

Research Article

Empowering Local Communities: Enhancing Engagement in Anti-Corruption Action Programs

Suteki *

Faculty of Law, Universitas Diponegoro, Indonesia

Abdul Jalil

Faculty of Law, Universitas Diponegoro, Indonesia

Aga Natalis

Faculty of Law, Universitas Diponegoro, Indonesia

Angelica Vanessa Audrey Nasution

Faculty of Law, Universitas Diponegoro, Indonesia

ABSTRACT: When attaining effective governance and justice, as described in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), corruption is a serious hurdle in sustainable development. The issue of corruption continues to be widespread in Indonesia, necessitating responses that are both comprehensive and international in scope. Essential to the fight against corruption is the empowerment of community engagement at the local level; in developing, implementing, and monitoring Anti-Corruption Action programs. On the other hand, there is considerable space for improvement regarding community participation in anti-corruption activities. This study aims to analyze the significance of community involvement in anti-corruption measures within Indonesia by employing a socio-legal methodology: a combination of legal research with sociological analysis. Data collection entails using primary sources, such as interviews and observations made in the field; in addition to secondary sources, including legal literature and decisions made by the courts. Descriptive-analytical approaches are used to examine the elements influencing community participation in preventing and eliminating corruption. After completing the research, the researchers concluded that anti-corruption learning programs, law enforcement, and community awareness are necessities to effectively combat corruption. Additionally notable is the increasing importance of the independent media's role in discovering corruption and increasing public awareness. Among the recommendations are the enhancement of community engagement, the promotion of anti-corruption education, the expansion of media cooperation, and the improvement of government openness. To combat corruption and promote good governance, it is possible to develop an effective and sustainable collaboration between the government and society by implementing these measures.

KEYWORDS: Corruption, Community Engagement, Anti-Corruption Action Programs, Local Governance

* Corresponding author, email: suteki@lecturer.undip.ac.id

Submitted: 3 February 2024 | **Reviewed:** 2 March 2024 | **Revised:** 7 March 2024 | **Accepted:** 26 March 2024

I. INTRODUCTION

Corruption and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are intricately linked. The involvement of politicians in corrupt practices highlights deficiencies in the legal system and the lack of justice and strong institutions.¹ This scenario hinders the realization of SDG 16, which prioritizes the enhancement of effective governance within the Legal and Governance Pillar of development. It thereby impacts progress towards the goals outlined in the SDG 2030 agenda. Hence, resisting corruption is essential to attain inclusive and sustainable development. Continued corruption practices will hinder societal well-being, notwithstanding economic prosperity.²

Corruption has transcended its status as a problem solely affecting underdeveloped nations and has now evolved into a global issue that necessitates comprehensive and transnational approaches.³ Therefore, in Indonesia, it is universally recognized as an exceptional offense. The impact of this extends beyond one generation, influencing subsequent generations. Which forms of corruption are considered detrimental to the long-term viability of governance and the well-being of future generations? The precise answer derives from the definition of corruption offenses, outlined in Law No. 31/1999 on the Elimination of Corruption Offences—which was subsequently modified by Law No. 20/2001.⁴ The definition outlined in this legislation may vary from the viewpoints of society, due to deeply rooted traditions practiced in both the private and public domains (including some dating back to ancient

¹ Ahmad Qisa'i, "Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and Challenges of Policy Reform on Asset Recovery in Indonesia" 17:2 *Indonesian Journal of International Law* at 231–252. Paul S Rockower, "Recipes for Gastrodiplomacy" (2012) 8:3 *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy* 235–246.

² Kempe Ronald Hope, "Corruption Reduction as a Target of the Sustainable Development Goals: Applying Indicators and Policy Frameworks" in Jarrett Blaustein et al, eds, *The Emerald Handbook of Crime, Justice and Sustainable Development* (Emerald Publishing Limited, 2020) at 105; Corina Joseph et al, "The ethical value disclosure index from the lens of SDG 16 and institutional theory" (2023) 39:3 *International Journal of Ethics and Systems* at 612–628.

³ Maskun, "Combating Corruption Based on International Rules" (2014) 4:1 *Indonesia Law Review* at 55–66.

⁴ Hendi Yogi Prabowo, "To Be Corrupt or Not to Be Corrupt: Understanding the Behavioral Side of Corruption in Indonesia" (2014) 17:3 *Journal of Money Laundering Control* at 306–326.

civilizations).⁵

In the private sector, exchanging gifts is prevalent and highly esteemed. It is customary to extend employment opportunities, such as project tenders and specific labor contracts, to coworkers or family members. This practice frequently extends and is similarly applicable to the public sector. It is commonly mentioned in ancient kingdom legends that sending presents and tributes to the monarch, regardless of their quantity, was a customary practice. There appears to be a difference in how things are perceived in public versus private settings. Is it better for the public domain to accurately reflect the private domain? This seems to be the reality in Indonesia.

There are still considerable gaps between strong intentions to prevent and fight corruption and society's readiness to do so. Corruption plagues communities impartially. However, its expression varies by social context. Many communities are passionate about fighting corruption. Citizens, activists, and governments often decry corruption. They support transparency, accountability, and anti-corruption laws. Despite humanitarian intentions, social organization defects often obstruct anti-corruption efforts. When looking at corruption in politics, business, and law enforcement, the difference between words and deeds becomes clear. Corrupt people exploit legal loopholes or collude with powerful people to avoid accountability.

Cultural norms and societal attitudes toward corruption can also help or hinder efforts to combat it. Strong legal and administrative frameworks and changes in societal values are needed to close these disparities. Education, knowledge, and ethical leadership must create an honest and accountable society. These imbalances must be addressed collectively for societies to move forward without corruption.

Due to Indonesia's adherence to the rule of law, state administration personnel must actively participate in national affairs or governance to attain social welfare/welfare state. The legislation has a duty to incorporate society's cultural values and the broad principles of good governance (*Algemene Beginselen van*

⁵ Andreas Nathaniel Marbun, "Suap di Sektor Privat: Dapatkah Dijerat?" (2017) 3:1 Integritas: Jurnal Antikorupsi at 53–85.

Behoorlijk Bestuur).⁶ State apparatuses employ these ideas as benchmarks to exercise their authority and to establish a state governed by the rule of law. When these principles of good governance combine, a transparent government can be achieved. A clean government lacks power abuse, corruption, or other bureaucratic disorders. Here, we observe a correlation between endeavors to prevent and battle corruption and endeavors to achieve good governance. It is a novel perspective that battling corruption is a fundamental element of this framework for good governance, complementing the components outlined by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP).⁷

As an integral component of Asia, Indonesian society's diverse and multifaceted character should be the foundation for implementing laws and regulations. The relationship between law and society is highly interconnected since (as argued by Brian Z. Tamanaha) law has a distinct and unique manifestation within social dynamics.⁸ Tamanaha explains that the field of law and society encompasses a framework known as 'The Law-Society Framework, which comprises distinct features about particular connections. Two fundamental elements denote these relationships. The initial component encompasses two primary concepts: the notion that law reflects society and that the purpose of law is to uphold social order. The second component comprises three elements: custom/consent, morality/reason, and positive law. In Donald Black's framework, culture encompasses the concepts of custom/consent and morality/reason.⁹

According to Tamanaha, Black's perspective considers culture as the basis for understanding morality and reason. Hence, there exists a strong correlation between the state (with its legal framework), society (with its customary

⁶ Henk Addink, "Good Governance on Multiple Levels" in Henk Addink, ed, *Good Governance: Concept and Context* (Oxford University Press, 2019).

⁷ Tauchid Komara Yuda, "Welfare Regime Transformation in Indonesia: A Citizenship Debate" (2018) 23:2 *Masyarakat, Jurnal Sosiologi* at 143–165.

⁸ Brian Z Tamanaha, *A General Jurisprudence of Law and Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021).

⁹ Black states that "culture is the symbolic aspect of social life, including expressions of what is true, good, and beautiful. It encompasses ideas about the nature of reality (theoretical and practical), whether supernatural, metaphysical, or empirical, as well as conceptions of what ought to be (right or wrong, proper, and technological), encompassing religion, magic, or folklore. Values, ideology, morality, and law possess such a symbolic aspect". See Donald J Black, *The Behavior of Law* (Academic Press, 1976).

practices and collective agreement), and natural law (with its ethical and religious principles). Society's perspective suggests that the success of law enforcement, particularly the fight against corruption, is influenced by societal factors. Society has a crucial role in preventing corruption; including the entire process from planning and implementation to monitoring action programs. Community participation plays a crucial role in combating corruption at the local level.

Community empowerment has a crucial role in effectively addressing corruption, but it is essential to operate within the confines of the law.¹⁰ The community participation process must be handled democratically, adhering to a structure that upholds principles, and a sense of propriety and fairness, while ensuring the preservation and acknowledgement of human rights. Although combating corruption is a component of establishing good governance, it does not imply that law enforcement activities are subordinate to political and governmental considerations. Community empowerment is vital in preventing corruption, but it is crucial to prioritize law enforcement and institutions responsible for tackling corruption problems.¹¹

In order to carry out the requirements stated in Article 41 paragraph (5) and Article 42 paragraph (5) of Law Number 31/1999 on eradicating corruption crimes, the Government has enacted Government Regulation Number 71/2000. This regulation outlines the procedures for community involvement and the granting of awards to prevent and eradicate corruption crimes.¹² According to Law Number 31/1999, specifically in Article 41 paragraph (5) and Article 42 paragraph (5), it is highlighted that the processes of involving the community and granting rewards to prevent and eliminate corruption crimes should be governed by Government Regulation.¹³ By involving the community, the aim is to actualize their entitlements and obligations in governing a

¹⁰ Deepa Narayan-Parker, *Empowerment and poverty reduction: A sourcebook* (World Bank Publications, 2002).

¹¹ Yulia Monita, Elizabeth Siregar & Dheny Wahyudhi, "The Role Of Society in Prevention and Eradication of Corruption Criminal Actions in Indonesia's Legislation Perspective" (2019) 2:2 *Berumpun: International Journal of Social, Politics, Humanities* at 47–58.

¹² Musa Pane & Diah Pudjiastuti, "The Legal Aspect of New Normal and the Corruption Eradication In Indonesia" (2020) 7:2 *Padjadjaran Jurnal Ilmu Hukum (Journal of Law)* at 181–206.

¹³ Muhammad Kamal & Muhammad Yarif Arifin, "The Community Role in Prevention and Eradication of Corruption" (2019) 15:2 *Varia Justicia* at 51–58.

corruption-free state.¹⁴ Moreover, the active involvement of individuals in such endeavors would foster greater enthusiasm among the society to effectively exercise social oversight over acts of corruption. Community engagement in combating corruption crimes is demonstrated through activities such as actively seeking, acquiring, and sharing data or information related to corruption crimes—and having the right to offer responsible suggestions and opinions on preventing and eliminating corruption crimes.¹⁵

This research aims to achieve several objectives, including understanding and elucidating the causes underlying corruption crimes, the involvement of local governments in addressing them, and the role of community participation. It additionally analyses and discusses the factors influencing the community's involvement in combating corruption crimes in the region. Finally, it seeks to identify the optimal model for community involvement in addressing corruption offenses.

II. METHODOLOGY

This study employs a socio-legal methodology that concurrently incorporates two research components: legal research (normative/doctrinal) and social research (sociological research).¹⁶ Normative research (often called doctrinal research) will be employed by examining legal writings and court rulings pertinent to the subject of study.¹⁷ Meanwhile, social research will be carried out by analyzing field phenomena associated with the disintegration of community organizations in Indonesia. Researchers in this technique strictly adhere to social notions and legal theories.

The research methodology employed is descriptive-analytical, offering a

¹⁴ Nandha Risky Putra & Rosa Linda, “Impact of Social Change on Society from the Crime of Corruption” (2022) 8:1 *Integritas: J Antikorupsi* at 13–24.

¹⁵ Sumaiya Khair, “UNCAC and Civil Society Activism Against Corruption In Bangladesh” in Kevin Yi Tan, ed, *Asian Yearbook of International Law*, Volume 20 (2014) (Brill | Nijhoff, 2018) at 115.

¹⁶ Suteki & Galang Taufani, *Metodologi Penelitian Hukum (Filsafat, Teori dan Praktik)* (Depok: Rajawali Pers, 2018).

¹⁷ Herlambang Perdana Wiratraman, “The Challenges of Teaching Comparative Law and Socio-Legal Studies at Indonesia’s Law Schools” (2019) 14:S1 *Asian Journal of Comparative Law* at 229–244.

systematic, factual, and precise depiction of the approach toward corruption offenses from legal, moral, and religious standpoints in Indonesia. This will specifically be the case in autonomous regions. The descriptive technique's primary objective is to portray individuals, situations, or certain groups accurately.

This study employs two distinct forms of data: primary and secondary. Secondary data is collected by conducting field observations and conversations with relevant individuals and referring to bibliographic materials, including primary, secondary, and tertiary legal sources. Data gathering strategies encompass field research and interviews with pertinent stakeholders, including officials from the Corruption Eradication Commission, community members, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), legal professionals, and local government officials. Additionally, literature evaluations are undertaken by scrutinizing laws, legal literature, expert papers, lecture materials, and pertinent court decisions.

Data analysis involves systematically arranging and classifying data to detect patterns, categories, and themes while developing working hypotheses. The legal analysis employed is a qualitative descriptive approach. This entails the representation, examination, and elucidation of legal norms, theories, and concepts about community involvement in combating corruption within local governments.

III. COMBATTING CORRUPTION: STRATEGIES FOR PREVENTION AND ERADICATION AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

According to Article 1, paragraph 3 of Law Number 30/2002 on the Corruption Eradication Commission, corruption eradication is a set of measures to prevent and eliminate corruption. These measures include coordinating efforts, supervising and monitoring, investigating cases, prosecuting offenders, and conducting court examinations. Relevant laws and regulations also emphasize community participation. Upon examining this definition, it is evident that corruption eradication also includes preventive elements. Anti-corruption actors occasionally fail to consider this factor. Implementing preventive measures would prove highly effective once we acknowledge that the

governance system, particularly public services, contributes to corruption. The issue of corruption in Indonesia has been a persistent concern for an extended period. In the 1950s, the Indonesian government sought to eliminate corruption by enacting legislation to complement the provisions on corruption offenses in the Criminal Code.¹⁸

Rules were put into effect; via the Regulation of the Central War Commander of the Army Staff (dated 16 April 1958), No. Prt/Peperpu/013/1958 and its implementing regulations, and the Regulation of the Central War Commander of the Navy No. Prz./Z.I/I/7 (dated 17 April 1958). Law No. 24/1960 was passed to address the investigation, prosecution, and examination of corruption crimes. The prevalence and endurance of corruption crimes then necessitated the enactment of Law No. 3/1971, which aimed to eradicate such offenses. Before 1998, the existing laws had limited success in eliminating corruption in Indonesia. As a result, a new measure was introduced during the Reformation period,¹⁹ known as the People’s Consultative Assembly Decree No. XI/1998. It aimed to ensure clean, corruption-free state administrators and combat collusion and nepotism. This measure was later followed by Law No. 28/1999, which also focused on clean and corruption-free state administrations, collusion, and nepotism.²⁰ In addition, in collaboration with the President, the House of Representatives Republic of Indonesia proceeded to enact a new legislation, Law No. 31/1999. This law serves as an anti-corruption measure, specifically targeting eradicating corruption crimes.²¹ With a now extensive catalog of regulations, the question remains: can implementing these rules effectively diminish both the prevalence and severity of corruption?

Instances of corruption have indeed demonstrated a rise throughout the reformation. Since the implementation of Law No. 22/1999 on 1 January 2001,

¹⁸ Salma Aulia Farahdina Ariani & Nanik Prasetyoningsih, “Fighting Corruption Post Revision of the Act of the Corruption Eradication Commission” (2022) 3:3 mls 235–254; Bambang Budi Priyanto, Faisal Santiago & Zudan Arief Fakrulloh, “The role of the Corruption Eradication Commission (CEC) in carrying out its functions and authorities to eradicate corruption” (2023) 4:7 Jurnal Indonesia Sosial Sains at 607–616.

¹⁹ Simon Butt, *Corruption and Law in Indonesia* (Routledge, 2017).

²⁰ Timothy Lindsey, *Indonesia, Law and Society* (Federation Press, 2008).

²¹ Andrew Boutros, “Indonesia” in T Markus Funk & Andrew S Boutros, eds, *From Baksheesh to Bribery: Understanding the Global Fight Against Corruption and Graft* (Oxford University Press, 2019).

which marked the beginning of regional autonomy, notable transformations have been evident in the nature and dynamics of corruption in Indonesia. The transition from organized and controlled corruption to disorganized corruption can be observed in different areas (regions and sectors). Regional autonomy not only expands democratic spaces but also serves as a platform for perpetuating and modernizing corrupt practices.²² In addition to regional autonomy, corruption has transitioned from systematic and command-based to chaotic corruption characterized by kleptocracy. This shift is demonstrated by the participation of numerous regional leaders and heads of government agencies in acts of corruption. Hence, it is not an overstatement when multiple global studies classify Indonesia as one of the most corrupt nations on the planet. What criteria determine a country's ranking or level of corruption? In general, the gauging metrics encompass two aspects: the inclination of individuals to report suspected instances of corruption, and the readiness of the government to address these accusations.

Suppose a connection between the above factors and regional governments' involvement and jurisdiction in preventing and eradicating corruption is established. In that case, regional governments should lead in these endeavors. Prior to the enactment of Presidential Regulation 55/2012, the jurisdiction of Regional Governments was outlined in Presidential Instruction Number 9/2011, which pertained to the Corruption Prevention and Eradication Action Plan for the year 2011.²³ In 2011, the President of Indonesia directed various government bodies and officials to take appropriate actions within their respective roles and responsibilities, to expedite the prevention and elimination of corruption. These bodies included cabinet ministers, the Attorney General's Office, the Indonesian National Police, the Indonesian National Armed Forces, The Presidential Delivery Unit for Development Monitoring and Oversight, heads of non-ministerial government institutions, governors, and regents/mayors. This directive was based on the National Development Priorities outlined in the National Medium-Term Development Plan for 2010-

²² Bambang Suprayitno & Rimawan Pradipto, "Fiscal decentralization and corruption: The facts in regional autonomy in Indonesia" (2017) 8:5 *Journal of Advanced Research in Law and Economics* at 1467–1483.

²³ La Hadifa, *Membangun Budaya Anti Korupsi: Langkah untuk Mewujudkan Kesejahteraan Sosial* (Kendari: CV. Adiprima Pustaka, 2019).

2014 and the Government's Work Plan for 2011. This presidential instruction encompasses six primary themes: prevention strategy, enforcement strategy, harmonization of legislation strategy, asset recovery strategy, international cooperation strategy, and reporting mechanism strategy.²⁴

The jurisdiction of regional governments in addressing corruption may be found in Presidential Regulation No. 55/2012, which outlines the National Strategy for the Prevention and Elimination of Corruption—both in the long-term (2012-2025) and medium-term (2012-2014).²⁵ The Regulation stipulates that Anti-Corruption Action refers to activities or programs derived from the National Anti-Corruption Strategy, which are to be implemented by ministries/institutions and regional governments. Ministries/agencies and regional governments develop and execute the National Strategy for Corruption Prevention and Eradication, as mandated in Article 2, by annually carrying out Anti-Corruption Actions. Regional governments collaborate with the ministry responsible for domestic governance concerns to establish the Anti-Corruption Actions mentioned in Article 3. In this arrangement, the ministry overseeing domestic governance concerns receives support from ministries/agencies responsible for national development planning.²⁶

In addition, regional governments must submit progress reports on the execution of Anti-Corruption Actions to the ministry responsible for domestic governance affairs and ministries/agencies responsible for national development planning. These reports must be submitted at least every three months. It is significant to mention that community engagement is involved when implementing the National Strategy for Corruption Prevention and Eradication, with the participation of ministries/agencies and regional governments. Suppose the goal is to create a strong system of regional governance. In such situations, local authorities must have the necessary authority and responsibility to actively address and reduce instances of corruption, considering the widespread occurrence of corrupt activities within

²⁴ Bambang Waluyo, *Pemberantasan tindak pidana korupsi: Strategi dan optimalisasi* (Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2022).

²⁵ Kanti Pertiwi, “Kesenjangan dalam Wacana Antikorupsi di Indonesia: Temuan dari Literatur Studi Korupsi Kritis” (2019) 5:2 *Integritas: J Antikorupsi* at 133–150.

²⁶ Anastasia Suhartati Lukito, “Building anti-corruption compliance through national integrity system in Indonesia” (2016) 23:4 *Journal of Financial Crime* at 932–947.

these areas. Without the active involvement of regional governments, it is necessary to question what other organizations are expected to take on the role of reducing and eliminating corruption within these areas. Is it possible to rely exclusively on law enforcement agencies and the Corruption Eradication Commission, while recognizing the inherent constraints they encounter in terms of personnel and additional resources?

Regional governments must prioritize taking decisive action and assuming leadership in collaboration with other stakeholders, to prevent and eliminate corruption effectively. Corruption is a manifestation of our flawed countenance. To prevent it, one must possess resolute determination and steadfast courage. Rectification typically involves discomfort, but addressing long-standing issues is the necessary course of action that regional governments must undertake to purify the image of regional governance. To initiate change, an individual needs to possess both the bravery and willingness to tolerate discomfort to implement essential modifications. It is crucial to acknowledge that activities, whether intentional or unintentional, can have results that are consistent with conditioning.

Anti-corruption measures might have unintended consequences for their advocates if their actions deviate from the established anti-corruption policies outlined in public policy documents in the respective regions. Here, it is necessary to pay careful attention to caution. While local governments can carry out measures to prevent and eliminate corruption, it is crucial to consider various resources (including human resources, soft skills, hard skills, and supporting infrastructure) to implement Anti-Corruption Action steps. Local governments should only promptly adopt central government action programs if the resources above are adequately prepared. The lack of readiness exhibited by local governments to execute action programs will inevitably result in the Anti-Corruption Action document being merely symbolic— potent in theory but feeble in practice. At what point do the responsibilities and powers of regional governments come into effect in the campaign to eliminate corruption? Firstly, it is imperative to ascertain the factors underlying corruption, as perpetrated by government officials, which encompass sporadic and organized instances. There is ongoing debate among researchers and practitioners over the factors that contribute to corruption. Bismar Siregar asserted that the underlying

cause of corruption lies in poverty, specifically moral and material deprivation.²⁷

Therefore, efforts to prevent and eliminate corruption should prioritize addressing poverty in both its moral and material dimensions. Mohammad Jasin identified five primary factors contributing to corruption in Indonesia, including within regional administrations.²⁸ The primary factors contributing to corruption include a lack of integrity and professionalism; inadequate commitment and consistency in law enforcement and regulations; conducive opportunities in the work environment and community that facilitate corruption; avaricious attitudes, diminished faith, honesty, and shame; and an ineffectual salary system. To effectively combat corruption, it is essential to address the following five causes: improving the ethical standards and competence of employees; ensuring strong dedication and uniformity in enforcing laws and regulations; minimizing opportunities for corruption in both the workplace and the community; fostering a culture of integrity, honesty, and accountability while discouraging greed; restructuring the salary system to prioritize professionalism. How can we assess the level of commitment of the federal and regional governments in eliminating corruption? The gravity of the situation is evident in the legislation passed and the government's diligent efforts in enforcing this legislation. According to Ian McWalters, the fight against corruption can be broken down into four essential components: a robust local legal framework against corruption, collaborative international efforts to provide mutual legal assistance, strong backing from the citizens of each country, and firm political determination to enforce government anti-corruption policies.²⁹ When analyzing these factors, it is necessary to consider the population's perspective on their communities, including the social, cultural, and religious values that influence them. Anti-corruption efforts should align with the population's desire to establish an improved society. These measures should also be regarded as integral components of a country's broader social structure, highlighting principles of sincerity, uprightness, and fairness through the

²⁷ Prianto Budi Saptono & Dwi Purwanto, "Factors causing the ineffectiveness of Good Corporate Governance in preventing Corruption in State-Owned Enterprises" (2022) 8:1 *Integritas : Jurnal Antikorupsi* 77–94.

²⁸ "Konvensi PBB tentang Pemberantasan Korupsi dan MoU antara KPK dengan BI" Mochammad Jasin, (2007).

²⁹ Ian McWalters, *Memerangi Korupsi Sebuah Peta Jalan Untuk Indonesia* (Surabaya, Indonesia: JP.Books, 2006).

implementation of legal procedures—so being ingrained in that country’s culture. The framework of the Anti-Corruption Action program should also incorporate the viewpoints put forth by McWalters. To effectively combat corruption, regional governments should integrate their anti-corruption efforts into the broader national social context. This entails engaging all local resources, including provincial and district/city regions, and fostering an anti-corruption culture among government officials. Ultimately, the goal is to establish a societal tradition and norm of actively opposing corruption. The central and regional governments should proceed to implement and rejuvenate, if necessary, the principles of good governance.

These principles encompass various aspects of good governance, including ensuring legal certainty, maintaining a balanced approach, ensuring equality in decision-making, taking careful and thorough actions, providing motivation for every decision, preventing the abuse of authority, promoting fair play, upholding justice, prohibiting arbitrary actions, meeting rising expectations, nullifying the consequences of canceled decisions, and protecting personal lifestyle. These principles should be revitalized by implementing the additional tenets proposed by the United Nations Development Program, such as participation, rule of law, transparency, responsiveness, consensus orientation, equity, effectiveness and efficiency, accountability, and strategic vision.³⁰

Indonesia has demonstrated its commitment to fighting corruption by signing UN Resolution No. 58/4 on October 31, 2003. This resolution pertains to adopting the United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC), ratified by 15 nations, including Indonesia, out of the 115 countries that signed it. Indonesia has further endorsed the UNCAC by enacting Law No. 7/2006, which ratifies the UNCAC 2003. The UNCAC supports member nations in combating corruption by facilitating tailored cooperation and assistance according to their specific needs and perspectives.³¹

³⁰ Ali Farazmand, *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*, Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance (Springer International Publishing, 2023).

³¹ Eddy Omar Sharif Hiariej, “United Nations Convention Against Corruption Dalam Sistem Hukum Indonesia” (2019) 31:1 *Mimbar Hukum-Fakultas Hukum Universitas Gadjah Mada* at 112–125.

The Compendium of International Legal Instruments on Corruption provides a comprehensive range of strategies for tackling corruption, as the UNCAC outlines.³² Several anti-corruption strategies involve implementing prevention policies, such as restructuring public services, promoting transparency and good governance practices, criminalizing corrupt behavior, fostering international cooperation, and facilitating asset recovery. Indonesia's proactive measures predate the formulation of the convention and resolution by the United Nations. The criminalization of corrupt activities has been in effect for several decades, dating back to the 1950s and continuing with the implementation of the Anti-Corruption Law and the Corruption Eradication Commission Law. Efforts to recover assets have also been undertaken.³³ However, despite international collaboration, the persistence of corruption remains a pressing issue that needs to be addressed.³⁴ While the strategies outlined in the UNCAC are accurate, one area that still requires significant attention is the issue of addressing root causes. Concrete measures, such as implementing preventive policies, improving public services, and establishing openness and good governance in state administration are essential to addressing this challenge.

IV. EMPOWERING COMMUNITIES: KEY PLAYERS IN THE FIGHT AGAINST CORRUPTION

As indicated earlier, the actions undertaken by the Corruption Eradication Commission demonstrate efforts to combat corruption through anti-corruption education and cultural initiatives.³⁵ Among these efforts, the Development of Integrity Seeds Products and Programs is a crucial task assigned to the

³² Jan Wouters, Cedric Ryngaert & Sofie Cloots, "The international legal framework against corruption : achievements and challenges." (2013) 14:1 Melbourne Journal of International Law at 205–280.

³³ Tinuk Dwi Cahyani, Muhamad Helmi Md Said & Muhamad Sayuti Hassan, "A Comparison Between Indonesian and Malaysian Anti-Corruption Laws" (2023) 10:2 PADJADJARAN Jurnal Ilmu Hukum (Journal of Law) at 275–299.

³⁴ Kanti Pertiwi, "But That's Not Corruption": An Interpretive Approach to Corruption in Business-Government Relations in Indonesia (PhD Thesis, The University of Melbourne, 2016) [unpublished] publisher: The University of Melbourne Australia.

³⁵ Adi Mansar, "The Efforts to Warn Corruption Through Education an Idiological Approach in Order Meet The Right to Country Rights" (2020) 1:1 Indonesian Journal of Education, Social Sciences and Research (IJSSR) at 10–15.

Commission. Specifically, targeting young children, the anti-corruption education program, Tunas Integritas.³⁶ serves as a proactive measure to enhance integrity, construct integrity systems, and foster organizational integrity. The Corruption Eradication Commission engages in various activities, including creating integrity seeds, to achieve these primary goals effectively and sustainably.³⁷

It is important to note that this program encompasses not only the internal features of the organization but also the exterior aspects. One of its objectives is to bring about behavioral changes, particularly among service users, with the expectation that they will refrain from offering bribes or gratuities—and instead, aggressively report infractions against them. This program has implemented Integrity Seed Reviews in several work units within the Ministry of Law and Human Rights. Integrity Seed Reviews have been implemented with the participation of several parties, including the Inspectorate General and the Ministry of Law and Human Rights.

In addition to emphasizing educational and anti-corruption cultural factors, the Corruption Eradication Commission takes actual actions through the Tunas Integritas initiative.³⁸ An anti-corruption education program specifically geared towards young children is offered through this program. Instilling anti-corruption ideals in children at a young age is a clear commitment in the Tunas Integritas program. Children are expected to uphold nine anti-corruption qualities: honesty, discipline, responsibility, fairness, courage, independence, hard work, and simplicity. The Corruption Eradication Commission is confident that by using this strategy, future generations will be better able to combat corruption. As a result, the efforts of the Corruption Eradication Commission are concentrated on enforcement and prevention, incorporating different layers of society to bring about beneficial changes in Indonesia's integrity culture.³⁹

³⁶ Jamila Lestyowati, "Metode Storytelling: Peningkatkan Motivasi Perilaku Antikorupsi" (2020) 6:1 INTEGRITAS: Jurnal Antikorupsi at 125–139.

³⁷ Ary Patria Sanjaya & Irena Trifena, "The role of education in curbing corruption: A comparison of Indonesia and Hong Kong" (2023) 9:2 Integritas: Jurnal Antikorupsi at 241–256.

³⁸ Putu Sriartha, Ni Luh Wayan Yasmianti & I Wayan Lasmawan, "The Implementation of Anti-Corruption Character Education Through Bali Local Wisdom in Junior High Schools" (2021) 10:4 JPI (Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia) at 609–621.

³⁹ Syarifah Gustiawati Mukri & Hidayah Baisa, "The Anti-Corruption Education on the Basis of Religion and National Culture" (2020) 8:2 Jurnal Cita Hukum at 399–414. *Once Again! Indonesia's RENDANG and NASI GORENG Crowned World's Best Foods*, by CNN (2017).

Even though the Corruption Eradication Commission has implemented an anti-corruption culture through preventative measures (shown to be highly effective),⁴⁰ these efforts must be synergized with the activities required to be performed by regional governments. Manado City and the Nganjuk Regency are the two regions that have been selected to do research for this particular study. In order to better understand how communities in the City of Manado and the Nganjuk Regency are involved in the fight against corruption, this research will investigate their participation.

According to statements made in our interview with Andre Angow, Mayor of Manado, the regional government has yet to dedicate a special program to eliminating corruption. All anti-corruption programs the Central Government organizes are the only ones adopted by the Manado City Government. Community members, including NGOs, the Regional Representative Council, and community leaders, are typically involved in implementing programs that the Central Government initiates.

Andre Angow remarked that during his time in office, the programs organized by the Central Government successfully minimized corruption within the Manado City Government. Regarding anti-corruption programs, Andre Angow stated that there were no significant barriers to their implementation from the Central Government. However, he mentioned that public legal awareness was a problem in implementing these programs. On the other hand, community engagement in programs is relatively easy, particularly when done through NGOs.

In addition to our interview with the Mayor of Manado, we also spoke to Risat Sanger, the Chairman of the Anti-Corruption Guard; and EK Tindangen, the Manado

⁴⁰ Thus far, the management of corruption has predominantly relied on repressive strategies, such as the apprehension and detention of corrupt individuals as a means of punishment. These actions are widely seen as unsuccessful in addressing corruption. Hence, employing other tactics, such as proactive measures, is imperative to deter corruption. Education is considered the most effective preventive measure in combating corrupt behaviours. Education is anticipated to impart and familiarise pupils with anti-corruption beliefs, despite encountering diverse obstacles, to cultivate their understanding from a young age that corruption opposes religious and moral principles. Therefore, initiatives to address corruption through education can be implemented via formal avenues such as schools and colleges, informational avenues such as families, and non-formal avenues such as communities. See Nur Eliza & Sri Mulyani, “The Role of PPKN Teachers in Growing Awareness Anti Corruption in Elementary School Students” (2023) 2:1 International Journal of Students Education at 296–300.

Posbakum. In their interviews, they claimed they also fight against crimes that do not involve corruption. Specifically, they fight against non-corruption crimes by reporting (if there is a suspicion of corruption), offering help to those who report corruption offenses, and monitoring cases until they are brought before the court.

In addition to conducting research and providing community service through legal counseling, they are also engaged in the fight against corruption-related crimes. Alongside NGOs, they offer help and monitor instances. We also spoke with Suyanto Yusuf, the Regional Representative Council of Manado City. He stated that the Manado City Regional Representative Council actively prevents corruption crimes using program socialization, reporting, and assisting in instances currently being investigated.

We had the additional privilege of interviewing Marhen Junaidi, the Regent of Nganjuk, while in the Nganjuk Regency. He clarified that he provides the community with various options to channel their desires about investigating corruption-related offenses. This is demonstrated by not impeding demonstrations that are being held by the community and also by welcoming members of the community to submit reports on offenses related to corruption. In a manner analogous to Manado City's, the anti-corruption program in Nganjuk Regency works through the programs the Central Government implements.

In addition, Marhen Junaidi indicated that the surveillance of the community causes authorities to be more cautious in their tasks, which also means that they avoid committing crimes related to corruption on their part. He dares to develop a program for preventing corruption and criminal activity based on the principle of 0 (zero) rupiah, which means that no bribery is involved in any job placement.

While interviewing the Regent of Nganjuk, we also spoke with Lawyer Wahyu Jatmiko and a representative from the Mapak Non-Governmental Organization, Supriyanto. Wahyu Jatmiko said that he takes part in the fight against corruption crimes by offering support and reporting instances of corruption crimes. In the meantime, Supriyanto has indicated that he has taken an active position in battling corruption crimes by assisting in cases of corruption crimes, as well as making reports and demonstrations.

V. COMBATTING HIGH LEVELS OF CORRUPTION IN LOCAL REGIONS: THE CRUCIAL ROLE OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

A significant problem that calls for urgent attention from all parties involved is the high incidence of corruption in areas.⁴¹ Fighting corruption refers herein to a sequence of measures to prevent and eliminate corruption.⁴² These actions include coordination, supervision, monitoring, investigation, prosecution, and trial proceedings. The community is involved in these efforts, and they are based on applicable laws and regulations. If we all understand that one factor contributing to corruption is the governance system, particularly in public services, then the prevention aspect is a powerful instrument.⁴³

The community can participate in efforts to avoid and battle corruption in various ways—including the right to seek, collect, and provide data or information concerning corruption and make responsible suggestions and opinions for preventing and eradicating corruption. Participation from the community is meant to bring about the realization of the rights and obligations of the community in the context of clean governance that is free from corruption. The community will be more enthusiastic about exercising social control over corrupting practices when this is considered.

The levels of community participation can be broken down into eight categories, as stated in the literature study concerning Sherry R. Arnstein's perspective.⁴⁴ These categories are citizen control, delegated power, partnership, placement, consultation, information, therapy, and manipulation.

⁴¹ Laode Muhammad Syarif & Faisal Faisal, "Addressing the Root of Political Corruption in Indonesia" (2019) 5:2 *Integritas : Jurnal Antikorupsi* at 191–198.

⁴² Diana Schmidt-Pfister & Holger Moroff, *Fighting Corruption in Eastern Europe: A Multilevel Perspective* (Taylor & Francis, 2013).

⁴³ Agus Riwanto, "Construction of Legal Culture Model for Corruption Prevention Through Social Media in Indonesia" (2022) 11:3 *Jurnal Hukum dan Peradilan* at 385–404.

⁴⁴ Sherry R Arnstein, "A Ladder Of Citizen Participation" (1969) 35:4 *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* at 216–224.

Table 1: Levels of Community Participation in Development Programs

Participation Tiers	Nature of Participation	Levels of Power Sharing
Manipulation	Community participation is just a game by the government, where implementing development plans in Musrenbang is not appropriate as a societal realization.	No participation
Therapy	Submission of development planning information to community representatives without any feedback.	
Informing	The government disseminates development planning to the community at this stage, but only as a formality of delivering information.	Tokenism
Consultation	At this stage, the government negotiates with the community. The government accommodates suggestions from the public but makes the final decision.	
Placation	At this stage, the government accepts opinions, suggestions, and criticisms from the public. However, the implementation of development programs is still carried out by what has been determined by the previous government.	
Partnership	At this stage, the government makes the community a partner to negotiate and	

	cooperate with in developing and implementing development programs.	The level of power in society
Delegated Power	At this stage, the government gives authority to the community in determining development planning decisions.	
Citizen Control	At this stage, the community controls government performance, including evaluating development planning programs.	

The bottom two rungs, 7 and 8, are classified as non-participation since they focus on providing educational opportunities for populations already included in the program. Levels 4 through 6 are referred to as the Tokenism levels, and they are positions in which communities are allowed to voice their ideas and have their voices heard. Meanwhile, the three highest rungs—1, 2, and 3—are classified as communal power levels of the hierarchy. Communities operating at this level can influence decision-making by forming partnerships and achieving bargaining power with authorities.

As was noted earlier, the nature of the many forms of community participation can be noticed, and these forms can be divided into two categories. To begin, there is the concept of autonomous or independent involvement, which refers to contributions made by community members who are conscious of the need to influence public policies. Secondly, there is mobilization, which includes ceremonial engagement, a type of community participation that particular political leaders or groups drive.

According to the findings of field research (namely, the interviews with several stakeholders in Manado City and Nganjuk Regency), community participation to eliminate corruption typically includes taking part in programs organized by the Central Government, reporting cases of suspected corruption, offering assistance to individuals who blow the whistle on corrupt practices, providing legal counseling to academics, and other activities. Using the information gleaned from these interviews,

an effort was made to determine how much community involvement in Manado City and Nganjuk Regency is involved in the fight against corruption.

According to statements made by the Local Governments of Manado City and Nganjuk Regency, these two regions do not have any anti-corruption programs that are specifically designed for them. The only thing the local governments do is make it easier for national-level anti-corruption programs of the Central Government. Local NGOs, the Regional Representatives Council, and local community leaders follow these programs. The only programs executed in the regions are those modeled after those designed by the Central Government, which typically involve distributing official knowledge. This is comparable to level 6, associated with the Tokenism level. Within legal education, there is also an initiative that aims to bring about enlightenment.

In addition, community ambitions have also been incorporated, whether through reporting suspected instances of corruption or holding demonstrations. During the interview, Nganjuk Regent Marhen Junaidi noted that he allows the community to channel their goals. These opportunities include not disrupting demonstrations and embracing reports of suspected corruption. At this level, the local community is permitted to voice their ideas; however, it still needs to be determined whether the Local Government has provided any input on the reports and aspirations that have been presented. Community engagement can be classified into levels 5 and 6 (consultation and placation, remaining in the Tokenism level) or justifications. Community participation in the fight against corruption in Manado City and Nganjuk Regency is still at the Tokenism level. It has yet to reach the level of Citizen Power, which is composed of citizen control, delegated power, and partnership. This is about the efforts the Local Government and the community have made. Our opinion is based on the fact that the Local Government has yet to have any partnerships or powers allocated to it to work with the community in developing and implementing anti-corruption programs in the region. However, even though the level of community involvement in the fight against corruption in Manado City and Nganjuk Regency has yet to attain Citizen Power, the efforts made have produced satisfactory outcomes, according to statements made by Mayor Andre Angow of Manado. The programs that the Central Government organized during his tenure have been quite successful in minimizing the instances of corruption occurring within the Manado

City Government. In a similar vein, Nganjuk Regent Marhen Junaidi noted that the monitoring carried out by the community has made officials more cautious in the performance of their duties, which has prevented them from indulging in acts of corruption.

VI. INFLUENTIAL FACTORS SHAPING COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN COMBATING LOCAL CORRUPTION

In order to effectively combat corruption, it is imperative that society as a whole plays a role— not only law enforcement authorities. Specifically, this is because eliminating corruption should place a greater emphasis on preventative measures rather than repressive activities. Furthermore, the most fundamental reasons why societal involvement is necessary in combating corruption are based on two simple facts: society as victims and society as a component of the state. Both of these elements are essential in the fight against corruption. The involvement of civil society should be necessary, particularly for protecting the state's finances, including natural resources, from corrupt practices.⁴⁵

On the other hand, only some members of society feel forced to participate in the fight against corruption. There has been a 43.8% decline in gratification reports from 2,881 to 1,503 reporters, as indicated by statistical data from the Corruption Eradication Commission website. This decrease occurred between 2019 and 2021. It is consistent with Indonesia's Corruption Perception Index, which has climbed from a score of 85 in 2019 to 102 in 2020. This increase occurred after the index was first calculated in 2019. This data suggests that there has been a reduction in instances of corruption in Indonesia. What if, on the other hand, this increase can be attributed to an unwillingness or fear on the part of Indonesians to report corruption or allegations of corruption to authorities? The low number of incidents of corruption is not only attributable to actual circumstances; it may also be due to the absence of reports, which results in many

⁴⁵ Muhamad Ali Zaidan, "Sociological Approach to Eradication Corruption In Indonesia (Alternative to Imprisonment)" (2017) 12:1 *Pandecta Research Law Journal* 28–38; Oryza Sativa & Christos Daskalakis, "Performance Management in Anti-Corruption Authorities Indonesian and Swedish Cases" (2018) 4:2 *integritas* at 129–158.

instances of corruption remaining undetected. This is comparable to the phenomena of the tip of the iceberg.⁴⁶

Several elements determine the extent of community participation in initiatives to eliminate corruption. According to the Indonesia Anti-Corruption Behavior Index published by the Central Statistics Agency in 2023, Indonesia's Anti-Corruption Behavior Index in 2023 is rated at 3.92 on a scale ranging from 0 to 5. This number is lower than the milestone of 3.93 that was achieved in 2022. It is important to note that a higher index number closer to 5 suggests that people are displaying more anti-corruption sentiment, whilst a value closer to 0 shows that people are becoming more lenient in their attitude towards corruption. In addition, there is a distinction in the Indonesia Anti-Corruption Behavior Index between urban and rural areas, with the Indonesia Anti-Corruption Behavior Index of urban communities in 2023 being 3.93 times higher than that of rural towns— which is 3.90 times higher. The disparity between the educational levels of people living in urban and rural areas is a factor that contributes to this difference. This is further supported by the fact that the Indonesia Anti-Corruption Behavior Index for individuals with education levels lower than high school amounts to 3.88, while the score for high school graduates is 3.93, and the score for individuals with higher education levels is 4.02.

Based on the information above, education may play a key part in molding how people perceive corruption. Not only is there a need for more awareness of corruption in society, but there needs to be a greater understanding of everyday habits that lead to corrupt practices, which fosters a culture of normalizing corrupt behaviors. This is the reason for the low level of anti-corruption behavior. To highlight this pattern, the following data from Indonesia's 2023 Indonesia Anti-Corruption Behavior Index are provided:

- a. The number of people in society who believe it is inappropriate for someone to involve family members in election campaigns or campaigns for village heads declined from 77.44% in 2022 to 73.62% in 2023.
- b. The proportion of people in society who believe that it is unacceptable for someone to spend the money of family members without their permission

⁴⁶ Awahan Ibaad El-Adzkiyaa, Labib Muttaqin & Adrian Adrian, "Brandish Red Report Card: Eliminating Corruption in Indonesia" (2022) 1:7 *Interdisciplinary Social Studies* at 816–827.

- (for example, money from shopping or pocket money from siblings) declined from 90.48% in 2022 to 90.08% in 2023 throughout this period.
- c. The percentage of people in society who believe that it is wrong for someone to use family members' belongings without their consent (such as shoes, clothes, and bags) declined from 81.91 in 2022 to 81.80 two years later in 2023.
 - d. The number of people in society who believe that it is wrong for neighborhood officials to aid village heads, district heads, and legislative candidates in delivering money, commodities, and facilities to the community to obtain votes declined from 83.67% in 2022 to 80.10% in 2023.
 - e. The proportion of people in society who believe that it is unacceptable to provide public service officials with money, products, or facilities to speed up administrative affairs (such as identification cards, family cards, and health insurance cards) declined from 66.53% in 2022 to 66.00% in 2023.

Additionally, the degree of education, the routines that an individual engages in daily, and the availability of information are all factors determining the level of community participation in the fight against corruption in the region. Analyzing part of the evaluation is a requirement to determine whether or not the community in the designated area has easy access to information. Are community members informed about the specifics of the programs organized by the central and local governments? Alternatively, are people in the community already familiar with the processes used to report alleged corruption? In order to ensure that efforts regarding the fight against corruption can be maximized, it is necessary to consider these issues during routine evaluations.

Furthermore, the level of security provided to persons who plan to report corruption charges is another factor that serves as a deciding factor. When people believe they are helpless, they are more likely to be reluctant or afraid to report alleged corruption, out of fear that their efforts may backfire on them. The public's awareness of their legal protection rights is likely another factor contributing to this reluctance, particularly when deciding whether to report perceived corruption to the authorities.

VII. EFFECTIVE COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT MODEL FOR ENHANCING ANTI-CORRUPTION EFFORTS LOCALLY

Implementing an appropriate community engagement model is necessary to increase the likelihood of success in the fight against corruption at the local level. According to Arnstein's notion of many degrees of community engagement, the Citizen Power level is the greatest level of community participation.⁴⁷ At this level, the community itself holds the power. Citizen control, the power that has been delegated, and partnership are all integrated into this level. In the context of the fight against corruption on a local level, the optimal level of community participation is the Citizen Power level. This is because it gives officials the incentive and pressure they need to be accountable for their duties, which includes refraining from engaging in corrupt activities.

According to Robert Klitgaard's "Corruption = Discretion + Monopoly - Accountability" (CDMA) Theory, corruption is caused by a combination of factors, including a significant amount of discretion and monopolistic abilities, followed by an inadequate amount of responsibility.⁴⁸ One of the defining characteristics of democratic culture is accountability, which enables the community's active participation in local financial management supervision. Intense participation from the community makes it easier to prohibit corrupt actions to the greatest extent possible. In addition, Klitgaard lists four primary components included in the approach to combat corruption. These components include "frying the big fish," which involves integrating the community into successful campaigns, fixing corrupt systems, and increasing employment opportunities for public servants.⁴⁹

In light of the information presented above, several initiatives can be conducted by communities and local governments to achieve the Citizen Power level in the fight against corruption on a local level. At the partnership level, which is the third rung, this is accomplished when the community's worries and reports are

⁴⁷ Arnstein, *supra* note at 53.

⁴⁸ Robert Klitgaard, *Controlling Corruption* (University of California Press, 1988).

⁴⁹ Teguh Kurniawan, "Peranan Akuntabilitas Publik dan Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Pemberantasan" (2011) 16:2 BISNIS & BIROKRASI: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi dan Organisasi at 116–121.

heard, validated, and reciprocated through negotiation. In this context, the government views the community as a working partner in participating in deliberations and working together on developing and implementing programs. This is extremely important, as anti-corruption programs fail when they are purely formalities that do not consider the level of public comprehension and the informational requirements of society.

After that, at the level of delegated power, the government gives the community the capacity to make decisions and develop programs. This ensures that the public is involved in ensuring that programs are accountable to the government through the channels of ambition channeled by legislative bodies.

Last but not least, at the highest level, Citizen Control encompasses community scrutiny of the functioning of the government, which includes evaluating anti-corruption programs and law enforcement against corrupt officials. Communities can participate by providing oversight, valid information, or reporting suspected corruption to the appropriate authorities, such as the Corruption Eradication Commission. Additionally, communities can evaluate and recommend measures for developing anti-corruption programs that central or local governments organize to prevent corruption.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Several essential conclusions can be made regarding eliminating and preventing corruption. First, the significance of anti-corruption learning programs, such as the Civil Servants Mental Integrity Revitalisation Program (geared towards state officials), must be considered. This program is crucial because state officials perpetrate the most corrupt acts. Additionally significant is the modification of state official conduct and putting into effect the provisions of the law already in place (such as Law Number 31/1999 concerning the Elimination of Corruption Crimes).

Second, it is of the utmost importance to be aware of the potential for corruption inside each individual and have suitable answers to combat corruption. It is herein clear that the government is not only responsible for preventing corruption; rather, it is also necessary for society to participate in the fight against corruption

actively. A commitment to transparency on the part of the government, the freedom of society to obtain information, the awareness of society to seek information, the involvement of society in the process of development, a partnership between the government and society, and legal guarantees for society should be required for community participation in the prevention and elimination of corruption.

According to Arnstein's levels of community engagement, community participation in the fight against corruption in Manado City and Nganjuk District is still at the Tokenism level, and it has yet to reach the Citizen Power level. The absence of partnership and delegation of authority between the community and the local government and the community's control over attempts to eradicate corruption are the reasons for this situation.

Third, the role of independent and free mass media is vitally important in the fight against corruption and the fight against its elimination. The presence of independent media and journalists, who are not subject to any interference in the performance of their professional duties, as well as the provision of legal protection for sources who expose alleged instances of corruption, are both vital components in uncovering instances of corruption and raising public awareness.

Several suggestions can be made in light of the discussion contained within this research report, including the following: the government and other relevant institutions are responsible for improving community participation in the fight against and eliminating corruption. In this context, enhancing is meant in reference to employees' integrity and professionalism and increasing commitment and consistency in law enforcement and legislative rules. It is educating the public and cultivating a culture against corruption to raise public awareness. In order to accomplish the goal of matching perceptions, education and the internalization of anti-corruption culture are important. The long-term efforts of this strategy are centered on developing anti-corruption values and attitudes in various sectors of life, within the three pillars of corruption prevention: our society, the private sector, and government institutions. Hence, the area for community participation in corruption prevention activities would then be expanded. Even though communities play a crucial role in the fight

against corruption, this fight must be conducted within the confines of legal structures and restrictions.

The engagement of the community in these procedures ought to be carried out democratically, with adequate consideration given to values (norms), appropriateness, and justice. In order to establish anti-corruption ideals and integrity traits, increasing interaction with the media is quite important. The promotion of cooperation with the media in developing anti-corruption principles and integrity characters (including through various creative media) is included in this. It enhances the level of accountability and transparency within the government. It is imperative to implement transparent information systems, which give information that is both clear and accurate regarding activities carried out by the government—as well as initiatives to improve the accountability and transparency of the government. By implementing the recommendations above, the government and society can work together—to successfully and sustainably fight against and eliminate corruption.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

None.

COMPETING INTEREST

The authors declared that they have no competing interests.

REFERENCES

Black, Donald J, *The Behavior of Law* (Academic Press, 1976).

Farazmand, Ali, *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*, Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance (Springer International Publishing, 2023).

Hadifa, La, *Membangun Budaya Anti Korupsi: Langkah untuk Mewujudkan Kesejahteraan Sosial* (Kendari: CV. Adiprima Pustaka, 2019).

Klitgaard, Robert, *Controlling Corruption* (University of California Press, 1988).

Lindsey, Timothy, *Indonesia, Law and Society* (Federation Press, 2008).

- McWalters, Ian, *Memerangi Korupsi Sebuah Peta Jalan Untuk Indonesia* (Surabaya, Indonesia: JP.Books, 2006).
- Narayan-Parker, Deepa, *Empowerment and poverty reduction: A sourcebook* (World Bank Publications, 2002).
- Pertiwi, Kanti, *“But That’s Not Corruption”: An Interpretive Approach to Corruption in Business-Government Relations in Indonesia* (PhD Thesis, The University of Melbourne, 2016) [unpublished].
- Schmidt-Pfister, Diana & Holger Moroff, *Fighting Corruption in Eastern Europe: A Multilevel Perspective* (Taylor & Francis, 2013).
- Suteki & Galang Taufani, *Metodologi Penelitian Hukum (Filsafat, Teori dan Praktik)* (Depok: Rajawali Pers, 2018).
- Tamanaha, Brian Z, *A General Jurisprudence of Law and Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021).
- Waluyo, Bambang, *Pemberantasan tindak pidana korupsi: Strategi dan optimalisasi* (Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2022).
- Addink, Henk, “Good Governance on Multiple Levels” in Henk Addink, ed, *Good Governance: Concept and Context* (Oxford University Press, 2019) 0.
- Ariani, Salma Aulia Farahdina & Nanik Prasetyoningsih, “Fighting Corruption Post Revision of the Act of the Corruption Eradication Commission” (2022) 3:3 mls 235–254.
- Arnstein, Sherry R, “A Ladder Of Citizen Participation” (1969) 35:4 Journal of the American Institute of Planners 216–224.
- Black, Donald J, *The Behavior of Law* (Academic Press, 1976).
- Boutros, Andrew, “Indonesia” in T Markus Funk & Andrew S Boutros, eds, *From Baksheesh to Bribery: Understanding the Global Fight Against Corruption and Graft* (Oxford University Press, 2019) 0.
- Cahyani, Tinuk Dwi, Muhamad Helmi Md Said & Muhamad Sayuti Hassan, “A Comparison Between Indonesian and Malaysian Anti-Corruption Laws” (2023) 10:2 PADJADJARAN Jurnal Ilmu Hukum (Journal of Law) 275–299.

- El-Adzkiyaa, Awhan Ibaad, Labib Muttaqin & Adrian Adrian, “Brandish Red Report Card: Eliminating Corruption in Indonesia” (2022) 1:7 *Interdisciplinary Social Studies* 816–827.
- Eliza, Nur & Sri Mulyani, “The Role of PPKN Teachers in Growing Awareness Anti Corruption in Elementary School Students” (2023) 2:1 *International Journal of Students Education* 296–300.
- Farazmand, Ali, *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*, Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance (Springer International Publishing, 2023).
- Hadifa, La, *Membangun Budaya Anti Korupsi: Langkah untuk Mewujudkan Kesejahteraan Sosial* (Kendari: CV. Adiprima Pustaka, 2019).
- Hiariej, Eddy Omar Sharif, “United Nations Convention Against Corruption Dalam Sistem Hukum Indonesia” (2019) 31:1 *Mimbar Hukum-Fakultas Hukum Universitas Gadjah Mada* 112–125.
- Hope, Kempe Ronald, “Corruption Reduction as a Target of the Sustainable Development Goals: Applying Indicators and Policy Frameworks” in Jarrett Blaustein et al, eds, *The Emerald Handbook of Crime, Justice and Sustainable Development* (Emerald Publishing Limited, 2020) 105.
- Jasin, Mochammad, “Konvensi PBB tentang Pemberantasan Korupsi dan MoU antara KPK dengan BI” Mochammad Jasin, (2007).
- Joseph, Corina et al, “The ethical value disclosure index from the lens of SDG 16 and institutional theory” (2023) 39:3 *International Journal of Ethics and Systems* 612–628.
- Kamal, Muhammad & Muhammad Yarif Arifin, “The Community Role in Prevention and Eradication of Corruption” (2019) 15:2 *Varia Justicia* 51–58.
- Khair, Sumaiya, “UNCAC and Civil Society Activism Against Corruption In Bangladesh” in Kevin Yl Tan, ed, *Asian Yearbook of International Law, Volume 20 (2014)* (Brill | Nijhoff, 2018) 115.
- Klitgaard, Robert, *Controlling Corruption* (University of California Press, 1988).

- Kurniawan, Teguh, “Peranan Akuntabilitas Publik dan Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Pemberantasan” (2011) 16:2 BISNIS & BIROKRASI: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi dan Organisasi 116–121.
- Lestyowati, Jamila, “Metode Storytelling: Peningkatkan Motivasi Perilaku Antikorupsi” (2020) 6:1 INTEGRITAS: Jurnal Antikorupsi 125–139.
- Lindsey, Timothy, *Indonesia, Law and Society* (Federation Press, 2008).
- Lukito, Anastasia Suhartati, “Building anti-corruption compliance through national integrity system in Indonesia” (2016) 23:4 Journal of Financial Crime 932–947.
- Mansar, Adi, “The Efforts to Warn Corruption Through Education an Idiological Approach in Order Meet The Right to Country Rights” (2020) 1:1 Indonesian Journal of Education, Social Sciences and Research (IJSSR) 10–15.
- Marbun, Andreas Nathaniel, “Suap di Sektor Privat: Dapatkah Dijerat?” (2017) 3:1 Integritas: Jurnal Antikorupsi 53–85.
- Maskun, “Combating Corruption Based on International Rules” (2014) 4:1 Indonesia Law Review 55–66.
- McWalters, Ian, *Memerangi Korupsi Sebuah Peta Jalan Untuk Indonesia* (Surabaya, Indonesia: JP.Books, 2006).
- Monita, Yulia, Elizabeth Siregar & Dheny Wahyudhi, “The Role Of Society in Prevention and Eradication of Corruption Criminal Actions in Indonesia’s Legislation Perspective” (2019) 2:2 Berumpun: International Journal of Social, Politics, Humanities 47–58.
- Mukri, Syarifah Gustiawati & Hidayah Baisa, “The Anti-Corruption Education on the Basis of Religion and National Culture” (2020) 8:2 Jurnal Cita Hukum 399–414.
- Narayan-Parker, Deepa, *Empowerment and poverty reduction: A sourcebook* (World Bank Publications, 2002).
- Pane, Musa & Diah Pudjiastuti, “The Legal Aspect of New Normal and the Corruption Eradication In Indonesia” (2020) 7:2 Padjadjaran Jurnal Ilmu Hukum (Journal of Law) 181–206.

- Pertiwi, Kanti, *“But That’s Not Corruption”: An Interpretive Approach to Corruption in Business-Government Relations in Indonesia* (PhD Thesis, The University of Melbourne, 2016) [unpublished].
- Pertiwi, Kanti, “Kesenjangan dalam Wacana Antikorupsi di Indonesia: Temuan dari Literatur Studi Korupsi Kritis” (2019) 5:2 *Integritas: J Antikorupsi* 133–150.
- Priyanto, Bambang Budi, Faisal Santiago & Zudan Arief Fakrulloh, “The role of the Corruption Eradication Commission (CEC) in carrying out its functions and authorities to eradicate corruption” (2023) 4:7 *Jurnal Indonesia Sosial Sains* 607–616.
- Putra, Nandha Risky & Rosa Linda, “Impact of Social Change on Society from the Crime of Corruption” (2022) 8:1 *Integritas: J Antikorupsi* 13–24.
- Qisa’i, Ahmad, “Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and Challenges of Policy Reform on Asset Recovery in Indonesia” 17:2 *Indonesian Journal of International Law* 231–252.
- Riwanto, Agus, “Construction of Legal Culture Model for Corruption Prevention Through Social Media in Indonesia” (2022) 11:3 *Jurnal Hukum dan Peradilan* 385–404.
- Sanjaya, Ary Patria & Irena Trifena, “The role of education in curbing corruption: A comparison of Indonesia and Hong Kong” (2023) 9:2 *Integritas: Jurnal Antikorupsi* 241–256.
- Saptono, Prianto Budi & Dwi Purwanto, “Factors causing the ineffectiveness of Good Corporate Governance in preventing Corruption in State-Owned Enterprises” (2022) 8:1 *Integritas : Jurnal Antikorupsi* 77–94.
- Sativa, Oryza & Christos Daskalakis, “Performance Management in Anti-Corruption Authorities Indonesian and Swedish Cases” (2018) 4:2 *integritas* 129–158.
- Schmidt-Pfister, Diana & Holger Moroff, *Fighting Corruption in Eastern Europe: A Multilevel Perspective* (Taylor & Francis, 2013).
- Sriartha, Putu, Ni Luh Wayan Yasmiati & I Wayan Lasmawan, “The Implementation of Anti-Corruption Character Education Through Bali

- Local Wisdom in Junior High Schools” (2021) 10:4 JPI (Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia) 609–621.
- Suprayitno, Bambang & Rimawan Pradiptyo, “Fiscal decentralization and corruption: The facts in regional autonomy in Indonesia” (2017) 8:5 Journal of Advanced Research in Law and Economics 1467–1483.
- Suteki & Galang Taufani, *Metodologi Penelitian Hukum (Filsafat, Teori dan Praktik)* (Depok: Rajawali Pers, 2018).
- Syarif, Laode Muhammad & Faisal Faisal, “Addressing the Root of Political Corruption in Indonesia” (2019) 5:2 Integritas : Jurnal Antikorupsi 191–198.
- Tamanaha, Brian Z, *A General Jurisprudence of Law and Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021).
- Waluyo, Bambang, *Pemberantasan tindak pidana korupsi: Strategi dan optimalisasi* (Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2022).
- Wiratraman, Herlambang Perdana, “The Challenges of Teaching Comparative Law and Socio-Legal Studies at Indonesia’s Law Schools” (2019) 14:S1 Asian Journal of Comparative Law S229–S244.
- Wouters, Jan, Cedric Ryngaert & Sofie Cloots, “The international legal framework against corruption : achievements and challenges.” (2013) 14:1 Melbourne Journal of International Law 205–280.
- Yogi Prabowo, Hendi, “To Be Corrupt or Not to Be Corrupt: Understanding the Behavioral Side of Corruption in Indonesia” (2014) 17:3 Journal of Money Laundering Control 306–326.
- Yuda, Tauchid Komara, “Welfare Regime Transformation in Indonesia: A Citizenship Debate” (2018) 23:2 Masyarakat, Jurnal Sosiologi 143–165.
- Zaidan, Muhamad Ali, “Sociological Approach to Eradication Corruption In Indonesia (Alternative to Imprisonment)” (2017) 12:1 Pandecta Research Law Journal 28–38.