. "Integration of Anti-Corruption Education in School's Activities." *American Journal of Applied Sciences* 12, no. 6 (June 1, 2015): 445–51. <https://doi.org/10.3844/ajassp.2015.445.451>.
- Lazarski, Christopher. *Power Tends to Corrupt: Lord Acton's Study of Liberty*. Northern Illinois University Press, 2012.
- Lubita, H, WN Webb - Administratio Publica, and undefined 2023. "Civil Society and Corruption Prevention: An Assessment of Antecedent

- Conditions.” *Journals.Co.Za* 31, no. 4 (2023): 93–116.
- Lukito, Anastasia Suhartati. “Fostering and Enhancing the Role of Private Sector: A Prevention Way Towards Corruption Eradication in Indonesia.” *Journal of Financial Crime* 22, no. 4 (January 1, 2015): 476–91. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFC-06-2014-0029>.
- M. Daud, Yussuf. “A Review of Effectiveness of Anti-Corruption Strategies and Institutions in Kenya.” *African Journal of Commercial Studies* 4, no. 4 (2024): 303–18. <https://doi.org/10.59413/ajocs/v4.i4.5>.
- Mansar, Adi. “The Efforts to Warn Corruption Through Education an Idiological Approach in Order Meet The Right to Country Rights.” *Indonesian Journal of Education, Social Sciences and Research (IJSSR)* 1, no. 1 (2020): 10–15. <https://doi.org/10.30596/ijessr.v1i1.4877>.
- Manurung, Mangaraja, and Dany Try Hutama Hutabarat. “Public Effort and Participation in the Enforcement of Corruption Eradication in Indonesia.” *Pandecta Research Law Journal* 18, no. 1 (2023): 35–46. <https://doi.org/10.15294/pandecta.v18i1.40572>.
- Maulidiah, Khaira, Daniel Muyassar, and Saddam Rassanjani. “Challenges in Anti-Corruption Leadership in Local Government.” *Journal of Government and Political Sciences* 1, no. 1 (2024): 15–32.
- McWalters, Ian. *Memerangi Korupsi: Sebuah Peta Jalan Untuk Indonesia*. Surabaya: JP.Books, 2006.
- Musriha, and Nurul Qomari. “Analysis of Factors Affecting The Implementation of The Integrity Zone Reviewing From The Gap Analysis of Employee Competency in Surabaya Industrial Research and Standardization Institute.” *Ekonika: Jurnal Ekonomi Universitas Kadiri* 8, no. 2 (September 30, 2023): 448–61. <https://doi.org/10.30737/ekonika.v8i2.4985>.
- Nazaruddin, Nazaruddin, Amzar Ardiyansyah, and Umar Mahdi. “Welfare and the Crime of Corruption in the Rule of Law,” 118–27, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.3059/insis.v0i1.17949>.
- Ogunbamila, Bolanle, Bamidele Emmanuel Osamika, and Emmanuel Dada Job. “Whistleblowing and Corrupt Tendencies among Selected Employees in Three Public Organizations.” *Journal of Management Studies and Development* 3, no. 02 (2024): 95–119. <https://doi.org/10.56741/jmsd.v3i02.535>.
- Okafor, Oliver Nnamdi, Festus A. Adebisi, Michael Opara, and Chidinma Blessing Okafor. “Deployment of Whistleblowing as an

- Accountability Mechanism to Curb Corruption and Fraud in a Developing Democracy.” *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal* 33, no. 6 (2020): 1335–66. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-12-2018-3780>.
- Okafor, Oliver Nnamdi, Michael Opara, and Festus Adebisi. “Whistleblowing and the Fight against Corruption and Fraud in Nigeria: Perceptions of Anti-Corruption Agents (ACAs).” *Crime, Law and Social Change* 73, no. 2 (2020): 115–32. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10611-019-09855-4>.
- Onyango, Gedion. “Whistleblowing Behaviours and Anti-Corruption Approaches in Public Administration in Kenya.” *Economic and Political Studies* 9, no. 2 (2021): 230–54.
- Pattanasrivichian, Suthida. “Communication Process to Promote Public Participation in Anti-Corruption of People in Muang Chiang Mai District.” *Rajabhat Chiang Mai Research Journal* 23, no. 3 (2022): 28–51. <https://doi.org/10.57260/rcmrj.2022.257364>.
- Permana, Sidik, and Mursyid Setiawan. “Corruption in the Education Sector in Indonesia: Reality, Causes, and Solutions.” *Integritas: Jurnal Antikorupsi* 10, no. 2 (2024): 249–68. <https://doi.org/10.32697/integritas.v10i2.1326>.
- Pradjonggo, Tjandra Sridjaja. *Sifat Melawan Hukum Dalam Tindak Pidana Korupsi*. Indonesia Lawyer Club, 2010.
- Prakasa, Satria Unggul Wicaksana, and Eky Karimatur Rais Alhakim. “Legal Protection for Students as Whistleblowers of Corruption Cases in Universities.” *Jurnal Penegakan Hukum Dan Keadilan* 5, no. 1 (2024): 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.18196/jphk.v5i1.18785>.
- Prooijen, Jan-Willem van, and Paul AM van Lange. *Cheating, Corruption, and Concealment: The Roots of Dishonesty*. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Putra, Nandha Risky, and Rosa Linda. “Impact of Social Change on Society from the Crime of Corruption.” *Integritas : Jurnal Antikorupsi* 8, no. 1 (June 25, 2022): 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.32697/integritas.v8i1.898>.
- Rafail, Arisha. “Examining the Role of Criminal Law in Combating Economic Crimes: A Comparative Analysis of Anti-Corruption Measures.” *Studies in Law and Justice* 2, no. 4 (2023): 37–44. <https://doi.org/10.56397/slj.2023.12.05>.
- Rahardjo, Satjipto. *Hukum Dan Perilaku: Hidup Baik Adalah Dasar*

- Hukum Yang Baik*. Jakarta: Penerbit Buku Kompas, 2009.
- . *Sisi-Sisi Lain Dari Hukum Di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Penerbit Buku Kompas, 2003.
- Recanatini, Francesca. “Anti-Corruption Authorities: An Effective Tool to Curb Corruption?” In *International Handbook on the Economics of Corruption, Volume Two*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2011. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9780857936523.00030>.
- Riyadi, Bambang Slamet, Basuki Rekso Wibowo, and Vinita Susanti. “Culture of Corruption Politicians’ Behavior in Parliament and State Official During Reform Government Indonesia (Genealogical Study).” *International Journal of Criminology and Sociology* 9 (2020): 52–62. <https://doi.org/10.6000/1929-4409.2020.09.06>.
- Salvo, Philip Di. “Digital Whistleblowing Platforms for Anti-Corruption: The Transparency International Italia Case.” *Digital Media and Grassroots Anti-Corruption*, 2024, 140–60.
- Saputra, Rio, Rommy Hardyansah, and Pratolo Saktiawan. “Preventing Corrupt Practices in Business and Investment through Effective Law Enforcement” 1, no. 2 (2021): 25–28.
- Satrio, Ndaru, and SH Faisal. “Protection of Witnesses and Victims of Certain Cases Based on Equality Before the Law Perspective.” *Cepalo Journal* 5, no. 1 (2021): 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.25041/cepalo.v5n01.2109>.
- Schütte, Sofie Arjon. “Government Policies and Civil Society Initiatives Against Corruption.” In *Democratization in Post-Suharto Indonesia*, 101–21. Routledge, 2008.
- Setiyono, Joko, Eduard Quiko, Andini Kusuma Putri, and Darminto Hartono. “Enhancing Cross-Border Justice: Facilitating Asset Recovery from Corruption Between Indonesia and Australia Through Mutual Legal Assistance.” *Journal of Indonesian Legal Studies* 9, no. 2 (2024): 537–69. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jils.v9i2.877>.
- Siddiqi, Sameen, Tayyeb I. Masud, Sania Nishtar, David H. Peters, Belgacem Sabri, Khalif M. Bile, and Mohamed A. Jama. “Framework for Assessing Governance of the Health System in Developing Countries: Gateway to Good Governance.” *Health Policy* 90, no. 1 (April 1, 2009): 13–25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2008.08.005>.
- Simanjuntak, Leonard. “Melihat Ulang Korupsi di Daerah: Defisit

- Demokrasi Dan Pertarungan Kepentingan.” *Jurnal Jentera* 9, no. 3 (2005): 18.
- Soekanto, Soerjono. *Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Penegakan Hukum*. Jakarta: Rajawali, 1983.
- Spyromitros, Eleftherios, and Minas Panagiotidis. “The Impact of Corruption on Economic Growth in Developing Countries and a Comparative Analysis of Corruption Measurement Indicators.” *Cogent Economics and Finance* 10, no. 1 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23322039.2022.2129368>.
- Sumah, Stefan. “Corruption, Causes and Consequences.” In *Trade and Global Market*, edited by Vito Bobek, Ch. 5. Rijeka: IntechOpen, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.72953>.
- Suramin. “Indonesian Anti-Corruption Law Enforcement: Current Problems and Challenges.” *Journal of Law and Legal Reform* 2, no. 2 (April 30, 2021): 225–42. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jllr.v2i2.46612>.
- Suteki, Abdul Jalil, Aga Natalis, and Angelica Vanessa Audrey Nasution. “Empowering Local Communities: Enhancing Engagement in Anti-Corruption Action Program.” *Lentera Hukum* 11, no. 1 (2024): 56–88. <https://doi.org/10.19184/ejlh.v10i1.46552>.
- Syah, Kaharuddin, and Abdul Malik. “Building an Anti-Corruption Legal Culture.” *International Journal of Criminology and Sociology* 10, no. mei 2009 (2021): 1523–32. <https://doi.org/10.6000/1929-4409.2021.10.174>.
- Tacconi, Luca, and David AledWilliams. “Corruption and Anti-Corruption in Environmental and Resource Management.” *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 45 (2020): 305–29. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-012320-083949>.
- Tamanaha, Brian. “A General Jurisprudence of Law and Society,” July 19, 2001. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199244676.001.0001>.
- Taylor, Jean Gelman. *Global Indonesia*. Routledge Contemporary Southeast Asia Series. Taylor & Francis, 2012.
- Taylor, Marilyn. *Public Policy in the Community*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2011.
- Thalhah, M. *Menggugat Fungsi DPRD Dalam Mewujudkan Good Governance Dan Clean Government*. Total Media, 2007.

- Tobondo, Yuyun Alfasiyus, Rinto Z W Abidjulu, and Arifin Balingki. "Public Administration and Anti-Corruption Efforts: A Critical Review" 1, no. November (2024): 61–74.
- Tovalini, Krismena, and Yulia Hanoselina. "Behavioral and Cultural Determinants of Corruption: Evidence from Indonesia." *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekotrans & Erudisi* 4, no. 2 (2024): 12–21. <https://doi.org/10.69989/pv810d72>.
- Trisiana, Anita, Anang Priyanto, and Sutoyo Sutoyo. "Analysis of Developing Anti-Corruption Education in Indonesia Through Media-Based Citizenship Education Learning Smart Mobile Civic." *Jurnal Cakrawala Pendidikan* 43, no. 1 (January 31, 2024): 166–75. <https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v43i1.60261>.
- Tumbelaka, Elizabeth. "Kajian Yuridis Terhadap Peran Serta Masyarakat Dalam Penegakan Hukum Pidana di Indonesia." *Lex Crimen* 11, no. 6 (2022): 1–15. <https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/v2/index.php/lexcrimen/article/view/4442>.
- Vian, Taryn, Brianna Agnew, and Keith McInnes. "Whistleblowing as an Anti-Corruption Strategy in Health and Pharmaceutical Organizations in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Scoping Review." *Global Health Action* 15, no. 1 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1080/16549716.2022.2140494>.
- Watkin, Thomas Glyn. "Honeste Vivere." *The Journal of Legal History* 5, no. 2 (September 1, 1984): 117–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01440368408530800>.
- Yunara, Edi, and Taufik Kemas. "The Role of Victimology in the Protection of Crime Victims in Indonesian Criminal Justice System." *Mahadi: Indonesia Journal of Law* 3, no. 1 (February 28, 2024): 63–78. <https://doi.org/10.32734/mah.v3i01.15379>.

DECLARATION OF CONFLICTING INTERESTS

The authors state that there is no conflict of interest in the publication of this article.

FUNDING INFORMATION

None

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

None

This page intentionally left blank