

PUBLIC AWARENESS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION GOVERNANCE AND LEGAL AWARENESS REGARDING ANTI-CORRUPTION MEASURES

Erdianto Effendi^{*}, Mahrus Ali^{**}

^{*} Corresponding author, Faculty of Law, Riau University, Pekanbaru, Indonesia

Contact details: Faculty of Law, Riau University, Bina Widya KM Campus. 12.5, Simpang Baru, Kec. Tampan, Pekanbaru, Riau 28293, Indonesia

^{**} Faculty of Law, Islamic University of Indonesia, Yogyakarta, Indonesia



Abstract

How to cite this paper: Effendi, E., & Ali, M. (2023). Public awareness of public administration governance and legal awareness regarding anti-corruption measures. *Corporate Law & Governance Review*, 5(1), 8–16. <https://doi.org/10.22495/clgrv5i1p1>

Copyright © 2023 by Authors

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

ISSN Online: 2664-1542

ISSN Print: 2707-1111

Received: 21.04.2022

Accepted: 30.01.2023

JEL Classification: K3, R1, R5

DOI: 10.22495/clgrv5i1p1

This study focuses on the extent of the influence of the level of legal awareness in society of the corruption problem, because of the importance of finding the cause of corruption persistence in Riau, Indonesia. By mapping the knowledge and understanding of the community, this research can identify what preventive steps need to be taken by local and central governments as well as law enforcement officials to prevent corruption (Marzuki et al., 2022; Arifin et al., 2015). This is an applied research, where the sample data are taken from three districts in Riau Province, Indonesia. Hopefully, in the future, the government and law enforcement will be able to identify concrete steps so that they can suppress the occurrence of corruption in Riau Province. The results of the study conclude that the people of Riau are quite tolerant of understanding corruption because of differences in views about disgraceful values in society if it has anything to do with non-corruption. The model of eradicating corruption in the community must be improved by increasing public understanding of corruption and improving the administrative system of the regional and central governments.

Keywords: Legal Awareness, Regulation, Governance, Corruption, Public Perception

Authors' individual contribution: Conceptualization — E.E.; Methodology — M.A.; Validation — E.E.; Investigation — M.A.; Data Curation — M.A.; Writing — Original Draft — E.E. and M.A.; Writing — Review & Editing — E.E. and M.A.

Declaration of conflicting interests: The Authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements: The Authors would like to thank Riau University and the Islamic University of Indonesia. Hopefully, it can be a good guide for researchers and the local community in general.

1. INTRODUCTION

Corruption is an act that cannot only harm the state's finances but can also cause losses to the people's economy. Arief (2013) believes that the criminal act of corruption is very despicable, condemned, and very hated by most people; not only by the people and nation of Indonesia but also by the people of the nations of the world.

The increase in corruption cases in Indonesia is no exception in Riau Province so Riau is often in the spotlight of the national media because of corruption cases that occur in Riau Province. There have been three Riau governors who were examined by the Corruption Eradication Commission or *Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi* (KPK) and became prisoners. Several people have been arrested and detained by the KPK and other corruption law enforcement

agencies, but every year there is always news about the revelation of corruption cases in Riau Province. The perpetrators range from executives and legislators to ordinary people. Previous research highlighted that law enforcement become one of the main determinants of corruption prevention, besides the rule of law (Sewu, 2015; Jensenius & Wood, 2016; Moore, 2013).

Various opinions and research results suggest the causes of corruption, and some have suggested economic interest as an important consideration of corruption practices as being antecedent and consequence alike (Stolenberg, 2000; White, 2006). According to Robertson-Snape (1999) and Khairo et al. (2019), in the case of Indonesia itself, there are a number of analyses that attempt to explain why corruption is so prevalent in Indonesia. According to Robertson-Snape (1999), there are at least three factors that are suspected to be the cause of the development of corruption, collusion, and nepotism in Indonesia, namely political factors, economic factors, and Javanese cultural factors. Based on Robertson-Snape's (1999) view, political factors are characterized by a gap in accountability, transparency, democratic institutions, and a free press are important factors that contribute to the widespread corruption in Indonesian society, especially in the Old Order and New Order eras. Meanwhile, related to economic factors, extensive government intervention in the economy is considered by Robertson-Snape (1999) as the cause of corruption in Indonesia. Through this intervention, a number of financial benefits were generated for a small number of Indonesians, particularly those with power and those with political patronage with those in power. The third factor that Marzuki et al. (2022) and Arifin et al. (2015) assessed as contributing to the practice of corruption in Indonesia was a factor related to cultural explanations. The corruption practices that occurred during the New Order (1966-1998) had their roots in the cultural traditions of Indonesia's past, especially the culture prevailing in Java. In this regard, a number of corruption practices, according to Robertson-Snape (1999), are rooted in ancient Javanese customs so that they are then considered as something natural. These habits include the custom of giving gifts to rulers; loyalty to family is stronger than to the state; and the hierarchical, fixed, and patrimonial concept of Javanese power.

Although in general the peoples in Southeast Asia are called Malay (including Java), demographically Malay and Javanese are two different tribes and cultures. However, where the habitual factor is in giving gifts to the authorities; loyalty to family is stronger than to the state; as well as the concept of hierarchical, permanent, and patrimonial Javanese power is one of the contributors to the continued occurrence of corruption in Indonesia, it is also possible to occur and become a habit that is considered good by non-Javanese ethnic communities, especially in this case the Malays, especially Riau Malays (Robertson-Snape, 1999).

Isjoni (2007) mentions that Malays are very smart, intelligent, and very polite human beings throughout Asia. Also, very kind, and cleaner in their way of life, and in general so beautiful that no other human being can be compared to them. In this

context, Valentijn (1862) sees that the Malays are a special nation when compared to other nations he has met throughout Asia. Not only because of the perfect physical form but more emphasis on the moral and cultural aspects of Malay itself. The view given by Valentijn (1862) is very reasonable because the Malays are a nation that is very flexible towards higher external cultural accommodations so Malays are not only part of a tribal entity based on physical form (skin color, facial expression, etc.), but as a nation with a character of attitude as conveyed by Valentijn (1862). The accommodation to a higher culture is because the Malays themselves are constantly in contact with the nations in the archipelago even in very distant areas, especially the Indian area, Arabic, and Persian. Sunandar (2015) gives three important reasons that distinguish Malays from other races in the process of forming their culture in the past, namely maritime orientation, flexibility in social structure, and affiliation to Islam.

Some studies (Baptista, 2010; Dickerson, 2001; Rose-Ackerman, 2010; Dalton, 2006; Goodrich, 2013; Cuervo, 2018) found that culture is also partly responsible. On the other side, to a relationship between a specific cultural outlook to behavioral elements of integrity (Vapnek, 2016; Kim & Kim, 1997). The increasing number of corruption cases today, apart from the increase in the number of quantity cases, is also due to the widespread understanding of corruption. If corruption is literally only defined as an act of misappropriation or embezzlement of state or company money for personal or other people's gain, it is possible that state administrators have experienced fear and caution to continue to dare to do so. However, other types of corruption such as giving something or receiving something are sometimes considered as normal things that do not violate the law. Many of those who are caught in corruption cases feel they are not corrupt because according to their beliefs, they do not take state money, and do not take advantage for themselves (Ekasari et al., 2022; Rix, 2019; D'Amore et al., 2019).

The most common corruption that occurs without realizing it includes: first, they do not receive any benefits but are considered responsible because their subordinates enjoy state money in a way that is against the law. Second, receiving or giving something that they think is normal and proper in addition, the permissive attitude of the Riau people has also triggered the corrupt behavior of a number of state administrators in Riau. From the cultural aspect, the people of Riau are permissive, tend not to want to know about people's activities, and forgiving. For example, there is a form of violation, people are indifferent and seem to forgive. That is called legal culture. As Indonesian legal culture is deemed a tolerant legal culture, the social sanctions given by the community to corrupt perpetrators are very weak.

With such large losses as a result of acts of corruption committed by individuals or groups of people. The legal policy given to non-corruption perpetrators should be firm. The goal to be achieved in law is contained in its function where there is human protection. Law is the main tool in achieving the goal of embodiment in regulating and directing the order and behavior in society. The purpose

of the law is to seek justice, usefulness, and legal certainty, all of which will not be achieved if law enforcement is not in accordance with the existing rules. Law enforcement that is not optimal is caused by several factors (Rahardjo, 2006). First, the existing legal regulations are not ideal, meaning that the legal regulations used have legal loopholes that criminals can use to escape punishment. Second, law enforcers who do not carry out their duties and functions in accordance with legal regulations. The practice of corruption is one of the factors that causes law enforcers to be unable to carry out their duties and functions properly.

The law formed must be in accordance with public awareness of the law, which means that the formation of the law must be in line with developments and also the desires that occur in society (Wiryawan & Tjatrayasa, 2016). Laws that are in accordance with human or individual development are good. That is, if you look at the community's development of legal awareness and legal developments related to public awareness; it can be described as a legal basis which is actually a generalization of the development of the law itself.

To find out why people obey the law, it is necessary to look at the legal awareness that exists in the community where legal awareness is the most important factor that people obey the law. A regulation can be enforced if there is support from the community for the importance of legal awareness, where legal awareness is the basis for the smooth implementation of the law itself (Hartono, 1976).

Although in criminal law it is recognized that there is a principle of no crime without fault where a person cannot be prosecuted if he does not know about the disgrace of an act, this principle conflicts with another principle, namely the fictive principle of law where everyone is considered to know about the law. This ignorance does not prevent someone from being punished for doing something according to the formulation of the Anti-Corruption Law. The main problem in this research can be formulated as the legal awareness of the Riau Malay community towards corruption in the context of accelerating the eradication of corruption in Riau Province. The second formulation is what models and methods are appropriate to increase the legal awareness of the Riau Malay community towards corruption. Starting from the problem above, it is very important to investigate whether it is true that the Riau Malay community does not fully understand the understanding of the crime of corruption, so it is necessary to conduct a study on how legal awareness, especially the understanding of the people of Riau Province towards corruption in the form of research legal awareness of the Riau Malay community towards corruption crimes in the context of accelerating corruption eradication in Riau Province.

The structure of this paper is as follows. Section 1 is an introduction that contains the reasons for the background of this paper. Section 2 reviews the relevant literature. Section 3 analyzes the methodology used in conducting the research. Section 4 contains the research results and discussion. Section 5 is the conclusion of the study.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The crime of corruption has destroyed a country's economy. The development of corruption in Indonesia is still relatively high, while its eradication is still very slow (Syarifuddin, 2021). This is because the government seems to have lost its function to deal with the perpetrators of corruption. The government is not able to overcome the problems that occur. The law seems weak in dealing with problems even though it is known that corruption is very detrimental to the nation and state (Hamzah, 1984).

In general, the Indonesian people, especially the Malays, as well as what happened to the Javanese, as stated by Robertson-Snape (1999) above, consider giving something (a gift) to someone as a form of respect. It is unethical to not give a gift as a form of thanks after being helped with something. Ignorance of the disgrace of an act as a criminal act of corruption is related to legal awareness where everyone's legal awareness is at different levels, from the lowest to the highest. Tagel (2013) determined the level of legal awareness can be studied from the points of knowledge of legal regulations, knowledge of the content of legal regulations, attitude towards legal regulations, and fairy patterns of legal behavior (Marzuki et al., 2022; Einbinder, 2019; Nichols, 2001; Bushey, 2015).

The lack of attention and studies on the role of public participation and public accountability in efforts to eradicate corruption has had an impact on the inadequate quality of community participation itself (Rizki et al., 2019). Therefore, it is necessary to raise awareness for every citizen that reporting something corrupt is a rewarding activity because it can help eradicate corruption. As explained that the public is given the right to assist the government to seek, obtain and provide information on allegations of corruption crimes and the right to provide suggestions and opinions responsibly to law enforcement officers who handle corruption cases.

At this time the public tends to be silent about acts of corruption. In addition to being troublesome, also consider that the report will not be responded to honestly. As long as people think so, it will be very difficult to expect people's behavior to help prevent/eradicate corruption (Bunga et al., 2019).

The legal awareness of the Riau people needs to be examined because many major corruption cases occur in Riau. Some of the corruption cases that occurred involved the governors and regents in Riau. Based on the records of Riau Online (<https://www.riauonline.co.id/>), since 2003, 10 regional heads, both still in office and no longer in office, have been involved in corruption cases when they were in power. From the 10 cases, it can be grouped that only the two regional heads mentioned above were involved in bribery cases. Meanwhile, 8 others were involved in corruption cases in Article 2 and/or Article 3, namely acts against the law that cause state financial losses to enrich themselves or others. The crime of corruption faced by 8 regional heads is due to their responsibility to make decisions that are considered by law enforcement as an act against the law. Those who enjoy the benefits do not have to be the regional head of 8 people.

The existence of an element of benefiting oneself or others in the Anti-Corruption Law causes many officials to be named suspects and then convicts, in the community's view, they are not seen

as corrupt as long as the person concerned does not enjoy the benefits. Thus, it is only natural that they still have public support politically. The public believes that the person concerned is not corrupt and has not committed any disgraceful act. This phenomenon does not only occur in Riau Province but occurs in almost all levels of society.

From the perspective of classical punishment theory, retaliation theory justifies punishment because someone has committed a crime. Supporters of this theory include Immanuel Kant who said "*Fiat justitia ruat coelum*". Kant based his theory on moral/ethical principles. Another proponent is Hegel who says that law is the embodiment of freedom, while crime is a challenge to law and justice (Hafidz, 2020). Therefore, according to him, the perpetrators of crime must be eradicated. In terms of gifts and bribery, there are some definitions in Indonesian laws. Gifts are family-friendly gifts and are not related to public positions. However, gifts received by state officials or civil servants can be referred to as gratuities. The gifts evolved from being initially neutral to being illegal. Gratification is considered illegal if it is received by public officials or civil servants related to their position and contrary to their duties such as bribery and extortion. Gratification is one type of corruption crime regulated in Articles 12B and 12C of the 2001 Anti-Corruption Law.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study uses a sample of respondents conducted in three districts in Riau Province, namely: Bengkalis Regency, Kampar Regency, and Pekanbaru City. Inadvertently, this survey of the community in three different locations shows that most people think that corruption is if the person concerned receives benefits for an unlawful act committed by someone. Another advantage is that it is considered an administrative error so that one does not have to be criminally responsible but only administratively accountable. Of the 200 respondents who were asked, most of them agreed that it was called corruption if an action against the law causes an advantage for the person concerned or other people.

Table 1. Misappropriation/embezzlement of state or company money as corruption

Answer	Amount	Percentage
Strongly agree	98	49%
Agree	63	31.5%
Doubtful	15	7.5%
Disagree	6	3%
Strongly disagree	8	4%

However, when asked whether the person concerned should enjoy the benefits, most of the respondents answered that the person who should receive the benefit is the person concerned. Regarding bribery, although according to the legal system, it is considered a despicable act which is therefore categorized as a criminal act of corruption; in the community it is considered a normal and reasonable act. This is in line with previous research that found bribery as the most common practice in corruption (Forrest & Norris, 2013; Nicholas, 2000; Salbu, 1999a; Spahn, 2009). This seems to be in line

with giving and receiving which is considered a commendable and noble act according to cultural standards, especially Malay culture. It is difficult to distinguish in practice which gifts constitute bribes, gifts, or extortion.

Gifts are usually exchanged as part of an orderly social relationship. On the other hand, people almost universally condemn bribery, considering it undesirable, harmful, and destructive. While bribes are given to influence the outcome of political, bureaucratic, business, or professional decisions or relationships. Gifts are legal, while bribes are illegal (Marbun, 2018).

Gifts always refer to the symbolic meaning associated with the social bond between the partner's and the giver's self-identity and as a ritual, gifts shape current and future expectations and behaviors of participants. Hence gifts have an important communicative function. It sends a symbolic message from the giver, which is interpreted by the receiver. Rewards can be used strategically as a signal of intention to build relationships and shorten social distance (Komter, 2007).

Not all bribes are gift related. Sometimes a bribe is a more instrumental transaction with the primary function of obtaining an immediate and one-time benefit for the participant. The most typical examples of non-gift-type corrupt transactions are bribing traffic police, parking attendants, customs officials, or other street-level bureaucrats. They usually occur "on the spot" when the actors do not know each other and it is unlikely that they will meet again in the future (Mustofa, 2013). Here cash bribes and instant responses dominate transactions.

Table 2. Respondents' opinion on whether giving and receiving something is fair and not against the law

Answer	Amount	Percentage
Strongly agree	37	18.5%
Agree	104	52%
Doubtful	28	14%
Disagree	24	12%
Strongly disagree	7	3.5%

Table 3. Respondents' opinion on state officials who accept money from other people and not taking state money is not considered corruption

Answer	Amount	Percentage
Corruption	66	33%
Doubtful	28	14%
No corruption	106	53%

Likewise, the attitude of people who feel that giving something as a gift to someone who is meritorious such as a government official is not a crime.

Table 4. Respondents' attitude to giving something (a gift) to someone is a form of appreciation and remuneration

Answer	Amount	Percentage
Strongly agree	65	32.5%
Agree	110	55%
Doubtful	13	6.5%
Disagree	8	4%
Strongly disagree	4	2%

¹ From Latin "Let justice be done though the heavens fall".

In terms of the types of corruption that occurred, some people answered that extortion was the most common type of corruption, with a comparison as illustrated in Table 5.

Table 5. The most common type of corruption in society

<i>Answer</i>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Extortion	76	38%
Bribery	56	28%
Collusion	45	22.5%
Nepotism	23	11.5%

Furthermore, to eradicate corruption, the people who are the respondents of this research are relatively permissive and choose to let it go because they feel that it is not their business.

Table 6. Respondents' attitude when seeing and/or knowing there is a corruption crime

<i>Answer</i>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Report it	112	56%
Advise him	32	16%
Let it go	14	7%
View conditions	52	26%

Table 7. Respondents' attitude to forgiving or not forgiving the perpetrators of corruption or a form of law violation that occurs in society

<i>Answer</i>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Forgive	12	6%
Think	52	26%
Do not forgive	136	68%
Support it	0	0%

Referring to the data in Table 7, regarding the legal awareness of the Riau Malay community towards corruption, most of the people actually already know about corruption. People understand that corruption is a despicable act based on cultural and religious values. Thus, to assess the element of legal awareness, namely the legal knowledge of the community related to corruption, it is still low. The people who were respondents in this study were relatively permissive and chose to give up because they felt that it was none of their business.

Table 8. Respondents' opinion on the success of eradicating corruption in Riau

<i>Answer</i>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Optimistic	45	22,5%
Doubtful	115	57,5%
Less optimistic	30	15%
Not optimistic	10	5%

From the explanation above, with the results of the data obtained from a survey conducted in three districts in Riau regarding public legal awareness of corruption, it can be said that most of the people actually already know about the dangers of corruption. People hate corruption and the perpetrators of corruption. However, in this case, the public still does not fully understand the juridical acts of corruption. There is a difference in the understanding of corruption by the empirical community and law enforcement. The Riau Malay community understands corruption in the sense of disgrace based on cultural and religious values, while law

enforcement understands corruption is an act of harming state finances with the aim of benefiting themselves or others as stated in the applicable laws and regulations. Thus, to assess the element of legal awareness, namely the legal knowledge of the community in this case related to corruption, it is still low.

Ideally, the law formalizes what the community considers to be reprehensible so that in enforcing it law enforcement does not experience conflict and is not challenged. In the case of conventional crimes such as theft or murder, there is no debate and there is no difference in the public's perspective on the disgrace of the act so that the community fully supports law enforcement officials in enforcing the law against cases of general crimes or conventional crimes.

Anti-Corruption Law is different from the Criminal Code. It is presented not only to formalize what the community considers a disgraceful act but at the same time to change the perspective of society or the despicable act. Thus, if the first legal awareness is related to public knowledge, in fact, the community already knows but does not fully understand, namely related to the second element of legal awareness, namely understanding that they have not fully understood the crime of corruption. Most of the officials involved in corruption do not intentionally want to enrich themselves but rather have a lack of understanding of the clear definition of corruption. Related to the next element, namely the attitude and behavior of the community are influenced by this understanding. Ignorance causes people to be permissive and choose to tolerate corrupt practices and even feel that they are not guilty when committing criminal acts of corruption such as receiving or giving officers tips and money, it is even considered a noble and commendable act.

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Eradication of criminal acts of corruption reached its peak in the reform era as a reaction to the demands of students and the people who overthrew the New Order regime who were accused of corruption, collusion, and nepotism. In fact, from the Old Order until the end of the New Order, corruption eradication activities have been continuously carried out. It also shows that a crime called corruption has also been going on for a long time until now and has touched perpetrators from low levels to major scandals involving state officials (Erdianto, 2014).

This also shows that the conclusion that public opinion about corruption is increasing in the current era is not entirely true. Corrupt practices in the administration of government in Indonesia have even occurred since the era of the Dutch East Indies. Likewise, collusion between businessmen and the colonial government and local government has been happening for a long time. Thus, although corruption is not a culture in the sense that it is the result of the creation, taste, and initiative of the Indonesian people, it must be honestly admitted that corruption has become entrenched in all levels of society. Some studies have widely examined the role of the corporate sector in corruption practices (Tobolowsky, 2016; Hess, 2015; Salbu, 2018; Stolenberg, 2000; Hess & Ford, 2008).

The presence of the KPK as an institution with an “extraordinary” character has given an extraordinary “shock effect” on government officials including other law enforcement officers such as police, prosecutors, and judges. However, after approximately 12 years of eradicating corruption by the KPK, there has not been a significant change in the cultural character of the community towards corruption. The judicial cases processed by the police, prosecutors, and the KPK itself encourage the public to assume that the more it is enforced, the more corruption cases will occur. It is still necessary to further investigate whether it is indeed an increase in corrupt behavior or whether the disclosure of corruption cases is increasing. At this point, it is the disclosure of corruption cases that has greatly increased. Corrupt behavior is actually reduced. The level of the prudence of state officials is much higher than before the existence of the KPK.

This means that judging from the deterrence theory (Thomas, 2016; Jensenius & Wood, 2016), the aspect of deterrence with shock therapy carried out by the KPK is sufficient. The resolution of corruption cases that lead to the conviction of the perpetrators is sufficient if viewed from the aspect of deterrence, especially for the perpetrators and also for the potential perpetrators.

From the perspective of classical punishment theory, the retaliation theory justifies punishment because someone has committed a crime. Proponents of this theory include Kant (Gomasca, 2013) and Hegel who says that law is the embodiment of freedom, while crime is a challenge to law and justice. Therefore, according to him, criminals should be eliminated. According to Thomas Aquinas, vengeance is in accordance with God’s teachings because it must be retaliated against criminals (Syarifuddin, 2019).

The sentencing process, which is a kind of primary choice for the settlement of criminal acts of corruption, actually gives rise to new problems such as the overcapacity of correctional institutions because every day there are more corruption convicts, not to mention that in practice the perpetrators of corruption receive “different” treatment than other inmates. There are two different treatments: first, which is negative for corruptors but positive for eradicating corruption, is the prohibition of remission for convicted, impoverishment of corruptors is needed or not, are new problems that arise with the policy of punishment for perpetrators of corruption. Second, it is common knowledge that corruption convicts still get various facilities that are not obtained by ordinary prisoners (Erdianto, 2014).

From a sociological perspective, Soekanto (2014) stated that the effectiveness of a sanction is influenced by several things, namely the characteristics or nature of the sanctions themselves, public perception, the period of application of negative sanctions, characteristics of the person being sanctioned, opportunities that are indeed given by a community culture, the characteristics of the behavior that needs to be controlled or monitored with negative sanctions, and community desire or social support for the behavior to be controlled (Arief, 2013). In this case, Sasmito (2017) also said that the use of criminal law must always

uphold the principles of human rights. Therefore, it is necessary to pay attention to the following matters. First, erasing the enforcement of criminal laws for retaliation. In this case, there are other interests, namely, the personal interests of the perpetrators must also be guaranteed so that the terms “crime” by the government and “the victim of abuse of power” do not appear. Second, in terms of the use of criminal law, if the victim is unclear. Third, in terms of the use of criminal law to achieve certain goals, if it can still be achieved by other equally effective means, and with less loss (principle of subsidiarity). Fourth, in terms of the use of criminal law, if the losses due to punishment are greater than the losses due to the crime itself. Fifth, in terms of the use of criminal law, if the by-products caused are more detrimental than the criminalized act. Sixth, in terms of the use of criminal law, if it does not get community support. Seventh, in terms of the use of criminal law, if it is thought to be ineffective. Eighth, criminal law must be able to maintain harmony and balance between the interests of the state, the interests of society, and the interests of the individual. Ninth, the use of criminal law must be in harmony with other non-penal preventive measures. Tenth, the use of criminal law must be able to reduce the main factors that are criminogenic. Eleventh, the formulation of criminal acts must be correct and meticulous in describing prohibited acts. Twelfth, criminalized acts must be clearly described. Thirteenth, the principle of differentiation of interests that damaged, the act committed, and the status of the perpetrator in the framework of culpability (Salbu, 1999b; Backer, 2005).

In relation to the eradication of corruption in Riau Province, it can be illustrated that the efforts to take action by the KPK or other corruption law enforcers have been quite effective in reducing the number of corruptions in Riau. Considering that crime prevention efforts through the “non-penal” route are more of a preventive measure for the occurrence of crime, the main objective is to address the conducive factors that cause crime. These conducive factors are, among others, centered on problems or conditions that can directly or indirectly breed crime. Thus, viewed from the point of view of criminal politics at a macro and global level, penal efforts occupy a key and strategic position from criminal political efforts. A key and strategic position is in tackling the causes and conditions that give rise to crime (Einbinder, 2019; Fonseca, 2019).

For corruption cases in Riau, an integrative policy model is needed for both enforcement and prevention in the scheme based on the type of corruption as follows. First, prevention of harming state finances and embezzlement in the office can be carried out with the efforts, such as improved understanding of state officials regarding corruption. Most of the corruption suspects became suspects due to their lack of understanding of the true meaning of corruption. Many of them do not realize that as long as they do not enjoy the benefits of unlawful acts that harm state finances, it is not a crime of corruption.

Another effort is increasing the role of the internal supervisory apparatus. The role of

the internal supervisory apparatus needs to be increased so that not all cases of state crimes must end with the means of criminal law. If the internal supervisor finds a state loss, it is sufficient to recommend a refund of the loss except for officials who have the intention of intentionally enjoying personal gain, causing state losses. The role of internal supervisors is also needed in terms of assessing whether, in a decision by a state administration official, there is a procedural error or not. If the results of the audit of the internal supervisory apparatus there is a loss so the work is not continued. If the internal supervisor's assessment has been carried out, then in the future there should be no more different assessments from law enforcement.

5. CONCLUSION

The results concluded that the perception of corruption of the Riau people is quite tolerant due to differences in views about the disgraceful value in society with the despicable value in the positive law regarding corruption. The model for eradicating corruption in the community is by increasing public understanding of corruption and improving the administration and administration system of the government.

So, it is recommended revisions to the Anti-Corruption Law regarding the administrative responsibilities of officials who do not enjoy the proceeds of corruption. Officials who do not intend or inadvertently enjoy personal gain at the expense of the state, should not be charged with criminal liability, but it is sufficient to impose administrative responsibility.

Second, in the cases of prevention of bribery, gratification, and extortion. As these three types of corruption are related to the attitude of the people who want to take the easy path in managing their interests, there is no other way that can be taken to prevent these three types of criminal acts except to increase the integrity of the public service apparatus, which is carried out with technology, for example, with online system services. There has been much evidence that the online system is able to prevent bribery, gratification, and extortion

practices such as passport processing, acceptance of civil servants, and acceptance of new students at state universities, so far it has been able to prevent bribery, extortion, and gratification practices. The public also needs to be socialized and change their perspective on bribery, gratification, and extortion. The public must be able to distinguish the giving of gifts from bribes or gratuities, namely where bribes and gratifications are related to the handling of something before the business is finished. After the business is finished, the public must also be guaranteed by the state that giving gifts after the business is finished is not a bribe or gratuity. The distinction between gifts and bribes or gratuities must be clear and firm not only for public understanding but also at the law enforcement level. With this understanding, both parties, the community and law enforcement, have the same understanding. Campaign for slogans such as "gift yes, bribe no gratuity". When a gift is called a gift and when a gift becomes a bribe and gratification must be clear and firm.

In case of someone felt blackmailed, they must take action to report, while the state must ensure the confidentiality of the reporter's identity. If the service is an online system, then there is no bargaining in the management. Against corrupt practices in the procurement of goods and services, the only solution that can be taken is to apply an online system for goods and services procurement activities.

The limitation of this research is that only the applied methods are used and data samples from three districts in Riau Province, namely Bengkalis, Kampar, and Pekanbaru City are taken. Where in the real approach related to efforts to increase a good understanding in the community of the dangers of corruption, it is still not enough to eradicate corruption in the province of Riau. Real and firm action is also needed from the government in dealing with cases of corruption. So, the authors recommend researching in the future with different methods, such as with real actions which must be done so that perpetrators of corruption are deterrent and do not commit acts of corruption again in the future.

REFERENCES

1. Arief, B. N. (2013). Kebijakan reformulasi ancaman pidana mati tindak pidana korupsi dalam peraturan perundang-undangan. *Masalah-Masalah Hukum*, 42(1), 23-33. <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/164728-ID-kebijakan-reformulasi-ancaman-pidana-mat.pdf>
2. Arifin, T., Trinugroho, I., Prabowo, M. A., Sutaryo, S., & Muhtar, M. (2015). Local governance and corruption: Evidence from Indonesia. *Corporate Ownership & Control*, 12(4-1), 194-199. <https://doi.org/10.22495/cocv12i4c1p3>
3. Backer, L. C. (2005). Emasculated Men, Effeminate Law in the United States, Zimbabwe and Malaysia. *Yale Journal of Law & Feminism*, 17(1), 1-64. https://www.academia.edu/3472238/Emasculated_Men_Effeminate_Law_in_the_United_States_Zimbabwe_and_Malaysia
4. Baptista, R. (2010). Culture, political institutions, and the regulation of entry. In A. Freytag & R. Thurik (Eds.), *Entrepreneurship and culture* (pp. 55-77). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-87910-7_4
5. Bunga, M., Maroa, M. D., Arief, A., & Djanggih, H. (2019). Urgensi peran serta masyarakat dalam upaya pencegahan dan pemberantasan tindak pidana korupsi. *Law Reform*, 15(1), 85-97. <https://doi.org/10.14710/lr.v15i1.23356>
6. Bushey, A. J. (2015). Second generation rule of law and anti-corruption programming abroad: Comparing existing US government and international best practices to Rachel Kleinfeld's advancing the rule of law abroad: Next generation reform. *Houston Journal of International Law*, 37, 139-156. <http://www.hjil.org/articles/hjil-37-1-bushey.pdf>
7. Cuervo, H. A. E. (2018). Challenging corruption in Latin American politics. *U.C. Davis Journal of International Law and Policy*, 25, 159. <https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/ucdl25&div=11&id=&page=>

8. D'Amore, G., Lepore, L., Landriani, L., Paolone, F., & Pozzoli, M. (2019). Ownership structure, firm performance and corruption: An empirical analysis of EU countries. In S. Esposito De Falco, F. Alvino, & A. Kostyuk (Eds.), *New challenges in corporate governance: Theory and practice* (pp. 399-415). Virtus Interpress. https://doi.org/10.22495/ncpr_49
9. Dalton, M. M. (2006). Efficiency v. morality: The codification of cultural norms in the foreign corrupt practices act. *New York University Journal of Law and Business*, 2, 583-563. <https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/nyujolbu2&div=20&id=&page=>
10. Dickerson, C. M. (2001). Culture and trans-border effects: Northern individualism meets third-generation human rights. *Rutgers Law Review*, 54, 865. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=433560>
11. Einbinder, F. (2019). Corruption abroad: From conflict to co-operation: A comparison of French and American law and practice. *International Comparative, Policy & Ethics Law Review*, 3, 667. <https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/icpelr3&div=25&id=&page=>
12. Ekasari, R., Rodli, A. F., & Arif, D. (2022). The effect of strategic planning on the implementation of independent campus learning. *Corporate Governance and Organizational Behavior Review*, 6(2), 300-306. <https://doi.org/10.22495/cgobrv6i2sip14>
13. Erdianto. (2014). Meninjau kembali kebijakan pemidanaan pelaku tindak pidana korupsi. *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum: Fakultas Hukum Universitas Riau*, 4(2), 229-241. <https://jih.ejournal.unri.ac.id/index.php/JIH/article/view/2791/2724>
14. Fanto, J. A. (2010). Organizational liability. *Journal of Law and Policy*, 19(1), 45-54. <https://brooklynworks.brooklaw.edu/faculty/169/>
15. Fonseca, R. C. (2019). Mexico's National Anti-Corruption System: Reaching the finish line? *The University of Miami Inter-American Law Review*, 50(2), 85-121. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26788365>
16. Forrest, M. P., & Norris, J. T. (2013). Bribery and China go together like Yin and Yang. *Cumberland Law Review*, 44(3), 423-433. <https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/cumlr44&div=21&id=&page=>
17. Gomasasca, P. (2013). The job's dilemma: Fiat justitia, ruat caelum. *European Journal for Philosophy of Religion*, 5(3), 95-115. <https://doi.org/10.24204/ejpr.v5i3.221>
18. Goodrich, B. N. (2013). The five W's of corruption: An Analysis of the disease of corruption in South America and how the search for a cure may impact the global rule of law. *Regent Journal of International Law*, 10, 183. <https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/regjil10&div=17&id=&page=>
19. Hafidz, J. (2020). Operasi Tangkap Tangan (OTT) in Corruption crimes based on sociological perspective of law enforcement. *Lex Publica*, 7(1), 40-58. <https://journal.appti.org/index.php/lexpublica/article/view/104>
20. Hamzah, A. (1984). *Korupsi di Indonesia: Masalah dan pemecahannya*. Gramedia.
21. Hartono, S. (1976). *Peranan kesadaran hukum rakyat dalam pembaharuan hukum*. Bina Cipta.
22. Hess, D. (2015). Combating corruption in international business: The big questions. *Ohio North University Law Review*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2649121>
23. Hess, D., & Ford, C. L. (2008). Corporate corruption and reform undertakings: A new approach to an old problem. *Cornell International Law Journal*, 41(2), 307-346. <https://scholarship.law.cornell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1724&context=cilj>
24. Isjoni. (2007). *Orang Melayu di zaman yang berubah*. Pustaka Pelajar.
25. Jensenius, F. R., & Wood, A. K. (2016). Caught in the act but not punished: On elite rule of law and deterrence. *Penn State Journal of Law & International Affairs*, 4(2), 686-717. <https://elibrary.law.psu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1144&context=jlia>
26. Khairo, F., Busroh, F. F., & Riviyusnita, R. (2019). Urgency of separation of powers in state institutions to defend against corruption in Indonesia. *Lex Publica*, 6(2), 36-42. <https://journal.appti.org/index.php/lexpublica/article/view/102>
27. Kim, J., & Kim, J.-B. (1997). Cultural differences in the crusade against international bribery: Rice-cake expenses in Korea and the foreign corrupt practices act. *Washington International Law Journal*, 6(3), 549. <https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/wilj/vol6/iss3/3/>
28. Komter, A. (2007). Gifts and social relations: The mechanisms of reciprocity. *International Sociology*, 22(1), 93-107. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580907070127>
29. Kurniawan, T. (2011). Peranan akuntabilitas publik dan partisipasi masyarakat dalam pemberantasan korupsi di pemerintahan. *Bisnis & Birokrasi: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi dan Organisasi*, 16(2), 116-121. <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/jbb/vol16/iss2/8/>
30. Marbun, S. K. (2018). *Studi nalar hadis tentang praktik korupsi, gratifikasi, dan suap* [Master's thesis, Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara]. Repository UIN Sumatera Utara. <http://repository.uinsu.ac.id/4221/>
31. Marzuki, H., Hasnan, S., & Ali, M. M. (2022). Contemporary review of corruption risk studies [Special issue]. *Corporate Governance and Organizational Behavior Review*, 6(2), 255-267. <https://doi.org/10.22495/cgobrv6i2sip10>
32. Moore, S. A. (2013). In the shadow of the law: An examination of corruption and the rule of law in Armenia. *Boston University International Law Journal*, 31, 199-227. https://www.bu.edu/ilj/files/2014/05/Moore_JCI3.pdf
33. Mustofa, M. (2013). Suap menyuap dan mafia peradilan di Indonesia: Telaah kriminologis. *Masalah-Masalah Hukum*, 42(1), 1-5. <https://ejournal.undip.ac.id/index.php/mmh/article/view/5854>
34. Nicholas, P. M. (2000). The myth of anti-bribery as transnational intrusion. *Cornell International Law Journal*, 33(3), 627-656. <https://scholarship.law.cornell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1477&context=cilj>
35. Nichols, P. M. (2001). The fit between changes to the international corruption regime and indigenous perceptions of corruption in Kazakhstan. *University of Pennsylvania Journal of International Law*, 22(4), 863-973. <https://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/jil/vol22/iss4/3/>
36. Rahardjo, S. (2006). *Hukum dalam jagat ketertiban*. UKI Pers. http://repository.uki.ac.id/1772/1/Satjipto%20Rahardjo_Hukum%20dalam%20Jagat%20Ketertiban.pdf
37. Rix, M. (2019). The new Australian system of corporate governance: Board governance and company performance in a changing corporate governance environment. *Corporate Law & Governance Review*, 1(2), 29-41. <https://doi.org/10.22495/clgrv1i2p3>
38. Rizki, L. T., Cahyono, M., & Soesaty, B. (2019). Aligning governance in structuring policies for the development of Pancasila ideology and national resilience. *Lex Publica*, 6(1), 10-17. <https://journal.appti.org/index.php/lexpublica/article/view/121>

39. Robertson-Snape, F. (1999). Corruption, collusion and nepotism in Indonesia. *Third World Quarterly*, 20(3), 589-602. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436599913703>
40. Rose-Ackerman, S. (2010). Corruption: Greed, culture and the state. *Yale Law Journal Online*, 120, 125-140. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1648859>
41. Salbu, S. R. (1999a). Are extraterritorial restrictions on bribery a viable and desirable international policy goal under the global conditions of the late twentieth century? *Yale Journal of International Law*, 24, 223-229. https://openyls.law.yale.edu/bitstream/handle/20.500.13051/6393/09_24YaleJIntL223_1999_.pdf?sequence=2
42. Salbu, S. R. (1999b). The foreign corrupt practices act as a threat to global harmony. *Michigan Journal of International Law*, 20(3), 419-449. <https://repository.law.umich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1424&context=mjil>
43. Salbu, S. R. (2018). Mitigating the harshness of FCPA enforcement through a qualifying good-faith compliance defense. *American Business Law Journal*, 55(3), 475-535. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ablj.12124>
44. Sasmito, J. (2017). Application of the retroactive principle in criminal law on gross human rights violations. *Lex Publica*, 4(2), 775-781. <https://journal.appthi.org/index.php/lexpublica/article/download/82/83>
45. Sewu, P. L. S. (2015). Pemberantasan tindak pidana korupsi pasca ratifikasi the United Nations Convention Against Corruption dan pembaharuan hukum pidana Indonesia. *Lex Publica*, 1(2), 101-118. <https://journal.appthi.org/index.php/lexpublica/article/download/16/15>
46. Soekanto, S. (2014). *Sosiologi suatu pengantar*. Rineka Cipta.
47. Spahn, E. (2009). International bribery: The moral imperialism critiques. *Minnesota Journal of International Law*, 18(1), 155-226. <https://scholarship.law.umn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1248&context=mjil>
48. Stolenberg, C. D. (2000). Globalization, "Asian values", and economic reform: The impact of tradition and change on ethical values in Chinese business. *Cornell International Law Journal*, 33(3), 711-730. <https://scholarship.law.cornell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1482&context=cilj>
49. Sunandar, S. (2015). Melayu dalam tantangan globalisasi: Refleksi sejarah dan berubahnya sistem referensi budaya. *Khatulistiwa*, 5(1). <https://moraref.kemeng.go.id/documents/article/97406410605886790>
50. Syarifuddin, M. (2019). Pembaruan sistem pemidanaan dalam praktik peradilan modern. *Lex Publica*, 6(1), 1-9. <https://journal.appthi.org/index.php/lexpublica/article/view/97>
51. Syarifuddin, M. (2021). Legal heuristic approach in judicial practice. *Lex Publica*, 8(2), 1-13. <https://journal.appthi.org/index.php/lexpublica/article/view/117>
52. Tagel, D. P. (2013). Kesadaran hukum masyarakat pengguna jalan di Kota Denpasar. *Jurnal Magister Hukum Udayana*, 2(2), Article 44216. <https://ojs.unud.ac.id/index.php/jmhu/article/view/5939>
53. Thomas, A. (2016). A reimagined foreign corrupted practices act: From deterrence to restoration and beyond. *Temple International and Comparative Law Journal*, 30, 385-412. <https://sites.temple.edu/ticlj/files/2017/02/30.2.Thomas-TICLJ.pdf>
54. Tobolowsky, Z. B. (2016). Brazil finally cleans up its act with the clean company act: The story of a nation's long-overdue fight against corruption. *Law and Business Review of the Americas*, 22(4), 383-414. <https://scholar.smu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1002&context=lbra>
55. Valentijn, F. (1862). *Oud en nieuw Oost-Indiën*. Van Kesteren.
56. Vapnek, J. (2016). Cultural factors and ethical integrity. *Hastings International and Comparative Law Review*, 39(1), 123-135. https://repository.uchastings.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1805&context=hastings_international_comparative_law_review
57. White, A. (2006). The paradox of corruption as antithesis to economic development: Does corruption undermine economic development in Indonesia and China, and why are the experiences different in each country? *Asian-Pacific Law and Policy Journal*, 8(1), 1-34. https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/sol_research/785/
58. Wiryawan, P. A., & Tjatrayasa, M. (2016). Analisis hukum penyebab terjadinya tindak pidana korupsi dan pertanggungjawaban pidananya. *Kertha Wicara: Journal Ilmu Hukum*, 5(2), 1-5. <https://ojs.unud.ac.id/index.php/kerthawicara/article/view/19138>