Journal Equity of Law and Governance
Volume 7, Nomor 2, Page: 164-174
https://ejournal.warmadewa.ac.id/index.php/elg/index

Online ISSN 2776-5121
Print ISSN 2775-9512

https://doi.org/10.22225/elg.7.2.2025.164-174

The Weakness of State Administrative Law as a Catalyst for Corruption in Indonesia: A Juridical Perspective and Proposed Solutions

Anak Agung Gede Agung Indra Prathama[1]

1. Faculty of Law Universitas Ngurah Rai, Denpasar, Indonesia

Coressponding author;
Anak Agung Gede Agung Indra Prathama, Faculty of Law Universitas Ngurah Rai, Denpasar, Indonesia
Email: indra.prathama@unr.ac.id

Abstract. From a juridical perspective, the weakness of the State Administrative Law (SAL) system can be regarded as one of the factors that facilitates the occurrence of corruption in Indonesia. The ambiguity of legal norms and the inadequacy of supervisory instruments within the framework of SAL create loopholes for the abuse of power by state officials, which ultimately harms the public interest. Corruption—essentially the misuse of public authority for personal or group gain—often thrives within an administrative system that lacks sufficient principles of efficiency, transparency, and accountability. Based on this premise, the focus of this study is directed toward two main legal issues related to investment governance in Bali Province: (1) How can a juridical perspective help in understanding the weakness of State Administrative Law as a trigger for corruption in Indonesia? and (2) What solutions can be proposed to address the weaknesses in State Administrative Law in order to prevent corruption in Indonesia? This study is doctrinal in nature and utilizes primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials. The data collection technique involves the card system and employs a statutory approach, factual approach, and conceptual analysis approach. The findings of this research indicate that juridical approaches to combating corruption should not be limited to repressive measures or sanctions but must also include preventive and corrective strategies. This includes reforming the structure of administrative law, optimizing oversight mechanisms, and integrating administrative law principles into all aspects of government administration. Systemic efforts to strengthen State Administrative Law as part of an anti-corruption strategy must be implemented collaboratively and sustainably. These efforts include regulatory reform, institutional restructuring, and the reinforcement of integrity values and transparency principles in the execution of governmental functions.

Keywords: State administrative law; corruption; juridical perspective; solutions.

INTRODUCTION

Corruption, from a legal perspective, can be defined as an unlawful act committed by an individual who abuses the power, position, or authority vested in them to gain personal, group, or corporate benefits in ways that are contrary to the law and ethical norms of public administration (Wibowo, Agus et al., 2022). Such acts are generally associated with the exploitation of facilities, opportunities, or resources obtained due to one's position or status, resulting in harm to the state's finances or economy. Corruption includes various forms, such as bribery (gratification), embezzlement in office, extortion by public officials, and fraudulent actions that cause state losses. In the contemporary era, the phenomenon of corruption has become a recurrent issue in media coverage, both in print and online. Ironically, among certain segments of society, corruption tends to be seen as a common occurrence or no longer taken seriously, even though, from a juridical standpoint, corruption is classified as an extraordinary crime. This qualification is given because the impact of corruption is not only limited to financial losses to the state, but also has far-reaching implications for the disruption of national development programs, the decline in the quality of public services such as education and infrastructure, and the exacerbation of

social inequality and systemic poverty (Kementerian Riset Teknologi Dan Pendidikan Tinggi Republik Indonesia, 2018).

Corruption is a form of crime that has persisted for a long time and continues to evolve in terms of methods and modus operandi in line with technological advancements and social dynamics. However, the essence of this criminal act remains the same, namely, an unlawful act that is manipulative in nature and results in harm to the state's finances or economy. In the current social reality, corrupt behavior is often regarded as commonplace or even justified by certain segments of society, leading to ambiguity in distinguishing between corrupt and non-corrupt actions. If strict and sustained law enforcement is not carried out, corrupt criminal acts will continue to evolve, causing serious negative impacts on governance and the life of the nation and state.

In general, corruption in the administrative context can have negative impacts, such as damaging the integrity of government, hindering development, and harming society. Additionally, some other consequences include: (i) significant financial losses to the state; (ii) obstructing economic growth, reducing investment, and increasing poverty; (iii) fostering a culture of corruption that undermines moral and ethical values; (iv) diminishing public trust in the government and state institutions, as well as creating social injustices; and others (A, Nursya, 2020). The efforts to combat corruption in Indonesia are a shared responsibility carried out by several law enforcement institutions, namely the Indonesian Attorney General's Office, the Indonesian National Police, and the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), which was established under Law No. 30 of 2002. Despite the existence of various institutions and legal instruments specifically designed to address corruption crimes, empirical reality shows that Indonesia— as the fourth most populous country in the world—ranked 96th in the Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) in 2021, with a score of 38 out of 100, as reported by Transparency International (Sitepu, Diyara Eninta Br, 2022).

The eradication of corruption cannot be effective without strong political will from the government, consistent coordination among law enforcement agencies, and the firm and impartial implementation of laws and regulations. Furthermore, corruption represents a deviation from the fundamental principles of state administrative law, as it often involves the abuse of power by government officials. Therefore, administrative law plays a crucial role in the preventive and repressive administrative aspects, as well as in the oversight mechanisms to prevent and address corrupt practices within the government bureaucracy (Subekti, Rahayu et al., 2022).

The efforts to combat corruption crimes in Indonesia are based on several regulatory provisions that serve as the juridical foundation for law enforcement against corrupt acts. The legal instruments in question are as follows:

Law No. 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Corruption Crimes, which is a fundamental regulation in Indonesia's special criminal law system, comprehensively governs both substantive and procedural provisions for preventing and prosecuting perpetrators of corruption crimes, with an emphasis on eradicating corruption, collusion, and nepotism.

Law No. 20 of 2001 concerning Amendments to Law No. 31 of 1999 on the Eradication of Corruption Crimes, which functions as a legal instrument to refine the law by adding and strengthening norms, including expanding the definitions of gratification, bribery, and increasing criminal penalties for perpetrators of corruption.

Law No. 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission, which serves as the legal basis for the establishment of the independent institution known as the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), with specific authority to conduct investigations, prosecutions, and legal proceedings in corruption cases to ensure the effectiveness of anti-corruption law enforcement in Indonesia.

Law No. 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code (KUHP), which replaces the colonial-era Wetboek van Strafrecht, and establishes the latest general criminal provisions, including regulations on a three-year transitional period from the date of enactment to provide space for adaptation to the new national legal system.

When discussing the relationship between corruption and state administrative law, it is evident that the connection between corruption crimes and state administrative law is both close and complex, considering the numerous corrupt acts that occur within the scope of government administrative activities and involve the abuse of authority by public administrative officials. State Administrative Law (SAL) functions as a normative framework that regulates the procedures and mechanisms for exercising governmental authority, formulating public policies, and providing public services. The existence of a strong, effective, and consistent SAL is a fundamental requirement for the creation of a government that operates in accordance with the rule of law, grounded in principles of justice, and upholding accountability in every action taken. In this context, SAL plays a strategic role in preventing corruption practices, both at the preventive and administrative enforcement levels (Matitaputty, Merlien Irene et al., 2024).

From a juridical perspective, the weakness of the State Administrative Law system (SAL) can be considered one of the factors that facilitates the occurrence of corruption crimes in Indonesia. The ambiguity of legal norms and the weaknesses in the supervisory instruments within the framework of SAL create loopholes for the abuse of power by state officials, ultimately harming the public interest (Marwiyah, Siti, 2020). Corruption, which is essentially the misuse of public authority for the benefit of individuals or specific groups, often flourishes within an administrative system that is not run according to the principles of efficiency, transparency, and adequate accountability (Asmara, Galang et al., 2025).

If the State Administrative Law system (SAL) is not implemented optimally, it will create normative and institutional gaps that can be exploited for corrupt actions. These potential deviations may include:

Corruption as a Violation of Administrative Norms

In practice, corruption often stems from the abuse of administrative authority by state officials. State administrative law establishes normative guidelines for the exercise of powers held by government officials. When these provisions are misused for personal or group interests, a violation of administrative principles occurs, which, at a certain level, can lead to unlawful actions that are criminal in nature.

The Preventive Role of Administrative Law in Corruption Eradication

Administrative law plays a strategic role in preventing corruption through the establishment of normative and institutional frameworks, such as internal oversight mechanisms, administrative audit systems, and the implementation of transparent and accountable licensing and procurement procedures. In other words, effectively drafted administrative regulations can narrow the space for potential deviations.

Imposition of Administrative Sanctions on Corrupt Acts

In addition to criminal sanctions under specific criminal law provisions, public officials who are found guilty of corruption may also face administrative sanctions as stipulated in state administrative law. These sanctions include demotion, dismissal without honor, and even termination. This highlights that the enforcement of administrative law and criminal law can work synergistically in addressing corruption crimes.

Public Administration Reform as an Instrument of Corruption Prevention

Efforts to improve the bureaucratic system through public administration reform, such as simplifying procedures, digitizing public services, and enhancing transparency and accountability, represent the implementation of state administrative law principles focused on preventing corruption. These reforms aim to create a governance system that is clean and free from the abuse of power (Siregar, Mangihut, 2023).

Thus, from a juridical perspective, corruption crimes are not merely violations of criminal law provisions, but also reflect dysfunctions in governance and the weakness of the effectiveness of the State Administrative Law (SAL) system's implementation. Therefore, efforts to eradicate corruption must be formulated in a comprehensive and integrated manner, which includes strengthening the normative framework of SAL, optimizing the mechanisms for enforcing administrative law, and enhancing public participation in overseeing the administration of government. Based on this explanation, the researcher

focuses the study on two main legal issues related to investment issues in Bali Province: 1) How does the juridical perspective help to understand the weakness of state administrative law as a trigger for corruption in Indonesia? and 2) What are the solutions related to the weakness of state administrative law in Indonesia to prevent corruption in Indonesia?

METHOD

This research employs a doctrinal method, which provides a systematic explanation of legal norms governing a specific legal category. In this case, it examines the relationship between legal norms, elucidates difficult areas, and offers a description in the form of predictions regarding the future development of legal norms (ius constituendum) (Pratama, I Putu Andika, et al., 2023:199). This can be understood as research that uses analytical and deductive reasoning to interpret and critique legal materials, aiming to develop legal theories or concepts by examining and comparing doctrines, principles, and legal precedents.

This research also utilizes primary, secondary, and tertiary data. The primary data used includes applicable regulations at both the national and local levels. Furthermore, this study utilizes secondary data in the form of literature, journal articles, and papers that are related to and relevant to the issues under investigation. The data used include dictionaries employed to search for the meaning of foreign terms that need to be translated.

The data for this study were collected using document studies or literature review techniques, which involve gathering data and information by examining literature or written sources related to the issues being studied (Puspitaningrat, I Dewa Agung Ayu Mas, et al., 2024:34). This research also uses several approaches to provide clarity about the substance of the academic work. These approaches include the factual approach and the conceptual approach. The factual approach involves analyzing something based on actual events that can be verified, in relation to theory and legislation. The conceptual approach, on the other hand, uses recent literature to investigate a phenomenon. This approach is based on views and doctrines that have developed in the field of legal studies.

DISCUSSION

Corruption is a systemic and chronic legal issue that poses a serious obstacle to the implementation of national development in Indonesia. Despite various countermeasures being implemented through a repressive criminal law approach, corruption practices remain widespread across various government sectors, indicating that mere enforcement is insufficient to address the root cause of the problem. One dimension often overlooked in the discourse on anti-corruption efforts is the strategic role of administrative law as a preventive instrument designed to regulate and oversee government management in a transparent, accountable manner, and in accordance with the principles of good governance. Administrative law plays a normative role in establishing the limits of authority, obligations, and the administrative procedures that must be adhered to by public officials in carrying out their functions and responsibilities. However, the implementation of administrative law in Indonesia still faces various challenges, including regulatory overlaps, weak internal oversight mechanisms, low compliance with the general principles of good governance (AUPB), and the suboptimal application of administrative sanctions that could provide a deterrent effect. These conditions create a grey area within government bureaucracy, which has the potential to be misused for personal or group interests.

Various corruption cases often begin with deviations from administrative authority, procurement of goods and services that do not adhere to transparency principles, and administrative decision-making without a valid legal basis. These facts reflect the weakness of the utility of administrative law in preventing corrupt practices from the early stages of the governmental process (Sumaryati et al., 2019). Therefore, a thorough juridical study is necessary to examine the contribution of the weaknesses in the administrative legal system to the proliferation of corruption, as well as the formulation of normative solutions to strengthen the role of administrative law as an effective preventive tool. A holistic approach, not only repressive through criminal law enforcement but also preventive through bureaucratic reform

and strengthening administrative regulations, is expected to create a more comprehensive, sustainable, and just anti-corruption system.

Juridical Perspective in Understanding the Weakness of State Administrative Law as a Trigger for Corruption in Indonesia

According to Soerjono Soekanto, a juridical approach is a method used in legal research that is conducted through literature review, utilizing secondary data as the primary source. This approach emphasizes the exploration of laws and regulations, legal doctrines, and other relevant literature related to the legal issues under study (Soekanto & Mamudji, 2001).

In general, the juridical approach is understood as a scientific procedure aimed at discovering legal truth based on normative reasoning and the prevailing legal system (Benuf, et al., 2020). In practice, the juridical approach is divided into three main types. First, the normative juridical approach, which is a legal research method that focuses on the analysis of positive legal norms, whether in the form of written regulations or legal principles, in order to provide normative solutions to legal issues. Second, the empirical juridical approach, which studies the effectiveness of the implementation of legal norms in social reality, including the behavior of legal subjects and the application of regulations in society. Third, the socio-legal approach, which integrates legal analysis with social sciences, assuming that law is not only a set of norms but also functions within a social structure and is influenced by the dynamics of society. This approach reflects the interdisciplinary nature of legal studies, requiring contributions from other disciplines to comprehensively understand the relationship between law and society (Suganda, R., 2022).

Thus, a juridical perspective can be understood as an analytical approach used to examine legal issues based on the applicable legal provisions, both in the form of written legal norms such as regulations, as well as unwritten norms such as legal customs, general legal principles, and jurisprudence (Ramadhani, Rahmania, and Mutiara Gita Cahyani, 2023). In this framework, the juridical approach focuses on assessing the legality of an action, policy, or event to determine its conformity with the existing positive legal system. Additionally, this approach includes the interpretation of legal norms, the systematic application of legal principles, and consideration of the principles of legal certainty, justice, and utility in the application of law.

In this academic work, the juridical approach aims to identify the factors contributing to the occurrence of corruption within the framework of administrative law and to formulate normative and institutional solutions to strengthen the effectiveness of administrative law in preventing corruption. The researcher outlines several strategic steps related to the analysis of the weaknesses of the administrative legal system as one of the factors causing the widespread occurrence of corruption in Indonesia, including:

Conduct a juridical review of the legislation regulating state administration and the eradication of corruption to identify potential normative weaknesses or legal gaps that may be exploited in corrupt practices.

Evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation of administrative law and anti-corruption regulations, particularly in the aspect of law enforcement, in order to uncover structural and operational barriers that reduce the utility of legal norms.

Identify institutional weaknesses within the scope of public administration, including deficiencies in organizational structure, procedural mechanisms, and internal and external oversight systems, which may create opportunities for administrative misconduct.

Analyze court decisions in corruption criminal cases as an instrument to assess the consistency and application of administrative law in judicial practice.

Assess the performance of law enforcement agencies, such as the Prosecutor's Office and the Police, in handling corruption cases and the effectiveness of applying administrative law principles in the law enforcement process.

It is important to note that actions classified as corruption offenses, as defined in the legislation, include, among others:

State Financial Loss

A corruption offense that causes financial loss to the state occurs when an individual unlawfully commits an act aimed at enriching themselves, others, or a corporation by abusing authority, opportunities, or resources available to them due to their position or status. A concrete example of this is budget manipulation (mark-up) by public officials to gain personal profit from the difference in the budget value, which directly burdens and harms the state's finances.

Bribery

Bribery refers to the act of giving, promising, or receiving something to or from a civil servant, state official, judge, lawyer, or other authority figures with the intent to influence actions or decisions that should be made in the course of their official duties. Bribery practices can occur among government officials—such as to obtain a promotion—or between employees and external parties, like when a businessperson offers a bribe to win a government project tender.

Embezzlement in Office

Embezzlement in office involves intentionally concealing or diverting state funds, securities, or other documents related to financial administration, including falsifying books or official records for personal gain. One form of this is the destruction of evidence by law enforcement officers to protect the perpetrators of corruption.

Extortion by State Officials

Extortion occurs when a public official abuses their power to force someone to give something, make a payment, or take certain actions for personal benefit or the benefit of others in an unlawful manner. An example of this is when a state official charges fees for administrative services that exceed the official rates, accompanied by threats of delaying or denying services.

Fraud

Fraud involves intentionally committing an act with the aim of gaining personal or third-party profit, which may cause harm or jeopardize public interests. An example is a goods and services provider who reduces the quality specifications in an infrastructure project, thereby endangering user safety or national security, such as in the procurement of national defense and security equipment.

Conflict of Interest in Procurement

A conflict of interest occurs when a public servant or state official, either directly or indirectly, participates in procurement activities for goods, services, or leasing, despite being responsible for managing or supervising those activities due to their position. An example is when a public official seeks to ensure a family-owned company wins a tender process in the agency where they work.

Gratification as Bribery

Gratification received by a public servant or state official related to their position and in conflict with their duties or obligations may be classified as bribery, especially if it is not reported to the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) within the designated period. For example, when a businessperson gives a luxury gift to a public official as an indirect reward for granting a project or facilitating licensing (Inspektorat Kota Banda Aceh, 2024).

Based on the previous explanation regarding the juridical perspective, the researcher concludes that the weakness of administrative law as a triggering factor for corruption in Indonesia can be examined from various aspects, including institutional weaknesses, deficiencies in the substance of legal norms, and the inefficiency of administrative procedures. This perspective emphasizes that the inability of the administrative legal system to effectively regulate, limit, and supervise the authority of state officials contributes to the widespread abuse of power (Firmansyah, Vicky Zaynul, and Firdaus Syam, 2021). The following points explain the relationship between the weaknesses of administrative law and the potential for corruption, examined from a juridical perspective:

The Absence or Indeterminacy of Administrative Law Regulations

Administrative law should serve as the normative framework that governs the actions of public officials to ensure adherence to the principles of legality, accountability, and transparency. However, in Indonesia, many administrative regulations are unclear or overly general (vague norms), allowing for broad interpretation. Furthermore, the procedures for granting permits, tenders, and procurement of goods/services are often non-transparent and susceptible to manipulation.

Lack of Supervision and Accountability Mechanism

From a juridical perspective, administrative law is intended to ensure the establishment of effective supervision mechanisms, both through internal control by superior officials or the Government Internal Supervisory Apparatus (APIP), and through external control by the public, the Indonesian Ombudsman, and the State Administrative Court (PTUN). However, in practice, these supervisory functions are often not optimal due to weak independence or ineffective oversight. As a result, various forms of administrative deviations, which could have been prevented or addressed at an early stage, are frequently overlooked in the legal process and have the potential to escalate into corrupt acts.

Overlapping Authorities and Fragmentation of Regulations

Overlapping administrative authorities between government agencies, both at the central and regional levels and between ministries/agencies, create ambiguity in the execution of governmental functions and powers. This situation leads to increased vulnerability of administrative decisions to political intervention and transactional practices. In addition, weak coordination mechanisms between agencies and the lack of synchronization in legal norms across regulations create opportunities for abuse of power, which ultimately become loopholes for corrupt practices in the administration of state governance.

Lack of Legal Certainty and Protection

Regulations on public services within the administrative domain do not automatically guarantee legal certainty for the public. When administrative officials exercise discretion without being constrained by clear and proportional legal provisions, there is a high potential for abuse of power that could benefit personal or certain group interests.

Weak Enforcement of Administrative Law

Various violations within the realm of state administration often do not receive adequate handling. The enforcement of administrative law—whether through the state administrative court mechanism or the application of disciplinary sanctions against civil servants—is often formalistic, slow, or not effectively implemented, thereby failing to create the deterrent effect necessary to ensure compliance with administrative norms in government operations (Kartika, Shanti Dwi et al., 2015).

Juridically, weaknesses in the state administrative law system in Indonesia have created a space for corrupt practices, as they provide gaps in both policy formulation and its implementation stage. The ineffectiveness of control over administrative authority, as well as the lack of guarantees for transparency and accountability in governance, exacerbates this vulnerability. Therefore, comprehensive reform of administrative law is necessary, which includes regulatory renewal, institutional restructuring, and strengthening law enforcement mechanisms. This way, administrative law will not only serve as a normative framework for government actions but also as a strategic tool in preventing and eradicating corruption within the bureaucracy.

Solutions Related to the Weakness of State Administrative Law in Indonesia to Prevent Corruption in Indonesia

In order to address the weaknesses in the state administrative law system and as a preventive measure against corruption in Indonesia, the implementation of a comprehensive and integrative strategy is required. The strategy includes a series of steps that can be implemented both in the normative legal framework and in the practical administration of government, as follows:

Regulatory reform in administrative law: It can be understood that Indonesia does not yet have a codified state administrative law system, as seen in many Continental European countries. A significant amount of corruption arises from the absence of or unclear standard operating procedures (SOPs) in

the execution of duties. Therefore, a specific law is needed that systematically regulates the principles of government administration, service standards, the use of discretion, accountability mechanisms for public officials, as well as a review of sectoral regulations to prevent opportunities for misappropriation.

Bureaucratic reform: This needs to be carried out to create an efficient, professional, and corruption-free bureaucracy, which can be realized through improvements in the government's procurement system to prevent deviations and corruption in the procurement process. Additionally, improvements in the application of the meritocratic system for recruitment, placement, and promotion of State Civil Apparatus (ASN) are essential, with a focus on placing ASNs with high competence, integrity, and professionalism in strategic government positions.

Simplification and digitalization of administrative procedures: This includes the digitalization of public services (e.g., e-budgeting, e-procurement, and e-licensing), which has been proven to reduce the potential for corruption by minimizing direct interactions between officials and the public. The implementation of a one-stop service system and an integrated information system will cut down long bureaucratic chains, which have historically been vulnerable to bribery practices.

Limitation and supervision of the use of discretion by public officials: It is essential to ensure that discretion is limited to specific conditions permitted by law, accompanied by official documentation, a clear legal rationale, and an effective supervision mechanism. Furthermore, training in administrative ethics and understanding legal responsibilities is crucial to ensure that every public official understands and adheres to the limits of their authority as set by the law.

Strengthening the legal culture and ethics of public administration: This is a strategic step to ensure that State Civil Apparatus (ASN) have a comprehensive understanding of the fundamental principles in state administrative law, including the principles of legality, due process of law, and the application of good governance principles. This effort must be systematically integrated into the curriculum of the Civil Servant Candidate (CPNS) education and training, as well as competency development programs for structural officials, with particular emphasis on anti-corruption values and public service ethics.

The application of administrative sanctions in a firm, proportional, and consistent manner has the potential to create a deterrent effect on state apparatus, thus not solely relying on criminal sanctions imposed by the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) (Republic of Indonesia Corruption Eradication Commission, 2006). The threat of administrative consequences, such as dismissal from office, delayed promotions, reduction of financial entitlements, and the revocation of official facilities, becomes a crucial instrument in strengthening the integrity of state administrators. To achieve this effectiveness, it is necessary to strengthen the enforcement mechanism of administrative law, which can be realized through enhancing the institutional capacity of law enforcement agencies, including the Indonesian National Police and the Indonesian Prosecutor's Office, enabling them to handle corruption cases professionally, promptly, and effectively. These efforts must be accompanied by regulatory reform and improvements in the quality of legislation governing the eradication of corruption, including strengthening policies that ensure the consistent and continuous implementation of the law. In addition, synergy between law enforcement agencies, particularly the KPK, the Police, and the Prosecutor's Office, must be reinforced to ensure effective coordination in carrying out prevention and law enforcement functions in a comprehensive and integrated manner (Wajdi, Faris et al., 2024).

The application of the principles of transparency and accountability in government administration is a fundamental element in realizing governance that is free from corruption. These principles can be implemented through the formation and strengthening of effective oversight mechanisms, both internally by functional oversight officials and externally by independent institutions and civil society. The goal is to ensure that the performance of state apparatus and public financial management are in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. In this context, ensuring public access to information, particularly regarding government procurement processes, must be guaranteed as part of the implementation of the public information openness principle, which supports participatory oversight from the public. Every government entity is also obligated to prepare and present performance reports and account for budget usage periodically, transparently, and measurably, as a manifestation of the principle of public accountability. Furthermore, strengthening the role of internal and external oversight institutions, such as the Inspectorate, the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia, and the Financial

Audit Agency (BPK), is essential to ensure their independence and effectiveness in detecting potential administrative deviations at an early stage. The optimization of these roles must also be accompanied by enhancing the function and authority of the State Administrative Court (PTUN) to provide citizens and legal entities with access to justice when challenging administrative actions that are suspected of being deviant. Therefore, a reformulation of the scope of PTUN's authority is necessary to make it more proactive and responsive in enforcing the principles of legality in government administrative actions (Ardiansyah, 2022).

Increasing education and socialization regarding ethics and integrity for State Civil Apparatus (ASN) is a strategic step in strengthening legal awareness about the dangers of corruption and the importance of applying honest, transparent, and responsible behavior in government duties. This effort can be realized through the granting of awards to ASNs demonstrating high integrity, alongside the firm and consistent application of administrative and disciplinary sanctions for those found guilty of violations, including involvement in corruption crimes. In addition, building a clean, professional, and corruption-free bureaucratic culture must be instilled across all government agencies. Anti-corruption education should also be an integral part of the national education curriculum at all levels, from elementary to higher education, to instill values of integrity and the principles of corruption prevention from an early age. Socialization regarding the negative impacts of corruption and efforts to combat it must also be carried out extensively among all elements of society, including civil society organizations, the media, and business actors. Moreover, it is crucial to build and strengthen public legal awareness concerning their active role in monitoring, preventing, and reporting corruption crimes. By applying a holistic, structured, and integrated approach, it is hoped that the state administrative law system can be strengthened, thereby promoting more effective and sustainable corruption prevention in Indonesia.

Thus, efforts to strengthen the role of state administrative law in preventing corruption in Indonesia must be carried out through the enhancement of transparency and accountability principles in government administration, optimization of oversight and administrative law enforcement mechanisms, strengthening legal education and public legal awareness, the development of open information systems, and the formulation of integrated and effective anti-corruption policies.

CONCLUSION

The weaknesses in the implementation of state administrative law have created systemic gaps in bureaucratic governance, which can potentially be exploited by government officials to commit acts of corruption. Therefore, strengthening state administrative law is not merely a supporting element in government governance but also a strategic component in the long-term effort to prevent corruption. A legal approach to combating corruption should not be limited to a repressive aspect or the imposition of sanctions, but must also encompass preventive and corrective measures. This includes the reform of the administrative legal structure, optimization of oversight mechanisms, and the integration of administrative law principles into all aspects of government administration.

Systemic efforts to strengthen state administrative law as part of an anti-corruption strategy must be implemented collaboratively and continuously. This includes regulatory reform, institutional restructuring, as well as the reinforcement of integrity values and transparency principles in the execution of government functions. Corruption crimes in Indonesia are unlawful acts that cause harm to the state, both in terms of finances and the national economy. These acts include various forms of violations, such as bribery, gratuities, and abuse of authority by public officials. Corruption is seen as a serious threat to the sustainability of a democratic and just rule-of-law state, and it has the potential to damage the legitimate governance system.

As a normative response to this threat, preventive policies need to be implemented through the creation of legal instruments specifically governing the confiscation of assets resulting from corruption, as well as the imposition of severe criminal sanctions, including life imprisonment, on perpetrators of corruption. This policy is expected to create a deterrent effect and strengthen public legal awareness regarding the legal consequences of corrupt actions. Furthermore, strengthening state administrative law must be an integral part of the anti-corruption strategy, with the following concrete steps:

The application of the principles of good governance, such as transparency, accountability, effectiveness, and efficiency, in every government administration process;

Strengthening institutions through the enhancement of the capacity of anti-corruption agencies and law enforcement officials;

Encouraging public participation in the oversight mechanisms of government administration;

Reforming regulations and ensuring consistent law enforcement against all forms of corruption-related crimes.

With a comprehensive approach that includes preventive, repressive, and rehabilitative dimensions, it is expected that anti-corruption policies can be implemented effectively, fairly, and sustainably.

REFERENCES

A, Nursya. (2020). *Beberapa bentuk perbuatan pelaku berkaitan dengan tindak pidana korupsi (Menurut Undang-Undang Tindak Pidana Korupsi)*. CV. Alumgadan Mandiri.

Ardiansyah. (2022). *Hukum administrasi negara: Fenomena hukum di ruang publik*. Deepublish Publisher.

Asmara, G. (2025). *Hukum administrasi negara*. Rajawali Pers.

Benuf, K., & Azhar, M. (2020). Metodologi penelitian hukum sebagai instrumen mengurai permasalahan hukum kontemporer. *Gema Keadilan, 7*(1), 20–33. https://doi.org/10.14710/gk.2020.7504

Firmansyah, V. Z., & Syam, F. (2021). Penguatan hukum administrasi negara pencegah praktik korupsi dalam penyelenggaraan birokrasi di Indonesia. Integritas: *Jurnal Antikorupsi, 7*(2), 325–344. https://doi.org/10.32697/integritas.v7i2.817Inspektorat Kota Banda Aceh. (2024). Ayo kenali dan hindari 30 jenis korupsi ini! Diakses 4 Mei 2025 dari https://inspektorat.bandaacehkota.go.id/2024/05/13/ayo-kenali-dan-hindari-30-jenis-korupsi-ini/

Kartika, S. D., et al. (2015*). Korupsi dan KPK dalam perspektif hukum, ekonomi, dan sosial. Pusat Pengkajian, Pengolahan Data dan Informasi (P3DI)*. Sekretariat Jenderal DPR RI dan Azza Grafika.

Kementerian Riset Teknologi dan Pendidikan Tinggi Republik Indonesia. (2018). Pendidikan antikorupsi untuk perguruan tinggi.

Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi Republik Indonesia. (2006). Buku saku untuk memahami tindak pidana korupsi. Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi.

Marwiyah, S. (2020). *Pengantar ilmu administrasi negara*. Universitas Panca Marga.

Matitaputty, M. I., et al. (2024). *Hukum administrasi negara*. Widina Media Utama.

Pratama, I. P. A., et al. (2023). Legal protection for buildings with traditional architecture in the modern era of Bali. *Indonesia Law Reform Journal, 3*(2), 196–206. https://doi.org/10.22219/ilrej.v3i2.28073

Puspitaningrat, I. D. A. M., et al. (2024). Niet ontvankelijke verklaard dalam putusan. *Jurnal Yustitia, 18*(1).

Ramadhani, R., & Cahyani, M. G. (2023). Analisis peran hukum administrasi negara terhadap upaya pencegahan praktik korupsi dalam pemerintahan. *Jurnal Riset Rumpun Ilmu Sosial, Politik dan Humaniora (JURRISH), 2*(1).

Siregar, M. (2023). *Antikorupsi*. UWKS Press.

Sitepu, D. E. B. (2022). *Anti corruption*. Diakses 30 Mei 2025 dari https://www.djkn.kemenkeu.go.id/kanwil-sumut/baca-artikel/15780/Anti-Corruption.html

Soekanto, S., & Mamudji, S. (2001). *Penelitian hukum normatif (Suatu tinjauan singkat)*. Rajawali Pers.

Subekti, R., et al. (2022). *Buku Ajar Hukum Administrasi Negara*. Widina Bhakti Persada Bandung (Grup CV. Widina Media Utama).

Suganda, R. (2022). Metode pendekatan yuridis dalam memahami sistem penyelesaian sengketa ekonomi syariah. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Islam, 8*(3), 2859–2866. http://dx.doi.org/10.29040/jiei.v8i3.6485

Sumaryati, et al. (2019). *Pendidikan antikorupsi dalam keluarga, sekolah dan masyarakat*. UAD Press.

Wajdi, F., et al. (2024). *Pengantar pendidikan antikorupsi (Teori, metode dan praktik)*. Widina Media Utama.

Wibowo, A., et al. (2022). *Pengetahuan dasar antikorupsi dan integritas*. CV. Media Sains Indonesia.