



The Effective Management of Corruption Treatment in Indonesia

Maisondra

Lecturer on Faculty of Government Management, Institute of Public Administration (IPDN), Indonesia

<http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v7i8.2020>

Abstract

The facts show that corruption among Government Officials is considered an acceptable behavior, even though the impact is tremendous. If there are officials who reject or are anti-corruption, they will be removed or will be eliminated by themselves. Meanwhile, internal and external controls are not effective in overcoming it. There must be innovation in efforts to eradicate corruption in Indonesia. The findings of this study indicate that government officials in their work environment will be very effective if involved in efforts to prevent and eradicate acts of corruption. This is manifested in 2 forms of effective management, namely: (1) Apparatus Complaint Management and (2) Suggestion Box Management. Apparatus Complaint Management has the character of conveying corrupt behavior or actions that occur in the apparatus work environment. Suggestion Box Management is an opportunity provided for all officials to convey their ideas and input to prevent and eradicate acts of corruption in the workplace.

Keywords: *Corruption; Apparatus Complaint Management; Suggestion Box Management*

A. Introduction

Corruption among the apparatus (PNS / ASN) cannot be tolerated because of its tremendous impact. Corruption has undermined existing development plans, implementation and results. Although the state losses incurred by private corporations are also quite large, it can be said that they also come from corrupt officials. Corruption has become a behavior and is tolerated. Therefore, the efforts to prevent and prosecute corruption by the apparatus must also be carried out in an extraordinary manner. There must be innovations in the efforts to prevent and prosecute corruption by the apparatus. One of them is by opening access to apparatus complaints that is smooth, safe, connected, guaranteed confidentiality, presumption of innocence, follow-up, and rewarding officials who complain. This must continue until efforts to prevent and act against corruption are also considered as behavior and understandable.

Meanwhile, the existing internal control system is considered very ineffective. Internal control was overwhelmed by strong superior intervention. The solution is determined by the supervisor, usually the highest boss. External supervision of the existing institutions also has limitations, while corruption occurs at all levels and in various forms which are constantly evolving and having specificities in each field of work. Every new mode of corruption is usually detected only after a long period of time, because the perpetrators and their implementation occur within an agency or institution that is full of protections that are difficult for outsiders to enter. Only the apparatus inside knows in advance and in detail.

Information from officials who are present and active in an agency or institution is very much needed in efforts to prevent and prosecute corruption. This information must be properly managed and utilized. For this reason, it is necessary to build and develop Apparatus Complaint Management, so that efforts to prevent and prosecute corruption are more effective, meaning that they are detected earlier, the problems are known in more detail, and can be prevented more quickly. There may even be less costs required to prevent and expose a corruption problem.

So, this research aims to reveal the facts of corruption that occur in government agencies which will be used as input to create a Apparatus Complaint Management model in order to empower the apparatus itself to prevent and disclose corruption in their respective work agencies. This will be a new innovation in efforts to eradicate corruption in Indonesia, because there has never been a single model that directly involves officials in their respective agencies in efforts to prevent corruption. Utilization of Information and Technology (IT) will be able to help develop this model later.

B. Research Method

This research uses descriptive qualitative research type, which is an analytical understanding process based on the methodology used to investigate a situation about the phenomenon of corruption in Indonesia and its management. In this approach, the researcher creates a complex picture, examines words, reports in detail from the informant's point of view, and conducts studies on natural social situations (Bungin, 2007: 69). According to Nawawi (1989: 72), qualitative descriptive research is aimed at describing existing phenomena, both natural phenomena and man-made phenomena, in this case those related to corruption. So, this qualitative descriptive research undertaken seeks to describe and interpret something that is taking place related to corruption in the civil service environment.

C. Research Findings and Analysis

1. Facts of corruption in the field

The findings of this study indicate that: 1) Apparatus understanding in various agencies about corruption is quite good. 2) Corruption exists on a large, medium and small scale, but not all corrupt practices can be exposed by internal and external supervision. 3) In addition to the general modes of corruption, each agency has unique modes that may differ from those in other agencies. 4) Some officials are aware of corrupt practices that have occurred in their institutions, but they respond differently, among others: some understand it, some argue internally and externally, and some make complaints, both formally or not (anonymous). 5) Even though some of the apparatus knew, they felt afraid and did not know how to complain. 6) Officials who question corruption in their institutions have various motives, namely: hate / or do not like corruption, do not get opportunities, do not participate in the results of corruption, fear or give up on corruption, have a small budget, and do not know how to do corruption. 7) Some officials think that most corrupt practices are not revealed. 8) There are corrupt officials who are promoted and loved by their superiors. 9) Some of the apparatus feel that there are unfair actions from internal and external supervision. 10) The apparatus is not familiar with the culture of complaining. 11) Most of the apparatus are ready to participate in efforts to prevent corruption in their respective agencies if there is formal access, guaranteed confidentiality, easy procedures, and are rewarded. 12) The need to get used to complaining when seeing acts of corruption, so that complaining becomes a culture.

The apparatus understanding about corruption is getting better. This is due to: the level of education of the apparatus which is getting better, information from various media that reports about the problem of corruption, knowledge about corruption that is easily accessible online, various education,

counseling, socialization carried out by the authorities, and so on. So that we can say that the corruption that occurs is not due to the "don't know" factor. Meanwhile, for officials who are not corrupt, it can be caused by several things: not having the opportunity, not knowing how to do corruption, and because they are afraid of getting into legal problems. Only a few percent of the apparatus are not corrupt because they are aware of sin and believe that corruption is a bad act.

Corruption in government agencies generally occurs on a scale: small, medium, and large. Usually the perpetrators of corruption are also graded based on position and based on experience in corruption. The perpetrators of large-scale corruption usually have already committed corruption in the medium and small scale. Likewise, the perpetrators of medium-scale corruption usually have already committed small-scale corruption. Rarely, an official commits direct corruption on a medium or large scale. Therefore, if an officer is found to have committed corruption on a large and medium scale, then his past small-scale corruption must also be exposed.

Despite various internal and external monitoring systems, there are more cases of apparatus corruption that are not revealed than those that have been revealed. This is due to the different modes of corruption in each agency and sub-agency, as well as the modes that continue to change and develop so that they are difficult to detect at first. Usually a new mode takes a long time to be detected by supervisors. This is where the real role of "Apparatus Complaints" is, because generally the apparatus is aware of a corrupt practice occurring in their institutions early.

What has happened so far, the attitude of an official when he finds out that there is a practice of corruption in his early instances is: 1) Silence, because he is afraid or lazy to question it, and this silence is because he considers that corruption is understandable. 2) Fussing / questioning it internally and externally. 3) Complaining, both formally and informally (anonymous letter), and so on. The research findings data show that most of the attitude of an official when he finds out that there is a corrupt practice in his institution is "silence", due to reasons of being afraid and lazy to be involved in questioning it, and to tolerate corruption as a natural thing. Then the second attitude is: making a fuss or questioning it internally and externally. This action or attitude is limited to discussing or making a fuss about the corruption, but willing to complain about it. And third, there are only some who have taken steps to complain, but the number is very small. This is because: they don't know how to complain and are afraid of the risks they will bear if they complain.

There are several reasons why an apparatus questions or makes a fuss about a corrupt practice that occurs in his work environment, including: the main reason is because he does not like the corrupt act, but other reasons are: because he does not get the opportunity to corrupt, does not know how or corruption mode, do not enjoy the results of corruption, fear or give up on corruption, and because they only have / manage a small budget. This means, if only they have the opportunity to corrupt, enjoy the results of corruption, know how to do corruption, do not give up corruption, or have a sufficient or large budget to be corrupted, then of course they will participate in corrupt practices or not participate in efforts to eradicate corruption.

In general, the apparatus realizes that most corrupt practices that occur are not revealed by internal or external supervisors. Even if it was revealed, but only a small part reached the realm of law. Usually there will be settlement efforts from the perpetrator with internal and external supervisors. This settlement is usually referred to as coaching. Some officials even feel that many of the perpetrators of corruption in their work environment receive more special attention from their superiors, are considered more performing, more loyal, even considered smart, so they are more likely to be used and promoted to a better position. If an apparatus succeeds in carrying out a corruption case safely, then he will be promoted to a higher and better position. In a new position, the quality of corruption will increase and he will continue to get promotion if all this can be done safely without entering the realm of law.

Internal and external controls do not have a big effect on perpetrators of corruption. All will be covered through lobbying, case bargaining, refunds, and coaching terms. It often happens, many small corruption cases are revealed, while big cases are not revealed. So it is not surprising that many officials think that both internal and external examiners are only working as they are to meet the targets of their findings. A case can disappear from the initial findings of the examination, and can also be replaced with another case. A case finding may be lost due to convincing arguments, but it can also be lost because it is replaced by another case. This means that there is bargaining about which cases of findings to be raised and which to close. Regarding this matter, there was bargaining with the internal / external supervision and only the internal officials knew. Again, this is where the apparatus pivotal. Without complaints from officials in that agency, no one would know that a bargaining game had occurred between the examiner and the party being investigated.

2. Getting used to the culture of complaining among the apparatus

So far, complaining is considered a bad thing, including complaining if we see corrupt behavior. People who complain are usually said to be jealous, expose others to disgrace, do not respect someone's privacy, like to interfere in other people's affairs, have a bad heart, are disloyal, pretentious, just looking for trouble, why complain because there are still many other jobs, and various other negative connotations. People who complain are often seen as worse than people who have committed the criminal act of corruption themselves.

As a result of the opinion that was built, people were reluctant to complain. Moreover, if the complainant is sanctioned by the environment, he may be ostracized, talk about by people or receive sanctions from the superiors being complained about. Anyway, complaints are negative actions that are uncomfortable to do. It is stigmatized that complaining is considered a sin. Even though complaining here is for a good cause, so that crime does not occur or can be minimized is a positive thing. This is because corruption in our country has become rampant in such a way that some say, corruption has become a culture. Because corruption has become such a culture, it must be countered with a culture of complaining among the apparatus.

Therefore, complaining behavior, especially among the apparatus, needs to be accustomed. Complaining in a positive sense and for a good cause. Why should the apparatus complain? As explained above, only the apparatus know in advance and in more detail about the criminal acts of corruption that have occurred in the agency or institution where they work. Complaints from the apparatus will reveal the data in detail, quickly and more accurately.

When Should the Apparatus Complain?

If an official see one of the forms and types of corruption that occurs in his institution or work environment, he must report it. However, many of the officials do not know what forms of action are classified as criminal acts of corruption. In fact, without knowing whether an act is a criminal act of corruption or not, then a person has the potential to be caught in a corruption case and it will also not be possible to complain about an act of corruption that has occurred in his / her environment. For this reason, an official need to know 30 forms which are classified into 7 types of corruption. Thirty forms of corruption can be seen scattered in thirteen articles in Law Number 31 of 1999 in conjunction with Law Number 22 of 2001 concerning the Eradication of Corruption Crimes.

3. Apparatus Complaint Management

Complaint management must be defined as a process of activities to accommodate, record, review, channel, confirm, clarify, provide alternative solutions to complainants, document and

disseminate the results of complaint management to the public. Complaint management is an implementation of management theory in the field of complaints. Apparatus Complaint Management must be interpreted as a form of apparatus participation in the administration and management of state finances.

Previously it was discussed that in order to carry out efficient supervision, complaints were used. With a culture of complaining, those who are and will commit acts of corruption will find it increasingly difficult to do so.

Indeed, we must admit that this culture of complaining does not exist in Indonesia. The culture of complaining is still perceived as an act that is detrimental to one's co-workers from the same apparatus (agency). In fact, if we want to be more in reasoning, with complaints from the same agency, then every act of corruption that is committed will continue until it is protracted, which will have an even greater impact on the state's losses.

There must be a strong awareness that with a culture of complaining, what we save is the state, not individuals or groups of people in an institution. Awareness of love for the country which is manifested in the form of anti-corruption with an attitude of complaining if there are signs of corruption that should be encouraged in every Government Apparatus.

Handling apparatus complaints is one of the efforts to implement the principles of transparency and accountability which are expected to prevent irregularities as early as possible, encourage the apparatus to learn to adopt an attitude of responsibility and accountability for the choice of decisions and activities they carry out and to encourage the growing awareness of officials to carry out supervision (control) in the work environment.

There must be a special section that facilitates complaints from apparatus for their own agencies. This will certainly be a form of preventive effort that is very useful for the country. Because those who work in the same environment, even in the same room, will certainly find out the "oddities" made by their own colleagues faster than those who are outside the office or outsiders whose daily activities are not there.

There are no complaints from officials like this in Indonesia. Based on this situation, in this discussion, we try to provide a solution for how this Apparatus Complaints model can work, so that later it can make a big contribution in preventing corruption, which has more and more modes, where one agency with another has different modes of corruption.

4. Suggestion Box Management

Besides the Complaints Management or System, it is also important to provide a Suggestion System or Suggestion Box Management. The most basic differences between the two systems are; if the Complaint Management is to convey corrupt behavior or acts that occur in the work environment of the apparatus, while the Suggestion Box Management is an opportunity provided for all officials to convey their ideas and input to prevent and eradicate acts of corruption in the workplace.

Although not all officials have knowledge and experience, especially an understanding of the law and an understanding of statutory regulations, or even if an apparatus does not have a bachelor's degree, do not be considered unable to provide input for the organization. They must have good suggestions and ideas that sometimes top management or middle management don't think of. These ideas may not arise from their knowledge, but from their daily experience of the work they have been doing for years. For example: corrupt practices that occur in waste management and cleaning in an office, may not be

monitored by the head of the agency, but a janitor may know and understand it. In fact, he might even have thought of a way to overcome it. This kind of thing must be obtained through the suggestion box provided.

Give the conveniences in this suggestion box. Provide suggestion boxes in every government agency even in each work unit, specifically to accommodate suggestions or ideas of employees, in terms of: savings ideas, ideas to overcome budget leaks, ideas to save assets, ideas on how to proper control and supervision, the idea of overcoming the use of fake receipts, the idea of overcoming the mark up, even the idea of building a surveillance and prevention system.

The most important thing from the suggestion box is, respect every suggestion that comes in. Break down each suggestion that comes in or is submitted. These suggestions may be classified into: Every suggestion that comes in is given 1 point, suggestions that are considered quality are given 3 point, and suggestions that can be realized are given 5 or 7 points depending on the quality of the suggestions. Every month or every year, the points of each employee are calculated and then given a reward based on the number of points. For example, 1-point costs Rp. 10,000, -, then if an employee can collect 30 points in a year, he will get a bonus of 3 million rupiah, if the reward is in the form of money.

Law enforcement agencies such as the Corruption Eradication Commission, the Police, and the Attorney General's Office should also open a suggestion box to get more input in efforts to prevent corruption. The Suggestion Box is an effort to prevent corruption before it occurs. The Suggestion Box is also an effort to involve the community and apparatus to be involved in it. The community and apparatus involved will automatically increase their motivation to always be anti-corruption.

Conclusion and Suggestion

1. Conclusion

The fact of corruption in the field shows that corruption occurs in almost all work environments of the apparatus with various modes that continue to develop. Meanwhile, the existing internal and external control systems are deemed ineffective. Internal control was overwhelmed by strong superior intervention. External monitoring of existing institutions also has limitations. There must be innovations in the efforts to prevent and prosecute corruption by the apparatus.

Only the apparatus knows earlier and in more detail about the criminal acts of corruption that have occurred in the agency or institution where they work. Therefore, it is necessary to create a special channel for the apparatus to complain and convey ideas on corruption prevention efforts, namely through Apparatus Complaint Management and Suggestion Box Management.

Apparatus Complaint Management has the character of conveying corrupt behavior or actions that occur in the apparatus work environment. Suggestion Box Management is an opportunity provided for all officials to convey their ideas and input to prevent and eradicate acts of corruption in the workplace.

2. Suggestion

Law enforcement agencies related to corruption should develop an Apparatus Complaints System by taking advantage of advances in IT (Information Technology). Meanwhile, all government agencies and institutions should implement the Suggestion Box System in simple ways so that all Government Officials at all levels can be involved.

References

- Ali, Mahrus, *Dasar-Dasar Hukum Pidana*, Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2011.
- Anwar, Syamsul, 2006, *Fikih Anti korupsi Perspektif Ulama Muhammadiyah Majelis Tarjih dan Tajdid PP Muhammadiyah*, Jakarta: Pusat studi Agama dan Peradaban (PSAP).
- Atmasasmita, Romli, *Sekitar Masalah Korupsi Aspek Nasional dan Aspek Internasional*, Bandung: Mandar Maju, 2004.
- Azhar, Muhammad, 2003, *Pendidikan Antikorupsi*, Yogyakarta: LP3 UMY, Partnership, Koalisi Antarumat Beragama untuk Antikorupsi.
- Baharudin Lopa dan Moch. Yamin, *Undang-Undang Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi*, Alumni, Bandung, 2001.
- Chaerudin, Syaiful Ahmad Dinar dan Syarif Fadhillah, *Strategi Pencegahan dan Penegakan Hukum Tindak Pidana Korupsi*, Bandung: PT Refika Aditama, 2008.
- Darwan Prinst, *Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi*, Citra Aditya Bakti, Bandung, 2002.
- Djaja, Eemansjah, *Memberantas Korupsi Bersama KPK*, Jakarta: Sinar Grafika, 2010.
- Jamrah, Alfian, *Percepatan Anti Korupsi bagi Aparatur Sipil Negara*, Padang: sumbarprov.go.id/details/news/7167, 2016.
- Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi, 2006, *Memahami Untuk Membasmi; Buku Saku Untuk Memahami Tindak Pidana Korupsi*, Jakarta: Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi.
- Nasir, Ridwan, 2006, *Dialektika Islam dengan Problem Kontemporer*, IAIN Press & LKiS.
- Pope, Jeremy, 2003, *Strategi Memberantas Korupsi; Elemen Sistem Integritas Nasional, (terj.) Masri Maris*, Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- Ridwan Zachrie Wijayanto, *Korupsi Mengorupsi Indonesia*, Gramedia Pustaka Utama, Jakarta, 2009.
- Yusuf, Muhammad, *Merampas Aset Koruptor: Solusi Pemberantasan Korupsi di Indonesia*, Jakarta: Kompas, 2013.
- Zed, Mestika, *Metode Penelitian Kepustakaan*, Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia, 2004.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).