Journal of Law and Legal Reform
Vol. 7 Issue 3 (2026) 1545–1584
DOI: https://doi.org/10.15294/jllr.v7i3.48991
Online since: July 13, 2026

Journal of Law & Legal Reform
https://journal.unnes.ac.id/journals/jllr

The Dynamics of Procedural Compliance and Organizational Learning in Civil Service Disciplinary Actions

Siti Mursidah [a] ✉, Cahya Wulandari [b], Moh. Khoiruddin [c], Ricky Dermawan Fauzi [a], Muhamad Sayuti Hassan [d]

[a] Directorate of General Affairs and Human Resources, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia
[b] Faculty of Law, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia
[c] Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia
[d] Faculty of Law, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi, Malaysia

✉ corresponding email: mursidah@mail.unnes.ac.id

Abstract

This study examines compliance with procedures for imposing disciplinary sanctions on civil servants, the deterrent effect of such sanctions, and their effectiveness in organizational learning at Universitas Negeri Semarang. The main research issues include the appropriateness of sanction procedures implemented by unit heads, patterns of enforcement of violations at the work unit level, and the effectiveness of sanctions in improving employee compliance. The study employs an empirical legal approach. Primary data were obtained through interviews with faculty deans, the Directorate of General Affairs and Human Resources, the Internal Audit Unit, the Employee Development Team, general staff, and employees who had previously been sanctioned. Observations, internal documents, and literature on legal and organizational management further supported the data. The research results indicate that formal sanction imposition procedures at UNNES have been carried out fairly systematically once cases enter the official investigation mechanism. Documents such as chronologies, summons letters, investigation minutes, investigation reports, and sanction decisions are available for formal cases. However, procedural compliance has been inconsistent at the pre-formal stage, as minor violations are often resolved informally without documentation. The culture of "ewuh pakewuh," limitations in post-sanction monitoring, and weaknesses in digital presence reduce the effectiveness of organizational learning. This study concludes that formal sanctions have a deterrent effect but need to be integrated with records of initial guidance, post-sanction monitoring, and anonymous case studies to become an instrument of sustainable disciplinary reform. This finding contributes to legal reform in public institutions by emphasizing the importance of documenting pre-formal disciplinary measures, strengthening procedural accountability, and integrating organizational learning into disciplinary governance systems.

Keywords

Civil Service Discipline, Procedural Compliance, Deterrent Effect, Organizational Learning, Higher Education Governance.

HOW TO CITE:

Chicago Manual of Style Footnote:

[1] Siti Mursidah, Cahya Wulandari, Moh Khoiruddin, Ricky Dermawan Fauzi, and Muhamad Sayuti Hassan, "The Dynamics of Procedural Compliance and Organizational Learning in Civil Service Disciplinary Actions," *Journal of Law and Legal Reform* 7, no 3 (2026): 1545–1584, https://doi.org/10.15294/jllr.v7i3.48991.

Chicago Manual of Style for Reference:

Mursidah, Siti, Cahya Wulandari, Moh Khoiruddin, Ricky Dermawan Fauzi, and Muhamad Sayuti Hassan. "The Dynamics of Procedural Compliance and Organizational Learning in Civil Service Disciplinary Actions." *Journal of Law and Legal Reform* 7, no 3 (2026): 1545–1584. https://doi.org/10.15294/jllr.v7i3.48991.

Introduction

Enforcing employee discipline is a crucial instrument for building accountable, effective, and integrity-driven public-sector governance. In public sector organizations, discipline extends beyond mere employee attendance or adherence to working hours. Discipline also reflects civil servants' willingness to fulfill their job obligations, respect prohibitions, perform their duties responsibly, and maintain public trust. When discipline is inconsistently enforced, organizations may experience a decline in service quality, weakened legitimacy, and the perception that rules can be negotiated through personal relationships or structural proximity.[1]

Beyond administrative compliance, disciplinary enforcement constitutes an important element of legal reform in public institutions. Effective disciplinary systems support the rule of law by ensuring that decisions are implemented consistently, transparently, and in an accountable manner. In PTN-BH institutions such as UNNES, disciplinary governance becomes increasingly important because stronger internal accountability mechanisms must accompany institutional autonomy.

In the context of the Indonesian civil service, Government Regulation No. 94 of 2021 on Civil Service Discipline serves as the primary normative basis for imposing disciplinary sanctions. [2] This regulation replaces some of the old approaches with more measurable provisions regarding duties, prohibitions, levels of punishment, authorized officials, investigation procedures, and administrative measures. Regulation of the State Civil Service Agency No. 6 of 2022 on Implementing Government Regulation No. 94 of 2021 on Civil Service Discipline then provides technical guidelines for implementation so that personnel management officials and unit heads have a more operational

---

1 R. Goedurov, "Public Sector Organizations: Work Environment, Employee Behavior, and Discipline," *International Journal of Public Review* 1 (2020): 6–11.

2 Republik Indonesia, *Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 94 Tahun 2021 tentang Disiplin Pegawai Negeri Sipil* (2021).

reference.[3] With this framework, discipline should not be left solely to leadership's discretion; it must be enforced through clear, documented, proportional, and administratively reviewable procedures.

Universitas Negeri Semarang (UNNES), as a state university with legal entity status (PTN-BH), faces a growing need to strengthen human resource management. The PTN-BH status provides broader autonomy in institutional management. However, this autonomy also demands a stronger internal accountability system. In the university environment, work relationships are often shaped by a collegial culture, long-standing personal ties, and close bonds among staff members. These conditions can facilitate coordination and harmony within a unit, but they can also hinder the objective handling of disciplinary violations. Minor violations may be viewed as internal unit matters, resolved informally, or left unreported due to reluctance.

This issue is important because the effectiveness of disciplinary sanctions is not determined solely by the severity of the punishment. New sanctions have only corrective power if employees understand the legal basis, accept the process as fair, and perceive consistency in the organization's response to violations. Procedural justice theory suggests that individuals are more likely to accept adverse decisions if the decision-making process is perceived as objective, transparent, and non-discriminatory, and provides opportunities for clarification.[4] From this perspective, disciplinary sanctions are not merely the final product, a written decision. Disciplinary sanctions constitute a series of processes beginning with the detection of violations, initial counselling, reporting, investigation, evaluation of evidence, determination of sanctions, and monitoring of behavioral changes after sanctions are imposed.

Previous studies indicate that public employee discipline is closely linked to service performance. Goedurov identifies discipline as an element of organizational behavior that influences the quality of the work environment and employee compliance in public-sector

---

[3] Badan Kepegawaian Negara, *Peraturan Badan Kepegawaian Negara Nomor 6 Tahun 2022 tentang Peraturan Pelaksanaan Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 94 Tahun 2021 tentang Disiplin Pegawai Negeri Sipil* (2022).

[4] T. R. Tyler, *Why People Obey the Law* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1990).

organizations.[5] Wulandari, Mozin, and Nani also found that employee discipline is a determining factor in public service performance, as non-compliance with work standards and service schedules can reduce organizational effectiveness.[6] This study provides a basis for understanding that discipline should not be narrowly viewed as an administrative matter, but rather as an instrument for organizational quality control.

Another study highlights that internal social and political factors often influence disciplinary actions in public organizations. Onyango explains that disciplinary actions in public organizations are not purely technical or administrative, but also constitute a socio-political process influenced by interests, relationships, and organizational stability.[7] Raddieh also situates the authority for disciplinary actions within the relationship between administration and legal oversight mechanisms, so that sanction decisions must remain subject to the principles of legality and accountability.[8] These findings are relevant to higher education institutions, as unit leaders may find themselves in a difficult position between maintaining working relationships and enforcing rules.

In the Indonesian context, several studies underscore the importance of implementing Government Regulation No. 94 of 2021. Rauzi discusses the imposition of disciplinary sanctions on civil servants and emphasizes the need for consistent application of the rules to ensure sanctions retain their corrective effect.[9] Pujiati and Dwiono, in their study on the implementation of Government Regulation No. 94 of 2021 at the North Lampung Regional Revenue Agency, indicate that weak monitoring, low transparency, and minimal employee involvement can

---

[5] R. Goedurov, "Public Sector Organizations: Work Environment, Employee Behavior and Discipline," *International Journal of Public Review* 1 (2020): 6–11.

[6] N. Wulandari, S. Y. Mozin, and Y. N. Nani, "Analysis of Employee Discipline as a Determinant of Public Service Performance: A Case Study at the Social Service of Gorontalo Province," *International Journal of Research in Engineering and Science* 13 (2025): 17–22.

[7] G. Onyango, "Organizational Disciplinary Actions as Socio-Political Processes in Public Organizations," *Public Organization Review* 19 (2019): 227–248.

[8] E. J. Raddieh, "The Authority of Disciplinary Action Between Administration and Judiciary," *Russian Law Journal* 11 (2023): 1974–1979.

[9] F. Rauzi, "Penjatuhan Hukuman Terkait Masalah Disiplin Pegawai Negeri Sipil," *Journal of Fundamental Justice* 4 (2023): 112–127.

hinder good governance.[10] Ramadhan and Lestari also emphasize that the regulation contains obligations, prohibitions, types of penalties, and administrative measures that must be carried out in an orderly manner to avoid procedural objections.[11]

Although research on civil service discipline has expanded, a gap remains in studies of officials' procedural compliance in sanctioning and the relationship between sanctions and organizational learning. Many studies treat discipline as a variable influencing employee performance or compliance. However, few studies have examined how violations enter the formal system, how organizational culture influences reporting, whether initial counseling is documented, and whether sanctions result in institutional memory. This gap is significant because organizations may appear formally compliant while still harboring unrecorded daily violations.

TABLE 1. Research Gap

Previous Studies	Main Focus	Gap
Goedurov (2020)	Discipline and performance	No procedural compliance analysis
Pujiati & Dwiono (2025)	Implementation of PP 94/2021	No organizational learning dimension
Ramadhan & Lestari (2023)	Regulatory implementation	No analysis of the pre-formal disciplinary stage
Current Study	Procedural compliance, deterrence, organizational learning	Addresses all gaps

This study offers novelty in three aspects. First, the study does not merely assess the presence or absence of sanctions but evaluates

[10] L. Pujiati and S. Dwiono, "Implementasi Peraturan Pemerintah No. 94 Tahun 2021 tentang Disiplin ASN di Bapenda Lampung Utara," *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Hukum Al-Zayn* 3 (2025): 2198–2205.

[11] A. Ramadhan and R. Lestari, "Implementasi Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 94 Tahun 2021 tentang Disiplin Pegawai Negeri Sipil: Studi di Mahkamah Syariah Meulaboh," *Jurnal Serambi Hukum* 16 (2023): 141–151.

procedural compliance from the pre-formal stage through to the sanction decision. Second, the study interprets the deterrent effect as changes in behavior and perceptions of compliance, rather than merely as fear of punishment. Third, the study positions sanctions as an instrument of organizational learning. Thus, this study does not stop at case evaluation but is directed toward reforming the university's disciplinary enforcement system.

This study is based on three main questions. First, have officials or unit heads within UNNES implemented sanctions in accordance with established procedures? Second, how are violations addressed at the work unit level? Third, are sanctions effective in providing learning opportunities and improving employee compliance? Based on these questions, this study aims to analyze compliance with sanction-imposition procedures, patterns of disciplinary action for violations, and the effectiveness of sanctions in deterring violations and fostering organizational learning.

The significance of this research lies in its contribution to strengthening effective, accountable, and transparent institutions. This theme aligns with Sustainable Development Goal 16, which emphasizes peace, justice, and resilient institutions.[12] In the university context, fair and well-documented disciplinary enforcement supports good university governance. Sanctions should not be a tool used only when cases have escalated. Sanctions must be part of a guidance system that encourages daily compliance, behavioral improvement, and the strengthening of a culture of accountability.

This study is a qualitative study that views social reality as holistic, complex, dynamic, and meaningful, with interactive relationships among phenomena. This study employs an empirical legal approach conducted at Universitas Negeri Semarang. The empirical legal approach was chosen because the research not only analyses legal norms codified in legislation but also assesses how those norms function in organizational practice. With this approach, regulations on civil servant discipline are not merely read as legal texts but as parameters for evaluating practices related to reporting, investigation, guidance, the imposition of sanctions, and the monitoring of employee discipline.

---

12 United Nations, "Goal 16," 2025, https://sdgs.un.org/goals/goal16#undefined.

Empirical legal research began with an examination of normative legislation, followed by an in-depth analysis of legal implementation within the institution, yielding research materials comprising both primary and secondary data. Primary data was obtained through observations and interviews with several groups of informants. Observations were conducted across various units within UNNES to examine attendance patterns, work behavior, and supervisors' responses to daily violations. Observations were also used to assess whether digital attendance reflects substantive compliance or merely administrative compliance. The informant groups targeted in this study include faculty deans, the Directorate of General Affairs and Human Resources, the Internal Audit Unit, the Employee Development Team, employees who have previously been sanctioned, and general staff. Informants were selected because they occupy different positions in the disciplinary enforcement chain. Faculty deans provided information regarding daily supervision, initial counselling, and reporting. The Directorate of General Affairs and Human Resources provided information regarding formal procedures, case data, investigation records, investigation reports, and sanction decisions. The Internal Oversight Unit provided information regarding system monitoring, digital attendance, and compliance validation. The Employee Development Team provided information on investigations, evidentiary challenges, and the effects of sanctions—employees who received sanctions provided information on procedural experiences, deterrent effects, and behavioural changes. General staff provided information regarding perceptions of fairness, consistency, and organizational culture.

Secondary data was obtained from performance reports, disciplinary violation records, available internal documents, laws and regulations, and relevant academic journals. The secondary data obtained were categorized into three types: primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials; however, this study utilized only primary and secondary legal materials. Primary legal materials refer to legally binding documents, namely applicable laws and regulations. The primary legal materials used in this study include Law No. 20 of 2023 on the Civil Service, Government Regulation No. 94 of 2021 on Civil Service Discipline, Regulation of the State Civil Service Agency No. 6 of 2022 on the Implementing Regulations for Government Regulation No. 94 of 2021 on Civil Service Discipline, UNNES Rector Regulation No. 27 of 2020 on Guidelines for the Enforcement of Ethics and Discipline of Employees at Universitas Negeri Semarang, UNNES Rector Regulation No. 52 of 2022 on the Code of Ethics for Educational Staff, and UNNES Rector Regulation No. 59 of 2022 on the Code of Ethics for Lecturers. Secondary legal materials were obtained from scientific articles, legal books, and archives to construct an analytical framework on legal effectiveness, legal culture, procedural justice, deterrence, and organizational learning. The study of legal materials involved examining the completeness of formal case files, including chronologies, summons letters, examination records, examination result reports, and sanction decisions.

Data analysis employed an interactive model. The first stage involved data reduction by grouping data according to the research questions. Data were categorized into the following themes: procedural compliance, enforcement patterns, deterrent effects, cultural barriers, guidance documentation, and post-sanction monitoring. The second stage involved presenting the data in the form of thematic descriptions and an interpretive matrix. The third stage involves analyzing the alignment between field practices and the parameters set out in Government Regulation No. 94 of 2021 and BKN Regulation No. 6 of 2022. The fourth stage involves analyzing factors influencing implementation, such as the "*ewuh pakewuh*" culture, interpersonal relationships, limitations in evidence collection, and weaknesses in the attendance system. The fifth stage is an impact analysis to determine whether sanctions change behavior, prevent recurrence, and generate organizational learning. The final stage involves drawing conclusions and formulating policy reform recommendations.

This study focuses on identifying patterns of procedural compliance, implementation barriers, deterrent effects, and potential for organizational learning. The study is not intended to judge the right or wrong of each disciplinary case. Therefore, the research findings are more appropriately presented as an institutional evaluation and recommendations for improving the disciplinary enforcement system for employees.

Thematic coding was employed to classify interview findings into seven analytical parameters, such as legality of authority, procedural certainty, procedural fairness, proportionality, non-discrimination, documentation accountability, and deterrence-learning outcomes. A cross-source comparison was conducted among interview data, observations, and documentary evidence to enhance analytical validity.

This study integrates three theoretical perspectives into a single analytical framework. Friedman's legal system theory is used to assess the relationship between legal substance, legal structure, and legal culture in disciplinary enforcement. Procedural justice theory is used to evaluate whether employees receive fair, transparent, and non-discriminatory procedures. Deterrence theory is used to assess whether sanctions generate behavioral change through certainty, celerity, and proportionality. These theories are not used separately; they are connected to explain why formal procedures may comply with legal norms while informal practices remain weak due to organisational culture and inconsistent documentation.

A. Normative Framework for Imposing Disciplinary Sanctions on Civil Servants

The imposition of disciplinary sanctions on civil servants is based on a comprehensive normative framework. Law No. 20/2023 establishes the direction of civil service management based on a merit-based system, digital transformation, and professional development of employees.[13] This law simultaneously repeals Law No. 5/2014, which, in its preamble, states that civil servant management encompasses elements ranging from needs planning to performance evaluation and discipline. This demonstrates that national legal norms have long incorporated employee discipline into civil service management. Within this framework, employee discipline is not merely an individual obligation but part of objective, performance-based human resource management. For PTN-BH, this principle is crucial, as institutional autonomy must be balanced with robust internal controls.

At the implementation level, Government Regulation No. 94/2021 defines civil servant discipline as the ability to comply with

---

13 Republik Indonesia, *Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2023 tentang Aparatur Sipil Negara* (2023).

obligations and avoid prohibitions. This regulation outlines the types of disciplinary sanctions, the officials authorized to impose them, and the procedures for summoning, investigating, imposing sanctions, and administrative appeals.[14] For example, this GR classifies disciplinary sanctions into three levels, namely minor, moderate, and severe, each with specific types of sanctions. The entire process, from the issuance of a summons and investigation to the imposition of sanctions, must be conducted in accordance with established procedures. Additionally, disciplinary penalty decisions must still be documented as part of the employee's performance evaluation, even if the penalty falls within the minor disciplinary level. This regulation indicates that sanctions cannot be imposed spontaneously or solely based on management's perception. Every decision must go through a process of evidence gathering, examination, and written determination.

BKN Regulation No. 6/2022, which implements Government Regulation No. 94/2021, strengthens the operational aspects of disciplinary enforcement. These guidelines are important because they close the door on overly broad interpretations in workplace practices. The regulation provides guidelines for government agencies, officials, and civil servants on implementing civil service discipline, covering obligations and prohibitions, types of sanctions, authorized officials, and procedures for summonses, investigations, decision-making, and documentation of disciplinary actions. For example, Article 3(d) and (f) require specific procedures for summons and examination, as well as the preparation of minutes and written records for each sanction. In the context of UNNES, particularly as a State University with Special Status (PTN-BH), this regulation serves as a benchmark for assessing whether unit heads, deans, and university leadership have carried out procedures in accordance with their respective authorities. These regulations serve as internal evaluation standards; the legality of sanctions is determined not only by the substance of the violation but also by compliance with the administrative procedures. These stages include reports or findings, clarification, summons, examination, examination minutes, examination results reports, recommendations, and sanction decisions.

---

[14] Republik Indonesia, *Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 94 Tahun 2021 tentang Disiplin Pegawai Negeri Sipil* (2021).

In addition to regulations established by state institutions, UNNES also has internal regulations to strengthen disciplinary values, including Rector's Regulation Number 27/2020, Rector's Regulation Number 52/2022, and Rector's Regulation Number 59/2022.[15] These ethical provisions complement the disciplinary norms for civil servants, ensuring ethical and professional conduct. This means that the handling of violations within the campus's Higher Education Institution (HEI) environment is not limited to administrative violations but also encompasses professional integrity, the quality of academic services, and the institution's reputation. Disciplinary sanctions must be viewed as a tool to uphold the organization's integrity, not as isolated individual actions detached from university governance. Therefore, disciplinary enforcement at UNNES is grounded in laws, government regulations, state agency regulations, and the institution's internal regulations.

TABLE 2. Normative Framework and Analytical Parameters

Regulation	Main Provision	Relevance to Procedural Compliance
UU ASN 20/2023	Merit system, professionalism, accountability, and civil servant management.	Places discipline as part of accountable public human resource governance
Government Regulation No. 94 of 2021	Defines obligations, prohibitions, levels of disciplinary sanctions, authorized officials, summons, examination, and sanction decisions	Becomes the main benchmark to assess whether formal disciplinary procedures are legally compliant
BKN Regulation No. 6 of 2022	Provides technical procedures for summons, examination, minutes of examination, reports, and documentation	Serves as the basis for evaluating whether the pre-formal and formal stages are properly documented.

15 Universitas Negeri Semarang, *Peraturan Rektor UNNES Nomor 52 Tahun 2022 tentang Kode Etik Tenaga Kependidikan* (Semarang: Universitas Negeri Semarang, 2022); Universitas Negeri Semarang, *Peraturan Rektor UNNES Nomor 59 Tahun 2022 tentang Kode Etik Dosen* (Semarang: Universitas Negeri Semarang, 2022).

Rector Regulations	Regulate employee ethics, lecturer ethics, educational staff ethics, and internal disciplinary values.	Complements national regulations within the university governance context

Based on this normative framework, this study employs seven analytical parameters. The first parameter is the authority's legality, specifically whether investigations and decisions are conducted by authorized officials or by a designated team. The second parameter is procedural certainty, namely the existence of reports, summonses, investigations, investigation minutes, investigation result reports, and sanction decisions. The third parameter is procedural fairness, namely the opportunity for employees to provide clarification, defend themselves, and understand the stages of the process. The fourth parameter is the proportionality of sanctions, namely the alignment between the type of sanction, the classification of the violation, and the facts of the investigation. The fifth parameter is non-discrimination, meaning the absence of influence from personal relationships, position, seniority, or age in case handling. The sixth parameter is documentation accountability, which means recording initial counselling and formal investigations. The seventh parameter is deterrence and learning, meaning whether sanctions change behavior, prevent recurrence, and serve as material for organizational evaluation.

These seven parameters are crucial because disciplinary enforcement cannot be adequately assessed solely based on the existence of sanction decisions. An organization may issue formally valid sanction decisions, yet still have weaknesses in the initial stages if minor violations are not documented. Conversely, informal guidance can be part of a humanistic approach, but it becomes problematic if it lacks an administrative record. Thus, the normative framework for imposing sanctions at UNNES must encompass the entire disciplinary cycle, from detection through post-sanction monitoring.

Analyzing UNNES's disciplinary enforcement using these seven parameters reveals that some of them have been met. First, regarding the legality of authority, violations within UNNES are handled by authorized bodies in accordance with the rector's regulations, such as DUSDM and SPI. Second, regarding procedural certainty, this has been partially fulfilled, especially for serious offenders, but unfortunately, minor violations are still not consistently addressed, leading to uncertainty. Third, regarding procedural fairness, offenders are granted the right to provide explanations and clarifications under UNNES regulations, as reflected in actual practice. Moreover, violators are aware of the procedures that will be followed. Fourth, regarding proportional sanctions. The sanctions imposed have been deliberated by the relevant authorities within UNNES, taking various factors into account, particularly the severity of the violation and the circumstances of the violator. Fifth, regarding non-discrimination. In implementing disciplinary enforcement procedures, a culture of "*ewuh pakewuh*" persists, leading to situations in which colleagues' violations go unreported; this is a form of discrimination in disciplinary enforcement. However, many violations are still being reported and processed, as discussed in the following section. Sixth, regarding documentation accountability, for some violations, documentation is still carried out properly and in accordance with existing regulations. However, for certain violations, such as late arrivals, warnings are sometimes not documented. Seventh, regarding deterrence and learning, some offenders feel deterred by the violations they have committed. Still, in cases such as minor daily violations that result only in a verbal warning, this deterrence does not always hold.

B. Procedural Compliance by Officials and Unit Leaders

Research findings indicate that compliance with disciplinary procedures at UNNES varies by level. At the formal level, once a case has entered the official review process, procedures generally follow the regulations. The procedures carried out range from summoning employees suspected of violations to investigations by immediate supervisors, the ethics oversight and employee guidance team, or the senate, conducting hearings, imposing penalties, and delivering penalty decisions. Disciplinary penalties imposed may be subject to administrative remedies under Article 27/2020, including objections, administrative appeals, and lawsuits filed with the administrative court.

Formal documents such as summons letters, examination minutes, and examination result reports are available and have been compiled comprehensively, authorized officials are involved, and sanction decisions are documented in writing. However, at the informal level, particularly regarding minor violations and daily supervision, procedural compliance remains inconsistent. The primary issues lie in the lack of documentation for initial counselling and cultural barriers to reporting.

From a documentation perspective, the observation results indicate that formal case files have been organized in a relatively complete sequence. Case files contain initial chronological reports, summons evidence, examination minutes, examination results, and sanction-imposition decisions. Examinations are conducted by authorized officials, assisted by an examination team. These findings indicate that the elements of legality, authority and accountability in documentation have been fulfilled in formally processed cases. The Directorate of General Affairs and Human Resources explains that oversight and validation mechanisms are guided by Government Regulation No. 94/2021 and BKN Regulation No. 6/2022. When a report is received from a unit, the Directorate of General Affairs and Human Resources requests the case chronology and information on the guidance provided. Subsequently, the university team's review is documented through an inspection report, an inspection findings report, and the rector's decision. This process demonstrates that, at the university level, the administrative system has a clear workflow and that the legal authority and accountability of documentation have been fulfilled in formal cases, as evidenced by all archived administrative records.

At the faculty level, the procedure proceeds through two stages. The first stage is initial validation or clarification. Faculty leadership requests objective evidence, such as raw attendance data, employee performance target achievements, or a written chronology. The second stage is a formal investigation. If the evidence is strong, the employee is uncooperative, or the violation is classified as serious, the faculty forms an investigative team and issues a formal summons. Through this process, the faculty strives to maintain a balance between initial guidance and procedural certainty.

Issues arise before a case reaches the formal stage. In an interview with a faculty member, the individual stated that written reports from immediate supervisors rarely surface when the violation is minor. Violations often end with an informal resolution. Immediate supervisors often hold back from addressing issues under the guise of guidance, but that guidance is not always documented. Observations reveal that tardiness or employees leaving their workstations during working hours do not always result in verbal or written reprimands. This situation indicates a disconnect between the formal system and daily supervisory practices.

The culture *of "ewuh pakewuh" (*a sense of awkwardness or reluctance to confront others) plays a significant role. Unit leaders may feel uncomfortable reporting subordinates or colleagues with whom they have worked for a long time. In a collegial campus environment, formal action against minor violations is often seen as potentially disruptive to working relationships. Consequently, immediate supervisors are for informal reprimands without documentation. On one hand, this family-oriented approach can maintain harmony. On the other hand, this approach can eliminate the administrative trail needed to assess repeat violations and the proportionality of subsequent sanctions.

This situation indicates that procedural compliance must be examined at two levels. The first level is formal compliance. At this level, UNNES has established appropriate procedures, and their implementation is relatively orderly. Authorized officials conduct inspections, minutes are taken, inspection reports are compiled, and sanction decisions are issued. The implementation of the first layer at the faculty level has also been carried out in an orderly manner in two stages: first, an initial clarification stage supported by objective evidence; followed by the formation of an inspection team and, if necessary, an official summons. This pattern ensures alignment between the severity of the violation and the depth of the investigation. The second layer is pre-formal compliance. At this level, minor violations, initial reprimands, and daily guidance are not always documented. Yet, initial guidance is a crucial component of disciplinary accountability. Without documentation, the organization struggles to prove that an employee has been counselled, that a violation has been committed repeatedly, or that a more severe sanction was imposed in proportion. For example, tardiness or leaving one's workstation during working hours is sometimes addressed with only a verbal warning, without documentation, such as written records, resulting in a lack of evidence that an individual has committed repeated violations. The absence of records of initial guidance causes the organization, in this case UNNES, to lose track of whether an individual has been guided previously and how the violator responded.

If the implementation of employee discipline at UNNES is analyzed through the lens of Lawrence M. Friedman's legal system theory, the following conclusions are drawn. Lawrence M. Friedman, in his book titled "The Legal System: A Social Science Perspective," states that the functioning of the law is determined by legal structure, legal substance, and legal culture.[16] Legal structure constitutes the permanent framework of institutions within a system. In implementing employee discipline at UNNES, the legal structure comprises the DUSDM, SPI, faculty leadership, immediate supervisors, and the inspection team. The relevant departments have been working effectively together to enforce discipline within the UNNES community and possess the knowledge required to enforce disciplinary measures. The monitoring system operates in accordance with existing regulations to ensure that sanctions are not imposed arbitrarily. However, enforcement remains inconsistent, particularly for minor violations.

Legal substance refers to all legal rules, whether written or unwritten, including laws, customs, treaties or agreements, international conventions, case law, legal doctrines, and expert opinions, as well as legal principles and norms. Legal substance can also refer to the products of the people within the legal system. Friedman explains that the emphasis on legal substance is not only on law written in books but also on law alive in society (*living law*).[17] A good legal substance cannot be fully realized without a sound legal structure. Neither legal structure nor legal substance can be fully realized without a sound legal culture. Regarding the substance of law in the implementation of employee discipline at UNNES, relevant regulations are in place through Law No. 20/2023, Government Regulation No. 94/2021, BKN Regulation No. 6/2022,

[16] Lawrence M. Friedman, *The Legal System: A Social Science Perspective* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1975).

[17] Lawrence M Friedman and Grant M Hayden, *American Law an Introduction*, *Oxford University Press*, vol. 11 (New York, NY, USA: Oxford University Press, 2017),

Rector Regulation No. 27/2020, Rector Regulation No. 52/2022, and Rector Regulation No. 59/2022.

Legal culture is the most critical variable in a legal system to ensure the effective enforcement of the law.[18] According to Friedman, legal culture refers to society's attitudes toward the law and the legal system, encompassing the community's values, beliefs, ideas, and expectations. Legal culture determines how the law is enforced, avoided, or abused. Without legal culture, the legal system does not function. All three legal system contains structure, substance, and legal culture that must work together to create an effective legal system. However, the primary weakness in the enforcement of employee discipline at UNNES lies in its legal culture. Some minor violations, such as leaving the workplace during working hours and late arrival, are still considered insignificant, and the warnings or disciplinary actions issued are not documented, making it difficult to determine whether they effectively raise awareness of the need for discipline. Other than that, a culture of hesitation and informal tolerance can undermine the consistency of norms. The "*ewuh pakewuh*" culture on campus leads to inconsistent enforcement of disciplinary measures against employees. The law exists as written rules, but its application is negotiated through social relationships. Without establishing written procedures at the initial stage, the effectiveness of sanctions is hindered because the basis for issuing warnings is difficult to prove, due to insufficient documentation and a weak legal culture.

The persistence of the '*ewuh pakewuh*' culture reflects a legal culture in which social harmony is often prioritized over procedural certainty. Unlike many government agencies, which are characterized by hierarchical control, university environments are shaped by collegial relationships, long-term interactions, and academic autonomy. These characteristics create stronger resistance to formal reporting and documentation mechanisms. This situation creates a risk of selective enforcement because similar violations may receive different responses depending on interpersonal relationships rather than objective standards.

[18] Suyono Suyatno, "Revitalisasi Kearifan Lokal Sebagai Identitas Bangsa Di Tengah Perubahan Nilai Sosiokultural (Local Revitalization as a National Identity in the Midst of Change Socio-Cultural Values)," *METASASTRA: Jurnal Penelitian Sastra* 4, no. 1 (2016): 82–89.

In administrative law, informal guidance may be understood as part of official discretion when it is used proportionally, transparently, and to correct minor violations. However, discretion becomes problematic when it results in unequal treatment, avoids required documentation, or prevents recurring violations from entering the formal mechanism. In such circumstances, informal settlement may create a risk of abuse of discretion because the decision to report or not report a violation depends more on personal relationships than on objective legal standards.

This lack of formal procedures has administrative legal consequences. First, the absence of documentation can create uncertainty in assessing repeat violations. Second, the absence of standardized record-keeping can lead to inconsistent treatment across units. Third, the absence of evidence of initial guidance can weaken the basis for imposing sanctions at subsequent stages. Fourth, employees may develop the perception that minor violations do not always have consequences. This perception can weaken the deterrent effect by reducing the certainty of the organization's response.

From an administrative law perspective, the absence of documentation at the pre-formal stage does not necessarily invalidate disciplinary action. However, it constitutes an administrative deviation from the accountability principles embodied in Government Regulation No. 94 of 2021 and BKN Regulation No. 6 of 2022. The lack of documentation weakens evidentiary continuity, reduces transparency, and creates risks of unequal treatment among employees.

Procedural fairness is also a critical issue. Employees who have previously received sanctions stated that the investigation process was clearly communicated and privacy was maintained. These findings suggest that once a case enters the formal system, employees are more likely to accept sanctions because they feel they have been allowed to clarify their position. However, perceptions of fairness can be undermined if employees observe that seemingly similar cases are treated differently. Differences in sanctions can actually be justified if the facts of the investigation, the impact of the violation, the degree of fault, and the disciplinary history differ. However, this principle needs to be communicated anonymously so that employees understand the reasons for the differing treatment.

Thus, the answer to the first research question is that officials and unit heads at UNNES generally follow sanction procedures in accordance with regulations once a case enters the formal process. However, procedural compliance remains inconsistent during daily supervision and initial guidance. The main weaknesses lie in the culture of "*ewuh pakewuh*," the lack of documentation of informal reprimands, and barriers to reporting from immediate supervisors.

TABLE 3. Comparison between Ideal Procedure and Actual Practice

Ideal Procedure	Actual Practice
Detection	Detection
Initial documentation	Informal verbal guidance
Clarification	No documentation
Formal investigation	Case stops
Sanction decision	-
Post-sanction monitoring	No post-sanction monitoring
Organizational learning	No organizational learning

The main leakage occurs between detection and initial documentation at the pre-formal stage. For example, when a supervisor observes an employee arriving late or leaving the workstation during working hours, the violation has already entered the detection stage. However, if the supervisor only gives an oral warning without preparing a written record, the violation does not proceed to the initial documentation stage. As a result, the case is not recorded in the employee's disciplinary history.

C. Patterns of Disciplinary Action at the Work Unit Level

The handling of violations at the work unit level at UNNES follows a phased approach. The first phase involves direct supervision by immediate supervisors, including monitoring attendance, fieldwork, and daily performance. If issues are identified, the second phase is initiated. The second phase consists of clarification and initial guidance within the unit or faculty. The second stage is based on objective evidence, such as raw attendance data, employee performance target achievements, or a written chronology. The employee in question is summoned for clarification, to provide an opportunity to explain rather than imposing punishment immediately. If the supporting facts of the violation are strong or the employee is uncooperative, the process proceeds to the third stage. The third stage is a formal investigation by a faculty or university investigation team. At this stage, an official summons, an investigation report, and a written explanation of the violated provisions are issued. The fourth stage involves the authorized official issuing recommendations and imposing disciplinary sanctions. If the case warrants a moderate or severe penalty, the case file is escalated to the DUSDM for university-level decision.

This phased approach demonstrates that UNNES does not immediately adopt a punitive approach. In many cases, the work unit first conducts guidance. Guidance can be carried out through verbal reprimands, meetings, assemblies, or direct communication with employees. This approach is important because civil service discipline aims not only to punish but also to guide. However, guidance becomes part of good governance only when it has clear direction, measurable standards, and proper documentation. Guidance that is not documented can turn into negligence.

At the faculty level, the process begins with validating objective evidence. The faculty does not immediately impose a penalty but instead requests attendance records, performance targets achieved, or a written chronology. The employee may then be summoned for an initial clarification. If the evidence is strong, the employee is uncooperative, or the violation is deemed severe, an investigative team conducts a formal investigation. This model aligns with the principle of due diligence, as disciplinary sanctions affect employees' rights and reputations.

At the university level, the DUSDM performs validation, coordination, and documentation functions. Reports from units must include a chronology and details of any guidance provided. The university investigation team then documents the investigation process in an investigation record, an investigation report, and the rector's decision. In this framework, the DUSDM serves as the liaison between work units and the authorized officials who impose sanctions.

The Internal Audit Unit plays a crucial role in overseeing the system. The Internal Audit Unit verifies the completeness and validity of documents, reviews case handling procedures, and conducts interviews and clarifications. It also utilizes online attendance systems, facial recognition, GPS-based attendance tracking, and personnel databases to detect tardiness, absences, unusual attendance patterns, and data inconsistencies. The SPI's role is vital because disciplinary oversight cannot rely solely on manual reports. Digital systems can help identify patterns of violations that are not easily discernible on a case-by-case basis. Developing digital oversight mechanisms through online attendance systems, facial recognition, GPS-based attendance tracking, and personnel databases to detect tardiness, absenteeism, unusual attendance patterns, and data inconsistencies will be highly effective in uncovering hidden violations. Integrating electronic data into government systems can enhance efficiency, transparency, and accountability.[19]

DUSDM data indicate a decrease in the number of formally processed violation cases from 11 in 2024 to 8 in 2025. In 2025, the dominant violations included divorce, integrity violations, sexual harassment, absence from work without a superior's permission, and document forgery. The data indicate that formal cases entered into the system encompassed ethical, administrative, and integrity violations. This indicates that disciplinary enforcement is being carried out in accordance with existing procedures. However, the majority of cases still involve moderate to serious violations rather than minor ones that occur daily. A decrease in the number of formal cases does not automatically imply a decrease in actual violations. Observations indicate that minor daily violations still occur, such as tardiness, leaving one's workstation during active hours, going to the cafeteria outside break times, and engaging in non-work-related activities during work hours. Thus, the number of formal cases is more accurately interpreted as the number of

[19] Amancik Amancik et al., "Reforming the Indonesian Bureaucracy through State Civil Apparatus Reform: Could It Be Optimized with Technology?," *Journal of Law and Legal Reform* 5, no. 3 (October 31, 2024): 943–72, https://doi.org/10.15294/jllr.v5i3.13753.

cases filed and processed, rather than the full extent of disciplinary violations.

The decline from 11 formal cases in 2024 to 8 cases in 2025 should not automatically be interpreted as improved compliance. The reduction may reflect stronger preventive guidance, underreporting, or unresolved weaknesses in documenting minor violations. Therefore, case frequency alone cannot be used as a reliable indicator of disciplinary effectiveness.

The distinction between formal violations and daily infractions is critical. Formal cases involve documentation, investigations, and decisions. In this context, formal violations are those taken seriously in accordance with existing regulations and constitute serious offences, such as sexual harassment. Meanwhile, daily infractions often occur in small, repetitive, and widespread forms. If daily infractions are not recorded, the organization loses the data needed to identify risk patterns. In the long term, overlooked small violations can foster a permissive culture. Employees may conclude that as long as a violation does not escalate into a major case, the organization will not respond firmly.

Disciplinary actions at UNNES can be categorized into four types. First, informal or persuasive guidance. This is carried out through verbal warnings, morning assemblies, guidance meetings, and case discussions without naming the violator. This approach helps preserve employee dignity and a positive work environment, but its effectiveness is low unless it is documented. Second, formal investigations through summonses and investigation reports. This model is used when there is strong evidence of a violation, the employee is uncooperative, or the violation is moderate or severe. Third, formal administrative sanctions, such as written reprimands, reductions in allowances, demotion, or other consequences based on the classification of the violation. Fourth, transfer as part of development, which moves employees to another unit or agency to change work dynamics. Transfer can help break unhealthy work relationship patterns and provide space for behavioral improvement in a new environment.

The enforcement measures described earlier face several obstacles. These obstacles can be grouped into four categories: first, cultural obstacles. The culture of "*ewuh pakewuh*" makes immediate supervisors hesitant to take action against or report their subordinates, and second, administrative obstacles. Formal procedures require time, complete documentation, summonses, signatures, witnesses, and a tiered, time-consuming clarification process. Third, evidentiary challenges. In some cases, particularly those involving ethics or integrity, there may be limitations in evidence, fourth, technological challenges. Digital attendance systems can verify *check-ins* and *check-outs* and minimize attendance fraud, but they do not always prove an employee's presence and productivity during working hours.

Technological challenges in enforcing employee discipline require special attention. Face recognition reduces the potential for proxy attendance. However, this technology still has vulnerabilities, such as detection errors, outdated equipment in certain units, or employees clocking in but not working in their assigned units. This highlights the distinction between administrative compliance and substantive compliance. Administrative compliance means that employees meet formal requirements, such as attendance requirements. Substantive compliance means employees are actually present, working, completing tasks, and fulfilling their job responsibilities. Organizations must not stop at attendance data alone. Attendance data must be linked to work output, supervisor reports, performance target achievements, and behavioral evaluations.

A study by Amancik, Barus, Saifulloh, Nggilu, and Nur indicates that civil service reform can be strengthened by using technology to promote efficiency, transparency, and accountability in public administration. In the context of UNNES, these findings support the need to integrate attendance data, performance targets, supervisor reports, and post-sanction monitoring, so that technology records formal attendance and supports monitoring substantive compliance.[20]

The disciplinary patterns at UNNES indicate a separation between guidance and punishment. This separation is justified as long as guidance does not eliminate procedural obligations. Guidance is part of civil service governance, while disciplinary punishment is a consequence of proven violations. Both must complement each other. Informal

---

[20] Amancik, Sonia Ivana Barus, Putra Perdana Ahmad Saifulloh, Novendri M. Nggilu, and Asrul Ibrahim Nur, "Reforming the Indonesian Bureaucracy through State Civil Apparatus Reform: Could It Be Optimized with Technology?" *Journal of Law and Legal Reform* 5, no. 3 (2024): 943–972, https://doi.org/10.15294/jllr.v5i3.13753.

guidance can serve as an initial step toward a humanistic approach, but it must not eliminate the obligations, documentation, and escalation if violations recur. Otherwise, there is a risk of procedural bias in disciplinary enforcement.

Bias in disciplinary enforcement does not always manifest as intentional favoritism. Bias can also arise from inaction, neglect, or the decision to resolve violations informally without creating administrative records. In such situations, employees committing similar violations may face different treatment solely because of differences in their immediate supervisors' responses. Therefore, the use of objective data, investigation reports, findings reports, and the involvement of an investigative team are crucial tools for preventing bias.

Thus, the answer to the second research question is that violations at the work unit level at UNNES are handled through guidance, clarification, formal investigations, investigation reports, findings reports, sanction decisions, and, in certain cases, disciplinary transfers. However, the effectiveness of these measures remains constrained by reporting barriers, a culture of reluctance to speak up, administrative constraints, limited evidence, and loopholes in the attendance system.

D. Effectiveness of Sanctions, Deterrent Effects, and Organizational Learning

In this study, the deterrent effect is not narrowly defined as fear of punishment. It is understood as observable behavioral change following the imposition of sanctions. Indicators include reduced repeat violations, increased employee caution, improved adherence to work hours and procedures, heightened awareness of legal consequences, and a shift in attitude toward official duties.

Deterrence theory and procedural justice theory are integrated in this study. While Beccaria and Bentham emphasize certainty, celerity, and severity of sanctions, Tyler emphasizes the importance of procedural fairness. Effective disciplinary enforcement, therefore, requires both credible sanctions and fair procedures. Severe sanctions perceived as unfair may fail to achieve long-term compliance.

Research data indicate that formal sanctions have a stronger deterrent effect than informal reprimands. Employees who have received sanctions state that the disciplinary process makes them more cautious, more compliant, and more aware of the consequences of their actions. Leaders and the training team also state that formal sanctions exert pressure regarding reputation and integrity. For many employees, the burden on their reputations, career records, and professional images can feel heavier than the economic aspects.

Faculty leaders distinguish between the effects of verbal reprimands and formal sanctions. Informal, family-style verbal reprimands are often viewed as routine warnings. Employees may perceive them as personal communication without administrative consequences. In contrast, written reprimands, salary reductions, demotions, or developmental transfers send a stronger message because they have tangible impacts on career, income, and reputation. This is what makes formal sanctions function as shock therapy.

A deterrent effect also emerges among other employees. When employees learn that a violation is being addressed, a collective sense of caution arises. However, this social effect is not always optimal because the disciplinary process is confidential to protect privacy. Privacy protection is essential to prevent employees from facing excessive stigma. Nevertheless, organizations must ensure that lessons from disciplinary cases are disseminated institutionally. This can be achieved through anonymous learning. The timeline, type of violation, legal basis, and consequences can be communicated without revealing the violator's identity.

Morning assemblies and staff development meetings can serve as spaces for organizational learning. Leaders can communicate patterns of violations and their legal consequences using a *"no name, no shame"* approach. This model preserves employees' dignity while conveying that rules have consequences. DUSDM can also share aggregated historical data on disciplinary cases with faculties, enabling each unit to learn from recurring patterns of violations. SPI can use audit results to strengthen oversight systems and prevent repeated violations.

However, organizational learning has not yet been fully institutionalized. A key finding of this study is the lack of robust post-sanction monitoring. DUSDM stated that it does not yet have a specific mechanism to monitor civil servants who are currently undergoing or have completed disciplinary sanctions. Post-sanction guidance is left to the immediate supervisor. Employees who received sanctions also suggested the need for monitoring after sanctions are imposed. General staff stated they were unaware of any changes in employees' behavior after cases were processed, as there was no visible follow-up monitoring.

This monitoring shortcoming has significant implications. From an administrative law perspective, a sanction decision may conclude the investigation process. However, from a human resources management perspective, a sanction decision should mark the beginning of ongoing guidance. Without monitoring, the organization struggles to determine whether the sanction has genuinely changed behavior. The organization also faces difficulty in assessing whether employees repeat violations, whether work units provide supportive guidance, and whether the oversight system requires improvement.

Penalties are effective in preventing violations if they meet three key elements, such as certainty, speed, and proportionality, based on the theory of *deterrence* proposed by Cesare Beccaria and Jeremy Bentham in the 18th century.[21] Cesare Beccaria emphasized that punishment must be carried out proportionally to the offense committed, clearly defined in writing, and administered promptly to be effective in preventing violations, thereby educating the public about the consequences of their actions.[22] Jeremy Bentham developed this theory within utilitarianism, which holds that humans can make rational choices between *pain* and *pleasure*. Jeremy Bentham explicitly divided *deterrence* into two concepts, namely general and specific.[23] The concept *of* general *deterrence* holds that punishment is intended to deter the public from committing

---

21 Chanjana Elsa Philip, "Theory of Deterrence: A Justification for Capital Punishment," *We the People DSNLU Journal of Social Sciences* 1, no. 1 (2023): 198–215, https://dsnlu.ac.in/storage/2023/02/16-Theory-of-Deterrence-A-Justification-for-Capital-Punishment.pdf.

22 Kelli D. Tomlinson, "An Examination of Deterrence Theory: Where Do We Stand?," *Federal Probation* 80, no. 3 (2016): 33–38, https://www.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/80_3_4_0.pdf.

23 Mustofa, *Metode Penelitian Kriminologi* (Jakarta: Pranadamedia Group, 2013), 123.

crimes.[24] This concept is expected to occur before a punishment is enforced through the threat of punishment.[25] The concept of specific *deterrence* holds that punishment is intended to deter the offender from repeating their actions.[26] This concept is expected to occur after the punishment has been carried out.[27] There are three main components in *deterrence* theory, referred to as the 3Cs: *certainty, celerity,* and *severity*.[28] *Certainty* refers to the likelihood that a person who commits an offence will be punished; the higher the certainty, the greater the deterrent effect is believed to be. *Celerity*, or speed, refers to how quickly a punishment is imposed following a violation. Prolonged delays weaken the association between the act and the punishment, thereby reducing its deterrent effect. *Severity*, or the severity of the punishment, relates to how severe the imposed sanctions are; however, increasing the severity of sanctions rarely strengthens the prevention of violations.

When deterrence theory is used as an analytical tool to enforce employee discipline at UNNES, the element of severity or proportionality, as articulated by Cesare Beccaria, is evident once a case enters formal review. The type of sanction is determined based on evidence, the classification of the violation, and the team's recommendations. However, the element of certainty remains inconsistent, as minor violations are often resolved through informal tolerance. The element of speed or *celerity* also varies, as the investigation

---

[24] La Ode Faiki, "Urgensi Pedoman Pemidanaan Demi Terwujudnya Putusan Hakim Yang Berkeadilan," *Journal of Mandalika Literature* 5, no. 3 (2024).

[25] Bryan Eduardus Christiano, "Implikasi Perubahan Delik Dalam Undang-Undang Nomor 28 Tahun 2014 Tentang Hak Cipta Terhadap Deterrence Effect Praktik Pembajakan Buku Akademis Di Indonesia," *Padjadjaran Law Review* 9, no. 1 (2021).

[26] Pitra Rinanti and Handoyo Prasetyo, "Model Pemidanaan Korporasi Berbasis Efek Jera Dalam Kasus Korupsi Di Indonesia," *Jurnal USM Law Review* 8, no. 3 (2025): 2371–86.

[27] R Paternoster, "How Much Do We Really Know about Criminal Deterrence," *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 100, no. 3 (2010): 766.

[28] Muhammad Rizki Aji Pratama, Dadang Sundawa, and Dwi Iman Muthaqin, "Implementasi Deterrence Social Sebagai Pencegahan Pelanggaran Lalu Lintas Remaja," *Bacarita Law Journal* 5, no. 1 (August 31, 2024): 97–107, https://doi.org/10.30598/bacarita.v5i1.13852.

process can take several weeks to several months, depending on the complexity of the case and the completeness of the evidence.

This view aligns with Sharaf Addin's study, which emphasizes that administrative disciplinary law must include clear definitions of violations, fair procedures, consistent application, and sanctions that build trust and deter. Thus, the effectiveness of disciplinary sanctions cannot be measured solely by the severity of the punishment, but also by the clarity of the basis for the violation and the fairness of the review process.[29]

Research by Yasrebi-de Kom, Dirkzwager, van der Laan, and Nieuwbeerta indicates that sanction severity does not act in isolation; rather, it interacts with procedural justice.[30] Severe sanctions do not automatically deter violations if the process is deemed unfair. These findings are relevant to UNNES. A clear disciplinary process must always accompany the deduction of allowances, written reprimands, demotions, or disciplinary transfers. Otherwise, sanctions may be perceived as subjective actions by leadership, rather than legitimate and educational administrative decisions.

Procedural justice also influences organizational trust, as individuals tend to assess an institution's legitimacy based on how decisions are made and implemented rather than on the outcomes. Meisey, Rahmat, and Onasis demonstrate that procedural justice is associated with organizational trust and affective commitment.[31] When procedures are carried out consistently, transparently, and non-discriminatorily, organizational members will feel valued and treated fairly. This fosters a sense of psychological security, increases voluntary compliance, and strengthens the belief that the organization operates on principles of

---

[29] Eltayeib Hussein Mahmoud Sharaf Addin, "Criminalization and Punishment Policies in Administrative Disciplinary Law: A Comparative Study of Criminal Law from a Societal Perspective," *Journal of Law and Legal Reform* 6, no. 2 (2025): 951–974, https://doi.org/10.15294/jllr.v6i2.16488.

[30] F. M. Yasrebi-de Kom, A. J. E. Dirkzwager, and P. Nieuwbeerta, "The Effect of Sanction Severity and Its Interaction with Procedural Justice," *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 49 (2022): 200–219, https://doi.org/10.1177/00938548211038358.

[31] S. E. Meisey, A. Rahmat, and D. Onasis, "The Influence of Organizational Trust and Procedural Justice on Affective Commitment," *Journal of Law and Legal Reform* 1 (2025): 68–78.

accountability. Conversely, unfairness in the process can breed suspicion, resistance, and erode trust in the organization's authority. In the context of UNNES, a fair disciplinary process does more than prevent legal challenges. A fair process also preserves employees' psychological connection to the institution after sanctions are imposed. Employees who receive sanctions but feel the process was fair are more likely to improve their behavior than those who feel they were treated arbitrarily.

Sanctions must also be directed as an educational tool. If sanctions only instill fear, employees may develop superficial compliance. Employees may comply with the attendance system, but do not fully uphold work ethics during working hours. Therefore, sanctions need to be linked to learning. This learning includes understanding the mistake, the legal basis, a development plan, post-sanction evaluation, and improvements to the monitoring system.

Organizational learning can be built through a disciplinary cycle. This cycle begins with recording violations, conducting initial counselling, conducting an objective review, imposing proportional sanctions, conducting post-sanction monitoring, and conducting institutional evaluation. Every case must yield knowledge for the organization. For example, if a violation arises from a gap in the attendance system, the system needs to be improved. If a violation arises from a lack of employee understanding, awareness campaigns need to be strengthened. If a violation arises because a direct supervisor is reluctant to report it, escalation standards and leadership training should be implemented.

Cases involving document forgery, integrity violations, and sexual harassment should not be viewed solely as individual misconduct. These cases provide organizational data that can be used to strengthen recruitment screening, ethics training, supervision mechanisms, and risk management systems. Anonymous case summaries may also be used as learning materials for employees without exposing personal identities. Such a mechanism enables organizations to transform disciplinary cases into institutional knowledge.

Thus, the answer to the third research question is that the imposition of sanctions can serve as a deterrent and improve compliance, particularly when sanctions enter the formal domain, impact reputation or career prospects, and are carried out through fair procedures. However, its effectiveness in organizational learning remains suboptimal because post-sanction monitoring is not yet institutionalized, guidance still relies on immediate supervisors, and daily violations are often met with informal tolerance.

E. Recommendations for Reforming Civil Servant Disciplinary Enforcement in Higher Education

Based on the research findings, disciplinary enforcement reform at UNNES should focus on system development rather than merely reaffirming disciplinary obligations. Legal norms are already in place. The implementing structure also exists. The main challenges lie in daily implementation, documenting guidance, ensuring consistency in reporting, and post-sanction monitoring. Therefore, the recommendations formulated must address the starting point, the formal process, and follow-up after a decision.

TABLE 4. Roadmap for Disciplinary Enforcement Reform

Timeframe	Reform Agenda	Main Action
Short-term, 0-1 year	Strengthening documentation	Record every initial guidance, verbal reprimand, and minor violation in a brief standardized form.
Short-term, 0-1 year	Escalation standard	Establish clear thresholds for recurring minor violations that must be reported to faculty or DUSDM.
Medium-term, 1-3 years	Supervisor capacity building	Train immediate supervisors on PP No. 94 of 2021, BKN Regulation No. 6 of 2022, ethics regulations, and documentation techniques.

Timeframe	Reform Agenda	Main Action
Medium-term, 1-3 years	Digital monitoring integration	Integrate attendance data, SKP, BKD, allowance data, mentoring records, and disciplinary case records.
Long-term, 3-5 years	Post-sanction monitoring	Develop a monitoring dashboard to assess behavioral change after sanctions.
Long-term, 3-5 years	Organizational learning system	Build anonymous case-learning materials to transform disciplinary cases into institutional knowledge.

First, UNNES needs to establish standards for recording initial guidance. Every verbal reprimand or persuasive counselling regarding a disciplinary violation must be recorded in a brief form. The form does not need to be complex. The information to be recorded includes the date, type of violation, form of counselling, the official providing the counselling, the employee's response, and the follow-up plan. This documentation is essential to ensure that family-oriented counselling remains accountable.

Second, UNNES needs to establish escalation thresholds. If a certain number of minor violations recur, the immediate supervisor must forward the report to the faculty or the DUSDM. Escalation thresholds prevent recurring minor violations from being resolved solely with informal reprimands. These thresholds also assist immediate supervisors because the decision to report no longer depends on hesitation but on institutional standards.

Third, the DUSDM and SPI need to develop a post-sanction monitoring dashboard. The dashboard can integrate data on sanctions, attendance, allowances, SKP, BKD, direct supervisor reports, and mentoring records. This system does not need to be used to disclose personal data widely. Access can be restricted to authorized officials. The goal is to ensure that employees who have been sanctioned receive guidance and demonstrate behavioral change.

Fourth, roll-call forums and guidance meetings should use an anonymous learning approach. Work units can present case studies without revealing the violator's identity. The information shared may include the type of violation, the legal basis, administrative consequences, and preventive measures. This approach protects employee privacy while disseminating lessons learned throughout the organization.

Fifth, immediate supervisors must receive specialized training on Government Regulation No. 94 of 2021, BKN Regulation No. 6 of 2022, the UNNES Code of Ethics, and documented guidance techniques. Immediate supervisors are the first line of disciplinary enforcement. If they do not understand the procedures, hesitate to report violations, or fail to document guidance sessions, the formal system will not function optimally.

A study by Jarodi, Khafid, and Yulianto indicates that fragmented human resource capacity, competency gaps, inadequate training, and weak inter-institutional coordination can hinder the effectiveness of legal reform. Therefore, training for immediate supervisors at UNNES should focus on strengthening procedural competencies, documenting disciplinary actions, coordinating case escalations, and analyzing disciplinary data as a foundation for organizational learning.[32]

Sixth, UNNES needs to standardize guidelines on the proportionality of sanctions. These guidelines help employees understand why seemingly similar cases may result in different sanctions. Differences in sanctions can arise due to variations in evidence, the impact of the violation, the degree of fault, disciplinary history, and mitigating or aggravating circumstances. Proportionality guidelines prevent the perception of selective enforcement.

Seventh, the attendance system must be supplemented with substantive presence monitoring within work units. Facial recognition and GPS help verify attendance, but they are insufficient to ensure

[32] Odi Jarodi, Muhammad Khafid, and Arief Yulianto, "From Fragmentation to Coherence: Enhancing Human Resource Capacity in Indonesian Law Reform for Effective Justice Delivery," *Journal of Law and Legal Reform* 5, no. 4 (2024): 2071–2092, https://doi.org/10.15294/jllr.v5i4.18924.

employees are working effectively. The system must be linked to work reports, daily outputs, and supervisor evaluations. In this way, the organization not only records who is present but also assesses work contributions during working hours.

Eighth, a database of disciplinary violations must be built in an integrated manner. This data can be used to map the types of violations, high-risk work units, patterns of recurrence, high-risk times for violations, and the effectiveness of sanctions. The database also aids future research and policy evaluation. With good data, guidance can be more targeted.

Ninth, UNNES needs to reinforce the paradigm that enforcing discipline is not merely about punishment. Sanctions must be part of the development cycle. Employees who violate rules need to understand their mistakes, accept the consequences, undergo development, and be re-evaluated. Work units also need to learn from cases to improve the monitoring system.

These recommendations indicate that civil servant disciplinary reform in higher education institutions must integrate legal norms, human resource management, technology, and organizational culture. A robust system not only punishes major violations but also fosters a culture of orderliness regarding minor infractions. Thus, discipline becomes an integral part of the work culture, not merely a reaction to specific cases.

Conclusion

The formal procedure for imposing sanctions at UNNES is carried out in accordance with Government Regulation No. 94 of 2021, BKN Regulation No. 6 of 2022, and the rector's regulations, all of which contain clear and detailed procedures for imposing sanctions. Officials or unit heads have implemented these procedures, but weaknesses remain in their implementation, particularly during the pre-formal stage. Disciplinary actions for violations at the work unit level are carried out through guidance, clarification, formal investigation, reports, and sanction decisions; however, gaps in documentation reduce procedural accountability. Sanctions have deterrent effects, especially formal sanctions, but organizational learning remains weak because post-sanction monitoring has not been institutionalized. This study is limited to a single university and relies heavily on interview-based evidence. Future studies should compare disciplinary governance across multiple PTN-BH institutions and employ quantitative methods to assess employee perceptions and behavioral change. Policy makers, both within the campus environment and at higher levels, are expected to shift the disciplinary enforcement paradigm from mere administrative punishment toward a development system based on data, documentation, monitoring, and organizational learnings, which can be achieved, among other things, through post-sanction monitoring. Those responsible for disciplinary enforcement are expected to document violations, even minor ones, to assess whether violations are repeated and to ensure that sanctions are proportionate.

References

Amancik, Sonia Ivana Barus, Putra Perdana Ahmad Saifulloh, Novendri M. Nggilu, and Asrul Ibrahim Nur. "Reforming the Indonesian Bureaucracy through State Civil Apparatus Reform: Could It Be Optimized with Technology?" *Journal of Law and Legal Reform* 5, no. 3 (2024): 943–972. https://doi.org/10.15294/jllr.v5i3.13753.

Anggoro, F. N. "Penyalahgunaan Wewenang oleh Pegawai Negeri Sipil: Ratio Legis Pasal 36 Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 94 Tahun 2021 tentang Disiplin Pegawai Negeri Sipil." *Jurnal Rechts Vinding* 11 (2022): 211–228.

Avelar, A. B. A., K. D. da Silva Oliveira and M. C. Farina. "The Integration of the Sustainable Development Goals into Curricula, Research and Partnerships in Higher Education." *International Review of Education* 69 (2023): 299–325. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-023-10013-1.

Badan Kepegawaian Negara. *Peraturan Badan Kepegawaian Negara Nomor 6 Tahun 2022 tentang Peraturan Pelaksanaan Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 94 Tahun 2021 tentang Disiplin Pegawai Negeri Sipil*. 2022.

Friedman, Lawrence M. *The Legal System: A Social Science Perspective*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1975.

Goedurov, R. "Public Sector Organizations: Work Environment, Employee Behavior and Discipline." *International Journal of Public Review* 1 (2020): 6–11.

Ismail, D. E., N. Ahmad, A. R. Y. Mantali, M. R. Moha, and A. W. Machmud. "The Comparative Study: Protecting Children's Rights through Law Reform of Restorative Justice in Juvenile Cases." *Journal of Law and Legal Reform* 6 (2025): 909–950.

Jarodi, Odi, Muhammad Khafid, and Arief Yulianto. "From Fragmentation to Coherence: Enhancing Human Resource Capacity in Indonesian Law Reform for Effective Justice Delivery." *Journal of Law and Legal Reform* 5, no. 4 (2024): 2071–2092. https://doi.org/10.15294/jllr.v5i4.18924.

Meisey, S. E., A. Rahmat, and D. Onasis. "The Influence of Organizational Trust and Procedural Justice on Affective Commitment." *Journal of Law and Legal Reform* 1 (2025): 68–78.

Midhol, A. B. "The Principle of Due Process in Disciplinary Sanctions for Civil Servants in Indonesia: Comparative Study of Government Regulation." *Journal of Law and Public Administration* 16 (2025): 99–114.

Nasrallah, W. B. F., and G. Zouari. "Organizational Culture, Compensation Systems, Decision-Making, and Efficiency of Public Higher Education Institutions: Case Study of the University of Sfax." *Decision* 51 (2024): 33–56. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40622-024-00377-0.

Ngatemi, N., E. Erniyanti, M. S. Respationo, and D. Dahlan. "Legal Analysis of the Effectiveness of Disciplinary Punishment Enforcement in Improving the Discipline of State Civil Apparatus." *Journal of Legal Studies* 1 (2024): 1–14.

Onyango, G. "Organizational Disciplinary Actions as Socio-Political

Processes in Public Organizations." *Public Organization Review* 19 (2019): 227–248.

Panusunan, P., A. Widyawati, D. Sulistianingsih, and R. K. Nababan. "Reformulation of Law Decision Bias on Restitution Payments in Sexual Violence Crimes: Comparison of Indonesia and The Netherlands." *Journal of Law and Legal Reform* 6 (2025): 1275–1304.

Pujiati, L., and S. Dwiono. "Implementasi Peraturan Pemerintah No. 94 Tahun 2021 tentang Disiplin ASN di Bapenda Lampung Utara." *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Hukum Al-Zayn* 3 (2025): 2198–2205.

Raddieh, E. J. "The Authority of Disciplinary Action between Administration and Judiciary." *Russian Law Journal* 11 (2023): 1974–1979.

Ramadhan, A., and R. Lestari. "Implementasi Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 94 Tahun 2021 tentang Disiplin Pegawai Negeri Sipil: Studi di Mahkamah Syariah Meulaboh." *Jurnal Serambi Hukum* 16 (2023): 141–151.

Rauzi, F. "Penjatuhan Hukuman Terkait Masalah Disiplin Pegawai Negeri Sipil." *Journal of Fundamental Justice* 4 (2023): 112–127.

Republik Indonesia. *Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 94 Tahun 2021 tentang Disiplin Pegawai Negeri Sipil*. 2021.

Republik Indonesia. *Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2023 tentang Aparatur Sipil Negara*. 2023.

Saputra, R., M. Kurniawan, B. Wibowo, W. N. Hanum, and D. Triasari. "Criminal Liability for Corruption of Bribery: Problems and Legal Reform." *Journal of Law and Legal Reform* 6 (2025): 2089–2140.

Sharaf Addin, Eltayeib Hussein Mahmoud. "Criminalization and Punishment Policies in Administrative Disciplinary Law: A Comparative Study of Criminal Law from a Societal Perspective." *Journal of Law and Legal Reform* 6, no. 2 (2025): 951–974. https://doi.org/10.15294/jllr.v6i2.16488.

Suastuti, E., N. B. Minarno, A. Farid, M. Sufyan, and G. Poernomo.

"Inconsistency in the Formulation of Article 2 and Article 3 of Law No. 31 of Corrupt Practices Eradication Law and Disparity in Criminal Penalty for Mining Corruption in the Practice of Law Enforcement." *Journal of Law and Legal Reform* 6 (2025): 1175–1206.

Tias, A., A. Mohyi, and R. Febriani. "The Effect of Work Discipline and Organizational Justice on Employee Performance with Organizational Commitment as a Mediation Variable." *Bimantara* 4 (2025): 104–115. https://doi.org/10.22219/bimantara.v4i02.42666.

Tyler, T. R. *Why People Obey the Law*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1990.

Universitas Negeri Semarang. *Peraturan Rektor UNNES Nomor 52 Tahun 2022 tentang Kode Etik Tenaga Kependidikan*. Semarang: Universitas Negeri Semarang, 2022.

Universitas Negeri Semarang. *Peraturan Rektor UNNES Nomor 59 Tahun 2022 tentang Kode Etik Dosen*. Semarang: Universitas Negeri Semarang, 2022.

Ukeje, I. O., I. T. Okolie, I. C. Akor, O. R. Suzana, A. I. Arinze, C. E. Ibeh, et al. "Public Sector Disciplinary Practices and Implications for Organizational Performance: Towards a Recalibrated Sustainable Service Performance Model." *Journal of Policy and Development Studies* 15 (2024): 95–110.

Wahid, M., and S. Saleh. "Public Employee Discipline." *Journal of Public Administration* 1 (2024): 38–45.

Wulandari, N., S. Y. Mozin, and Y. N. Nani. "Analysis of Employee Discipline as a Determinant of Public Service Performance: A Case Study at the Social Service of Gorontalo Province." *International Journal of Research in Engineering and Science* 13 (2025): 17–22.

Yasrebi-de Kom, F. M., A. J. E. Dirkzwager, and P. Nieuwbeerta. "The Effect of Sanction Severity and Its Interaction with Procedural Justice." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 49 (2022): 200–219.

https://doi.org/10.1177/00938548211038358.

Yasrebi-de Kom, F. M., A. Dirkzwager, S. van der Laan, and P. Nieuwbeerta. "Deterrent Effects of Sanction Severity and the Role of Procedural Justice in Prison: A Preregistered Randomized Vignette Experiment." *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 21 (2025): 251–279. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-023-09585-7.

Acknowledgment

The author would like to express gratitude to the Research and Community Service Institute of Universitas Negeri Semarang, the Directorate of General Affairs and Human Resources, the Internal Audit Unit, the faculty leadership, the Employee Development Team, and all informants who supported data collection for this study.

Funding Information

This research was funded by the Research and Community Service Institute (LPPM) of Universitas Negeri Semarang under the 2026 Strategic Policy Research scheme.

Conflicting Interest Statement

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest in the publication of this article.

Publishing Ethical and Originality Statement

All authors declared that this work is original and has never been published in any form and in any media, nor is it under consideration for publication in any journal, and all sources cited in this work refer to the basic standards of scientific citation.

Generative AI Statement

The authors maintain full accountability for the final content. The AI performed no original data analysis or interpretations without human oversight.