Reassessing Anti-Corruption Enforcement in Indonesia: Between Legal Reform and Political Influence

Herwinda Larasati [1], Intan Nur Aeni [2]
[1] Law Study Program, Universitas Harapan Bangsa, Purwokerto, Indonesia
[2] Law Study Program, Universitas Harapan Bangsa, Purwokerto, Indonesia

Abstract. Corruption is a systemic problem that continues to erode governance, public trust, and economic stability in many developing countries, including Indonesia. Although various legal reforms have been implemented to strengthen anti-corruption law enforcement, significant challenges remain in achieving effective and independent law enforcement. This study aims to reassess the effectiveness of anti-corruption law enforcement in Indonesia by examining the relationship between legal reforms and political influence. The research method employed is a normative legal approach using conceptual and comparative frameworks, analyzing the national legal framework and comparing it with international standards, particularly those outlined in the United Nations Convention against Corruption. The research findings indicate that although Indonesia has made progress in regulatory aspects, there remains a gap in implementation, primarily due to the potential for political influence and challenges to institutional independence, including within the Corruption Eradication Commission. This situation creates a mismatch between normative objectives and law enforcement practices. Therefore, strengthening anti-corruption law enforcement requires not only regulatory reform but also the reinforcement of institutional integrity and independence, as well as alignment with global standards.

Keywords: anti-corruption; law enforcement; legal reform; political influence; governance

1 Introduction

Corruption in Indonesia has long evolved from mere individual misconduct into a systemic, structured social pathology that continues to be perpetuated across generations. In its 2024 Corruption Perceptions Index, Transparency International once again ranked Indonesia at 37 out of 100, indicating an alarming stagnation after more than two decades of reform and the establishment of the Corruption Eradication Commission (Saputri et al., 2025). As a multidimensional phenomenon, corruption not only undermines the rule of law but also weakens governance, erodes public trust, and hinders sustainable economic development. In Indonesia, corruption has even been classified as an “extraordinary crime” due to its far-

[1] Corresponding author: herwindalarasati2712@gmail.com

reaching impact and its deeply entrenched nature across various sectors of society, at both the national and local levels(Binaji & Hartanti, 2019).

In an effort to address these issues, Indonesia has implemented various significant legal reforms over the past two decades. These reforms include the establishment of specialized agencies, the drafting and amendment of laws and regulations in the field of anti-corruption, and the strengthening of transparency and accountability mechanisms. A key milestone in these reforms was the establishment of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), which plays a strategic role in investigating, prosecuting, and bringing to justice acts of corruption, particularly those involving individuals in positions of power (Langingi & Bakar, 2025). Normatively, these various efforts reflect Indonesia's strong commitment to eradicating corruption and aligning its legal system with international standards. However, although Indonesia's regulatory framework is becoming increasingly comprehensive, the effectiveness of anti-corruption law enforcement remains a subject of debate. The main issue lies in the gap between established legal norms and their implementation in practice. In many cases, law enforcement has not been optimal due to various obstacles, such as inconsistencies in the application of the law, selective enforcement practices, and limited institutional capacity.

Political corruption in many countries has involved those in the highest positions of power as the perpetrators. Ugandan leader Idi Amin; Mobutu Sese Seko of the Congo; Jean Claude Duvalier of Haiti; Jean Bodel Bokassa, leader of the Central African Republic; Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto, leader of Pakistan; Augusto Pinochet, leader of Chile; Chun Do Hwan, leader of South Korea (Shashkova, 2018). These are all examples of political corruptors who, while in power, served as the highest-ranking leaders of their respective countries. A number of previous studies have examined this issue from various perspectives. A study conducted by Cindy Maulana in the journal Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Pancasila, Kewarganegaraan, and Law titled "The Effectiveness of Law Enforcement in Combating Corruption in Indonesia" indicates that although there has been an improvement in regulatory frameworks and the number of corruption cases prosecuted, the effectiveness of anti-corruption efforts still faces serious challenges, particularly regarding the independence of law enforcement agencies and the potential for political interference in case handling. This finding confirms that the main problem does not lie in a lack of regulations, but rather in implementation and institutional integrity (Maulana, 2025).

Various instances of corruption involving public officials and political elites demonstrate that corruption is not merely a matter of legal violations, but also an issue with far-reaching consequences for society. Corruption causes significant financial losses to the state, hinders development, and reduces the quality of public services that the public is entitled to receive. Furthermore, corruption can erode public trust in the government and law enforcement agencies, particularly when the handling of corruption cases is perceived as unfair and lacking transparency. Another consequence is the emergence of social and economic inequality resulting from the suboptimal utilization of state resources for the public good. These conditions demonstrate that corruption poses a serious threat to the realization of a clean, democratic government dedicated to the welfare of the people (Hasibuan et al., 2025).

Meanwhile, a study by Safrizal Z. A. et al., titled "The Role of Public Policy in Mitigating Corruption: A Comparative Analysis of Anticorruption Strategies in Asian Democracies," analyzes the role of public policy in mitigating corruption in Asian democracies through a qualitative and comparative approach. The results of the study indicate that the effectiveness of anti-corruption strategies is highly dependent on the strength of the legal system and the independence of law enforcement agencies in each country. Additionally, the participation of civil society and the media also plays a significant role in enhancing transparency and accountability. However, developing democracies still face various challenges, such as the influence of political elites and resource constraints, which hinder the optimal implementation of anti-corruption policies(A. et al., 2025).

Based on these previous studies, there is a common finding that the main obstacles to combating corruption lie not only in normative aspects, but also in structural and political aspects. However, there remains a need to examine more deeply the relationship between the legal reforms that have been implemented and the reality of political influence in law enforcement practices in Indonesia. This is important to identify the extent to which existing reforms are truly capable of enhancing the effectiveness of law enforcement or, conversely, face obstacles in their implementation.

One of the most crucial factors in explaining this gap is the presence of political influence in the law enforcement process. Political influence can manifest in various forms, including interference in investigative and prosecutorial processes, regulatory changes that potentially weaken anti-corruption institutions, and pressure on law enforcement officials (Rasiwan, 2025). This situation raises serious concerns regarding the independence and integrity of law enforcement agencies. In this context, the dynamics of the authority and position of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) have come under intense scrutiny, particularly in light of legal and policy changes deemed to impact the agency's effectiveness.

From a global perspective, Indonesia has ratified the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC), which sets out international standards for the prevention and eradication of corruption. The UNCAC emphasizes key principles such as institutional independence, transparency, accountability, and international cooperation (Wardani & Fitriono, 2025). Therefore, an evaluation of anti-corruption law enforcement in Indonesia cannot be separated from a comparative framework with these international standards, in order to assess the extent to which national practices align with global principles.

Based on these issues, this study aims to re-examine the effectiveness of anti-corruption law enforcement in Indonesia by analyzing the relationship between legal reform and political influence. This study focuses on two main research questions: first, what is the current effectiveness of anti-corruption law enforcement in Indonesia; and second, to what extent does political influence affect the independence and performance of law enforcement agencies. This study is expected to contribute both theoretically and practically. Theoretically, it offers a critical analysis of the relationship between legal reform and the effectiveness of law enforcement in the context of combating corruption. Practically, the findings are expected to serve as a basis for recommendations to strengthen the anti-corruption law enforcement system through enhancing institutional independence, improving integrity, and aligning with international standards.

2 Method

The research method employed in this study is normative legal research using a qualitative approach that is analytical and evaluative in nature. Normative legal research focuses on examining legal norms, legal principles, the systematics of legislation, and institutional structures governing anti-corruption law enforcement in Indonesia. This method is based on the analysis of legal materials, including legislation, court decisions, legal doctrines, and legal literature, which serve as the primary data source in addressing the legal issues under investigation (Muhaimin, 2020). The analysis emphasizes the consistency of legal norms and their interrelationships within the national legal system while viewing law not only as a body of written rules (law in books) but also as a system operating within political and institutional contexts (law in context). To achieve the research objectives, this study employs several approaches, namely the statutory approach to examine regulations concerning corruption eradication and assess the implications of normative developments; the conceptual approach to analyze concepts such as the rule of law, institutional independence, accountability, and political intervention; the comparative approach to compare Indonesia's anti-corruption legal framework with international standards established under the United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC); and the analytical approach to identify and evaluate discrepancies between legal norms and their implementation in practice (Widiarty, 2024).

3 Results and Discussion

3.1 Analysis of Anti-Corruption Law Enforcement in Indonesia

Law enforcement officials play a crucial role in the fight against corruption in Indonesia. Corruption is a chronic problem that has become deeply entrenched in various aspects of national life, making it a crime that is difficult to combat. This is reflected, among other things, in the continued occurrence of acquittals or the imposition of relatively light sentences on corrupt officials, which are disproportionate to the severity of their crimes. Corruption not only causes material losses to the state but also erodes societal moral values, exacerbates social inequality, and hinders development(Siregar et al., 2024) .

These conditions were one of the factors that spurred the 1998 reform movement in Indonesia, marking a turning point aimed at rooting out deeply entrenched corruption; this was identified as a key priority in the overhaul of the legal system and governance (Kristiana & Hutahayan, 2024). Since the reform era, the enforcement of laws against corruption in Indonesia has shown significant progress, both in terms of regulations and institutional frameworks. The enactment of Law No. 31 of 1999 on the Eradication of Corruption, which was later amended by Law No. 20 of 2001, marked a crucial milestone in strengthening the legal foundation for combating corruption. This law establishes a comprehensive definition of corruption, covering bribery, abuse of authority, embezzlement in office, and the unlawful acceptance of gratuities. The penalties stipulated in this law include imprisonment, fines, and restitution of state losses. This regulation also provides a legal basis for strengthening the enforcement of the law against perpetrators of corruption, including public officials (Siregar et al., 2024). The momentum of legal reform gained further strength with the establishment of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) through Law No. 30 of 2002, which was subsequently amended by Law No. 19 of 2019. The KPK was established in response to the need for an independent institution with special authority, including the power to investigate, conduct inquiries, and prosecute, as well as the authority to conduct wiretapping and coordinate oversight of the police and the Attorney General's Office. Furthermore, the roles of other law enforcement agencies, such as the police and the Attorney General's Office, remain an integral part of the integrated anti-corruption law enforcement system (Widiasih, 2026).

The reforms were also marked by the strengthening of mechanisms for preventing and recovering state losses, such as regulations on gratuities, limited reversal of the burden of proof, forfeiture of assets derived from criminal acts, and the strengthening of asset reporting obligations for public officials. From a normative perspective, these developments demonstrate the state's commitment to building a more comprehensive anti-corruption system aligned with international standards. However, the development of regulations and the strengthening of these legal instruments do not fully correlate with the effectiveness of their implementation. The dynamics of regulatory changes, including revisions to the KPK Law, have also sparked debates regarding institutional independence and the potential for political influence in the law enforcement process (Siregar et al., 2024) .

The role of law enforcement agencies is a key factor in determining the effectiveness of the implementation of established regulations. Indonesia's anti-corruption system does not rely on a single institution but is built through an integrated mechanism involving the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), the Indonesian National Police, and the Attorney General's Office. The KPK was established as an independent agency with special authority to investigate, conduct inquiries into, and prosecute corruption-related criminal offenses, and it also serves a coordinating and supervisory role over the police and the Attorney General's Office (Merita & Djufri, 2021). This institutional design is intended to address the structural barriers and potential conflicts of interest that previously undermined the enforcement of anti-corruption laws. Meanwhile, the police and the prosecution continue to play a central role in the criminal justice system, including in the handling of corruption cases at various levels.

The relationship among these three institutions is designed to be coordinated and complementary, with the aim of ensuring effective and consistent law enforcement. However, in practice, this synergy does not always function optimally. Overlapping jurisdictions, differences in case-handling approaches, and the dynamics of institutional relationships often affect the law enforcement process (Merita & Djufri, 2021). In addition, regulatory changes affecting the structure and authority of the KPK have sparked debate regarding the agency's level of independence in the face of political pressure. Therefore, the effectiveness of anti-corruption efforts is determined not only by the comprehensiveness of regulations and the formal distribution of authority, but also by the quality of coordination, the integrity of officials, and the institution's resilience against external interference.

Indonesia has ratified the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) through Law No. 7 of 2006, which reaffirms the country's commitment to adopting international principles in the fight against corruption, such as the independence of anti-corruption agencies, transparency, accountability, the prevention of conflicts of interest, and asset recovery mechanisms. This indicates that Indonesia has taken a relatively progressive step when measured against international standards. From a regulatory perspective, various provisions of the UNCAC have been incorporated into the national legal system, including regulations regarding gratuities, limited reversal of the burden of proof, international cooperation, and the forfeiture of assets derived from corruption offenses(Hiariej, 2019). This fact demonstrates that, from a legal standpoint, Indonesia has sought to align its anti-corruption system with an internationally recognized global framework.

Although Indonesia has established a relatively comprehensive anti-corruption legal framework that is in line with international standards, in practice there remains a significant gap between regulations and their implementation, which is often influenced by political factors (Artawijaya, 2025). This disparity is particularly evident in the inconsistencies in law enforcement, whether during the investigation phase, the prosecution phase, or in the courts' sentencing decisions. In some cases, there are striking disparities in sentencing between one case and another, even though the criminal offenses share similar characteristics. This situation raises questions regarding the consistency of legal norms and legal certainty within the criminal justice system. Law enforcement officials are often criticized for being selective in the intensity with which they handle cases, particularly when the cases involve political figures, high-ranking officials, or parties with access to power. In this context, the law risks being perceived as not functioning entirely impartially, but rather as influenced by political configurations and specific interests. Yet, the fundamental principle of the rule of law demands that everyone be treated equally before the law (equality before the law). The gap between progressive normative design and implementation practices that are not yet fully consistent indicates that the effectiveness of anti-corruption efforts is determined not only by the existence of strong regulations but also by the integrity of law enforcement officials, institutional independence, and the absence of political interference in the judicial process.

According to the Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) released by Transparency International, Indonesia's CPI score has fluctuated in recent years and has even declined during certain periods, placing Indonesia in an unstable position within the category of countries with low levels of corruption (Transparency International, 2025).

Table 1. Trends in Indonesia's CPI Score (2020–2025)

Year	CPI Score	Global Rankings	Source
2020	37	102	Transparency International
2021	38	96	
2022	34	110	
2023	34	115	
2024	37	99	
2025	34	109	

The table showing the development of Indonesia's Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) for the 2020–2025 period indicates that the CPI score has fluctuated but remains in a relatively low category. In 2020, Indonesia scored 37 with a global ranking of 102, then saw a slight improvement in 2021 with a score of 38 and a ranking of 96. However, in 2022, the CPI score dropped significantly to 34 with a ranking of 110 and remained stagnant at the same level in 2023 with a ranking of 115. Although there was an increase in the score to 37 in 2024 and the ranking improved to 99th place, a decline occurred again in 2025 with a score of 34 and a ranking of 109. These fluctuations indicate that despite efforts at legal reform and institutional strengthening, perceptions of corruption levels in the public sector have not shown consistent and sustainable improvement. The decline in the score and ranking in 2025 further underscores the gap between normative regulatory strengthening and the effectiveness of its implementation in practice (Transparency International, 2025).

In addition to the CPI indicator showing a significant decline from the previous year, this serves as a worrying signal because it reflects the public's low confidence in the state's ability to combat corruption. This decline in the index also reflects that the anti-corruption efforts undertaken by the government and relevant institutions are still far from effective. This data also confirms that corrupt practices not only persist but are becoming increasingly complex and organized. Public perception of the performance of law enforcement agencies is also a key measure in assessing the effectiveness of the anti-corruption system. The level of public trust in institutions such as the KPK, the police, and the Attorney General's Office reflects the social legitimacy of the law enforcement process. When the public perceives that law enforcement is carried out inconsistently or selectively, this legitimacy tends to decline, which ultimately weakens social pressure against corrupt practices (Siregar et al., 2024). Based on Lawrence M. Friedman's theory of legal systems, it can be concluded that the suboptimal enforcement of anti-corruption laws in Indonesia is due to weak synergy and coordination among law enforcement agencies, inconsistent application and interpretation of laws and regulations, and a culture of tolerance toward corrupt practices that remains strong in society(Widiasih, 2026).

The issue of law enforcement officials' integrity is also a key factor affecting the effectiveness of anti-corruption efforts. The integrity of individual officials determines the consistency and professionalism with which they exercise their authority. Integrity in this context includes honesty, impartiality, accountability, professionalism, transparency, and the ability to resist conflicts of interest and external pressures in carrying out law enforcement duties. When law enforcement officials are involved in the abuse of authority or conflicts of interest, the legitimacy of the law enforcement system is eroded. This impacts not only the quality of case handling but also the level of public trust in law enforcement institutions as a whole. Another hindering factor is the weakness of anti-corruption prevention efforts, particularly in managing conflicts of interest and ensuring transparency in public decision-making. An effective prevention system should be able to identify potential misconduct before it escalates into criminal acts. However, if mechanisms for asset reporting, public information disclosure, and internal oversight systems do not function optimally, the door to corrupt practices remains open. In many cases, enforcement approaches dominate over prevention strategies, resulting in anti-corruption efforts that tend to be reactive rather than preventive.

Overall, these factors indicate that the effectiveness of anti-corruption systems depends not only on the strength of legal norms, but also on institutional resilience, the quality of human resources, and the consistent application of the principles of transparency and accountability. Without strengthening these aspects, the legal reforms that have been implemented risk remaining symbolic and failing to produce substantive changes in governance practices. Anti-corruption law enforcement in Indonesia thus reflects the dynamics of legal reform that are not only normative but also political. On the one hand, Indonesia has established a relatively comprehensive regulatory framework; on the other hand, the effectiveness of its implementation still faces structural challenges and political interference.

3.2 Political Influence on the Independence and Performance of Law Enforcement

Overall, these factors indicate that the effectiveness of anti-corruption systems depends not only on the strength of legal norms, but also on institutional resilience, the quality of human resources, and the consistent application of the principles of transparency and accountability. Without strengthening these aspects, the legal reforms that have been implemented risk remaining symbolic and failing to produce substantive changes in governance practices. Anti-corruption law enforcement in Indonesia thus reflects the dynamics of legal reform that are not only normative but also political. On the one hand, Indonesia has established a relatively comprehensive regulatory framework; on the other hand, the effectiveness of its implementation still faces structural challenges and political interference.

The independence of law enforcement agencies is a fundamental principle in ensuring the rule of law. Normatively, effective law enforcement requires that law enforcement officials be free from all forms of intervention whether direct or indirect so that every legal process can proceed objectively, fairly, and in accordance with the provisions of the law (Rasiwan, 2025). However, in the practice of governance, the relationship between law and political power cannot be completely separated. The law is often embedded within power structures that allow political actors to influence both its formulation and enforcement (Aulia et al., 2025). This situation creates an opening for political interests to infiltrate the legal system, which ultimately risks undermining the independence of law enforcement agencies and shifting the focus of law enforcement from one grounded in the principle of justice to one driven by power struggles.

Political influence in anti-corruption law enforcement can be identified through various forms of intervention that, in principle, have the potential to undermine the independence and objectivity of law enforcement officials. In an ideal legal system, every stage of the law enforcement process from preliminary investigations and formal investigations to prosecution must be conducted in accordance with the principle of legality and free from interests outside the law (Kurdi et al., 2026). However, in practice, there are indications that this process is not entirely free from political influence. One of the most critical forms of influence is intervention in the legal process, particularly during the investigation and prosecution phases. During the investigation stage, intervention can take the form of efforts to slow down, limit, or halt the handling of specific cases involving political actors or strategic interests, which is normatively contrary to the principle of due process of law. Meanwhile, during the prosecution stage, political influence can be reflected in the decision to proceed or not with a case in court, a decision that should be based solely on the sufficiency of evidence (Prakoesa et al., 2026).

In addition to direct intervention, political influence can also manifest in the form of pressure on law enforcement officials. This pressure can be either structural or non-structural. Structural pressure typically stems from power dynamics that place law enforcement officials in a position vulnerable to influence from superiors or political actors, whereas non-structural pressure can arise through the formation of politicized public opinion (Abdullah et al., 2025). Both forms of pressure have the potential to influence the independence of law enforcement officials in making legal decisions, thereby leading to a lack of neutrality and a deviation from the principle of objectivity in law enforcement.

Political influence is also reflected in the erosion of law enforcement agencies' independence through regulatory changes. In theory, changes to laws and regulations should enhance the effectiveness of anti-corruption efforts; however, in practice, they can also serve as instruments that create opportunities for legal-formal intervention (Salim et al., 2025). Revisions to the authority of institutions, particularly the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), have legal implications for the level of independence of these institutions. Restrictions on authority and changes to operational mechanisms have the potential to reduce the agency's autonomy in carrying out its functions of enforcing anti-corruption measures and preventing corruption. Furthermore, the establishment of potentially politically motivated oversight mechanisms, such as non-independent supervision, can restrict the agency's operational freedom and influence the legal decision-making process (Saroinsong et al., 2026).

On the other hand, conflicts of interest also serve as a clear manifestation of political influence in law enforcement. The involvement of political elites in the power structure creates opportunities for unequal treatment in the handling of cases, thereby contradicting the principle of equality before the law (Awaludin et al., 2025). The practices of nepotism and political patronage further exacerbate this situation, in which personal connections and political interests can influence the direction of law enforcement (Praja et al., 2026). In such a situation, the law risks losing its function as an instrument of justice and becoming a tool to protect certain interests.

In a global context, these conditions highlight the challenges in meeting international standards, particularly as set forth in the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC). The UNCAC emphasizes the importance of the independence of law enforcement agencies as a key prerequisite for effective anti-corruption efforts, and requires states to ensure that these agencies are free from undue influence (Agatha et al., 2024). In addition, the UNCAC also emphasizes the principles of transparency and accountability as the foundation for governance and law enforcement (Muhamad & Arief, 2025). However, the continued presence of political interference, conflicts of interest, and non-independent oversight mechanisms indicates that the implementation of these principles has not yet been fully optimized.

Table 2. Analysis of the Influence of Politics on Anti-Corruption Law Enforcement (The UNCAC Perspective)

Aspect	**Principles of the UNCAC**	**The Legal Framework in Indonesia**	**Signs of a Problem**
Signs of a Problem	Law enforcement agencies must be independent and free from interference	Legally guaranteed, but subject to regulatory changes	Potential erosion of independence (e.g., at the KPK)

Law Enforcement Process	They must be objective, transparent, and act in accordance with the law	Already regulated by law, but implementation is not always consistent	Interference in investigations and prosecutions
Accountability	Every action taken by law enforcement officials must be accountable	Mechanisms exist, but oversight is not yet fully independent	Potentially politically motivated oversight
Transparency	Legal proceedings must be open and accessible to the public	Transparency is mandated, but remains limited in practice	Selective information and potential manipulation
Conflict of Interest	Such actions must be prevented and strictly regulated	Regulations exist, but are not yet comprehensive	Nepotism and patronage
Integrity of Public Officials	Law enforcement officials must be professional and free from pressure	Regulated by codes of ethics and law	Structural and non-structural pressures remain

The table shows that, in theory, Indonesia has adopted various principles consistent with international standards in the fight against corruption. However, there is a significant gap between the legal framework and its implementation, particularly regarding institutional independence, the objectivity of law enforcement, and the management of conflicts of interest. This indicates that political influence remains a dominant factor hindering the effectiveness of anti-corruption law enforcement. Therefore, strengthening the independence of anti-corruption institutions, enhancing transparency and accountability mechanisms, implementing stricter conflict-of-interest regulations, and ensuring merit-based recruitment and promotion within law enforcement agencies are essential measures to reduce political interference and improve the effectiveness of anti-corruption law enforcement in Indonesia.

4 Conclusion

Based on the analysis, it can be concluded that anti-corruption law enforcement in Indonesia has shown significant normative progress through various legal reforms, institutional strengthening, and alignment with international standards through the ratification of the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC), which emphasizes the principles of independence, transparency, and accountability. However, these regulatory advancements have not been fully reflected in effective implementation, resulting in a substantial gap between law in the books and law in action. This gap is caused by several factors, including weak coordination among law enforcement institutions, inconsistencies in the application of the law, limited integrity among some law enforcement officials, and the predominance of repressive approaches that are not adequately balanced by preventive measures. Furthermore, political influence remains a dominant factor affecting the independence and performance of law enforcement agencies, as reflected in interventions in investigative and prosecutorial processes, pressure on law enforcement officials, and regulatory changes that potentially weaken institutions such as the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK). These conditions undermine public trust and weaken the legitimacy of the legal system. Therefore, improving the effectiveness of anti-corruption law enforcement in Indonesia requires not only continuous legal reform but also stronger institutional independence, enhanced integrity, greater transparency and accountability, stricter management of conflicts of interest, and consistent efforts to minimize political interference in order to establish a more effective, independent, and sustainable anti-corruption system.

References

A., S. Z., Sari, A. L., Limijadi, E. K. S., Saliman, A. R., & Taufiqurrahman. (2025). The Role of Public Policy in Mitigating Corruption: A Comparative Analysis of Anti-Corruption Strategies in Asian Democracies. *CosmoGov: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, *11*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24198/cosmogov.v11i1

Abdullah, G. S., Puluhulawa, M. R. U., & Apripari. (2025). Whistleblower Government System: Strategi Menuju Pemerintahan Daerah yang Transparan dan Bersih di Bone Bolango. *Al-Zayn : Jurnal Ilmu Sosial & Hukum*, *3*(6), 10313–10329. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.61104/alz.v3i6.2766

Agatha, S. W., Handayani, E. P., & Siciliya, M. Y. (2024). Challenging Corruption: Impacts on State Finances, Economy, and the Ratification of UNCAC. *Estudiante Law Journal*, *6*(3), 607–619. https://doi.org/10.33756/eslaj.v6i3.16576

Artawijaya, I. M. D. (2025). Analisis Efektivitas Penegakan Hukum terhadap Korupsi di Indonesia. *Jurnal Penelitian Ilmiah Multidisipliner*, *2*(03).

Aulia, N., Fawaid, & Suhayat, A. (2025). Dinamika Politik Hukum dalam Pembentukan KUHP Baru: Antara Kepentingan Publik dan Kekuasaan Negara. *Causa: Jurnal Hukum Dan Kewarganegaraan*, *13*(9). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.6679/jxh67d83

Awaludin, A., Randiana, P., Lambouw, G. A. P., Suhendi, A., Wiradirja, I. R., & Haspada, D. (2025). Realitas dan Idealitas dalam Penegakan Hukum di Era Kegundahan Politik. *Al-Zayn : Jurnal Ilmu Sosial & Hukum*, *3*(4), 4212–4220.

Binaji, S. H., & Hartanti. (2019). Korupsi sebagai Extra Ordinary Crimes. *Jurnal Kajian Hukum*, *4*(1), 157–174.

Hasibuan, R. K., Septiawati, M., Nellia, A. B., Cahyani, A. P. I., & Maharani, A. P. (2025). Dampak Korupsi Terhadap Inflasi Dan Pertumbuhan Ekonomi di Indonesia. *Jurnal Keuangan Dan Perbankan*, *22*(01), 01–10. https://doi.org/10.35384/jkp.v22i01.708

Hiariej, E. O. S. (2019). United Nations Convention Against Corruption Dalam Sistem Hukum Indonesia. *Mimbar Hukum-Fakultas Hukum Universitas Gadjah Mada*, *31*(1), 112.

Kristiana, Y., & Hutahayan, B. (2024). Judicial corruption in the post-reform era: Assessing the effectiveness of legal reforms in Indonesia. *International Criminal Law Review*, *25*(2–3), 420–441.

Kurdi, Ardhan, A., & Dadek, T. A. (2026). Transformasi Penegakan Due Process of Law dalam Tahapan Penyidikan di Indonesia: Antara Perlindungan Hak Tersangka dan Efektivitas Penegakan Hukum. *Legal Standing : Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, *10*(1), 33–45. https://doi.org/10.24269/ls.v10i1.12833

Langingi, S., & Bakar, R. A. (2025). Pengawasan Terhadap Lembaga Negara Independen: Antara Independensi dan Akuntabilitas. *Lentera: Multidisciplinary Studies*, *3*(4), 749–766. https://doi.org/10.57096/lentera.v3i4.180

Maulana, C. (2025). Efektivitas Penegakan Hukum Dalam Menanggulangi Tindak Pidana Korupsi Di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Pancasila, Kewarganegaraan, Dan Hukum*, *2*(2), 19–24. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.70134/pakehum.v2i2.570

Merita, E., & Djufri, D. (2021). Sinergitas Kewenangan Lembaga Penegak Hukum Terhadap Tindak Pidana Gratifikasi Dalam Struktur Hukum Pidana Di Indonesia. *Lex Librum : Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, *7*(2), 195–206. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.46839/lljih.v7i2.498

Muhaimin, M. (2020). Metode penelitian hukum. *Dalam S. Dr. Muhaimin, Metode Penelitian Hukum, Mataram-NTB: Mataram*, *1*, 59–62.

Muhamad, R. N., & Arief, E. (2025). Pengaruh Ratifikasi UNCAC Terhadap Kebijakan Antikorupsi di Indonesia. *HUKUM DAN DINAMIKA MASYARAKAT*, *21*(1), 69–77. https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.56444/hdm.v23i1.6276

Praja, M. N. L., Junaidi, M., & Arifin, Z. (2026). Konflik Kepentingan Partai Politik dalam Pengadaan Barang dan Jasa Pemerintah. *Journal Juridisch*, *4*(1), 72–92.

Prakoesa, P. D. H., Ningsih, D. W., & Suyanto. (2026). Tumpang Tindih Kewenangan Penyidikan Korupsi: Dampak terhadap Kepastian Hukum dan Due Process of Law. *Judge: Jurnal Hukum*, *6*(07), 1302–1310. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.54209/judge.v6i07.1997

Rasiwan, I. (2025). *Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi: Dari Konsep, Penindakan, hingga Visi Masa Depan*. AMU Press.

Salim, A., Suryati, S., & Yusoh, R. (2025). Law Enforcement Against Corruption in Indonesia: Between Expectation and Reality. *Realism: Law Review*, *3*(2), 12–30. https://doi.org/10.71250/rlr.v3i2.73

Saputri, A., Nurhasanah, A., Ananda, A. N., Saputri, I. K., & Sary, W. E. (2025). Korupsi Sebagai Patologi Sosial Sistemik di Indonesia dan Kegagalan Hukum Pidana dalam Menciptakan Efek Jera. *Jurnal Kajian Hukum Dan Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan*, *2*(1), 344–352.

Saroinsong, V. A., Sinaga, N. A., & Purbowati, L. (2026). Analisis Yuridis Dampak Tes Wawasan Kebangsaan terhadap Independensi Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi dalam Perspektif Prinsip Negara Hukum. *Al-Zayn : Jurnal Ilmu Sosial & Hukum*, *4*(2), 955–969.

Shashkova, A. V. (2018). Corruption Is a Problem of Political Theory and Practice. *Montenegrin Journal of Economics*, *14*(3), 143–154. https://doi.org/10.14254/1800-5845/2018.14-3.10

Siregar, P. B., Arisandi, M. R., & Puanandini, D. A. (2024). Efektivitas penegak hukum bagi pelaku tindak pidana korupsi di Indonesia. *Civilia: Jurnal Kajian Hukum Dan Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan*, *3*(2).

Transparency International. (2025). *Corruption Perceptions Index*.

Wardani, S. K., & Fitriono, R. A. (2025). Prinsip-Prinsip Hukum Internasional dalam Pengembalian Aset Hasil Tindak Pidana Korupsi di Indonesia: Principles of International Law in The Repatriation of Assets Arising from Corruption Offenses in Indonesia. *Journal of Policy*, *16*(1), 37–44.

Widiarty, W. S. (2024). *Buku Ajar Metode Penelitian Hukum*. Publika Global Media.

Widiasih, N. P. S. (2026). Perkembangan Penegakan Hukum terhadap Tindak Pidana Korupsi di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Humaniora*, *2*(1), 729–735. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.63822/fvw8s137