POLITICAL OFFICE, CORRUPTION OPPORTUNITY, AND ITS PREVENTION IN INDONESIAN'S STATE INSTITUTIONS

Fauzan Ali Rasyid[1*], Syahrul Anwar[2], Ateng Ruhendi[3], Aden Rosadi[4], Ahsanuddin Jauhari[5]
[1,2,3,4,5]State Islamic University of Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia.
Email: [1*]fauzan.ali.rasyid@uinsgd.ac.id, [2]syahrulanwar@uinsgd.ac.id, [3]atengruhendi@uinsgd.ac.id, [4]adenrosadi@uinsg.ac.id, [5]ahsanjauhari@uinsgd.ac.id

Abstract

Purpose of this study: This article aims to analyze the characteristics of the ideal political office, the political office that triggers opportunities for corruption, and the role of political office in preventing and eradicating corruption in state institutions.

Methodology: This study used the literature review method with a qualitative approach to analyze various issues related to political office and corruption in Indonesia's state institutions.

Main findings: The researcher found that the ideal political office was oriented on the progress of the State and the welfare of the people, and all were developed from parties with transparent political recruitment patterns. On the other hand, political offices in government institutions trigger opportunities for corruption. However, the political office can also be the most effective tool in preventing and eradicating corruption in developing countries.

Applications of this study: This research is useful for leaders in making decisions on corruption eradication policies and as initial information in determining officials in government.

Novelty/Originality of this study: The novelty of this research lies in the researcher's perspective in seeing corruption, which can be prevented and eradicated through political office.

Keywords: Political Offices, Corruption, Corruption Preventions, State Institutions, Political Recruitment, Political Parties.

INTRODUCTION

In the last few decades, the election contestation in Indonesia has been tainted by the problem of alleged corruption, in the form of political corruption (Sjafrina, 2019). Political corruption, from an institutional perspective, is interpreted as an act which deviates from the formal duties of a public role for private financial gain or personal wealth (private, close family) or groups, in certain ways that are considered to violate applicable regulations. Political corruption has an impact on the stability of the State because these actions violate the rules and drain the wealth of the State (Diansyah, 2009; Suherry, 2017).

In more detail, political corruption can take the form of bribery to shorten the length of procedures and queues of public services, supervision of public bureaucracy, increase the power of economic sectors, public officials imagery, buying votes to maintain political party power, nepotism or patronage to get certain jobs, financing political parties and obtaining votes for potential public officials. To eradicate political corruption it is necessary to formulate a law on political party finance and campaign funding so that a transparent and accountable political party finance and campaign funding system is realized (Setiadi, 2018).

Based on Indonesian corruption watch data from 2010 – 2017, there were 215 of the heads of a region that were caught in corruption cases (Pradano, 2018). Corruptions were carried out in the forms of project budget extortion, bribery on budgets ratification, corruption on the procurement of goods and services, licensing bribery, and bribery on case handling. The positions mostly entangled in corruption cases were 130 regent cases, 42 mayor cases, 18 deputy regent cases, 16 governor cases, seven deputy mayor cases, and two deputy governor cases (Indonesian Corruption Wacth, 2018).

Until now, corruption is still a very crucial problem in Indonesia (Bhakti & Djauhari, 2017; Sulastri, 2012). The issue particularly worrying is the existence of corruption among public officials who are entrusted for running the government. Therefore, the initiative to eradicate corruption is the most urgent thing to do for the progress of the nation. Corruption is a common enemy of the Indonesian people, but complex problems often hinder the eradication of corruption. Corruption cases that entangle politicians and even public officials who are chosen by the people are already familiar to the public (Atnan, 2014; Setiadi, 2018).

Previous studies showed that the characteristics of heads of regions who were proxied by those affiliated with parties indicate committing corruption in capital expenditure (Yusup & Aryani, 2015). Besides, another study conducted by Atnan (2014) stated that corruption cases that occurred in Indonesia mostly involved legislatures elected by-election. Therefore, the data released by Soegeng Sarjadi Syndicate (SSS) resulted in a survey in 2012 that placed the People's Representative Council or DPR (47%) as the most corrupt institution. Furthermore, intense competition in the elections in the executive and legislative seats triggered serious problems of criminal acts of corruption, ranging from budget

extortion, business license provision, position buying, and selling, to bribery on the winning of election disputes (Adelina, 2019). Alkostar (2009) states that politics is associated with corruption, someone who behaves politically makes an effort to maintain and extend power by abusing power and there is a need for a socio-political order. The ways related to the abuse of power are an indication of political corruption which can eliminate the people's strategic right to live properly and kill their future hopes. Meanwhile, according to Astuti(2013), political corruption is related to systemic corruption. This corruption prioritizes the politicization of positions through corruption to make a person have a higher position or position so that it is untouched by applicable law (Rasyid & Marta, 2020). Besides, this corruption involves some law enforcement officials such as the police, prosecutors, and judges, and even justice in the Supreme Court.

The study aims to highlight the phenomenon of corruption in State institutions, where positions in these institutions are obtained through political channels or in other words is determined as political offices. Political office is a position that is obtained through a political process (election) which is held every five years. The fact is that the institutions occupied by the winners in the election contestation tend to commit acts of corruption. The real fact of the entanglement of public officials is influenced by the system of recruitment of officials in government institutions which is more concerned with popularity and not capabilities. Furthermore, this study also examines the reason for corruption cases incidence related to political offices in state institutions. Then, researchers try to provide ideas in improving the electoral system and the recruitment model of the political elite to create political offices that make an effort for the welfare of the people and develop the state institutions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Political office

Political offices in public administration are public officials selected from an election or local election. Political offices are positions generated by the political process, for example, the Governor, the Deputy Governor, the President/Vice President, and the Ministers. Political offices include executive positions, legislative positions, and judicial positions (Nora, 2014).

Legislative power is a form of a political office that has a crucial function in approving, choosing, giving consideration, and proposing state officials. Besides, legislative power has the functions of legislation, budgeting, and controlling (Hadi, 2013). This function is a determining factor for the progress of the State. Someone who wants a position in government institutions, especially in legislative institutions, must use political channels (Putra, 2008). The political path can be found in parties endorsed by the government. The party functions to recruit cadres with political recruitment. According to Aji, Asy"ari, & A.L.W(2016), political recruitment is a social and political process to occupy a position in political office, thus this political recruitment is also a process of building a political career. Political recruitment and political office have a close relationship. In other words, someone who wishes to occupy a political position must go through a political recruitment process carried out by a political party (Imansyah, 2012; Rosana, 1999). Therefore, political parties have a very strategic position in recruiting candidates who will fill political positions in state institutions.

Corruption

The explanation of corruption in the body of government seemed never to vanish to be discussed. Corruption is inherent in all levels of the government and the activities of the government (Setiyono, 2017). In general, corruption is expressed as behaviour in misusing public office, power, or resources for personal and group interests (Rose-Ackerman, 1978). According to Luo (1997), corruption is related to the exchange of transactions carried out in a short time, and there is no moral term in corruption, only amoral is known. Besides, the legal aspect of the practice of corruption always crashes into all existing rules. Corruption is behaviour that deviates from formal duties for the benefit of individuals and groups. Besides, corrupt behaviour can endanger the public interest (Friedrich, 1966). It is also confirmed by Azra (2002), who explains that corruption is an "illicit or illegal activity" intended to gain personal or group benefits.

Corruption behaviour is an extraordinary crime because it can slowly threaten and damage the government, which is causing the bankruptcy of a government (Sulastri, 2012). Corruption distinguished into three forms of 'white' corruption, 'gray' corruption, and 'black' corruption. White corruption deals with nepotism, meaning that this corruption occurs during employee recruitment. Meanwhile, gray corruption deals with joint corruption in the interests of business improvement or employee welfare. Black corruption deals with corruption to enrich some people and their groups (He, 2000). Other forms of corruption are conveyed by Underkuffler, (2009) who classifies corruption in four ways, namely: (1) Corruption as the Violation of Law, (2) Corruption as the Breach of Duty, (3) Corruption as Betrayal and Secrecy, and (4) Corruption as Inequality. Meanwhile, the classification of corruption according to Sanusi (2009), includes four kinds: First, shortcut corruption namely corruption carried out by individuals in the form of weakening the regulations that bind their businesses. Second, corruption-tribute. This emphasizes the payment of tributes made by individuals to the party, the group that is credited with winning himself in the election. Third, contract-corruption. In this part of corruption, an official has a contract with the entrepreneur to give the tender without having to go through the auction. Fourth, corruption-extortion as the security guarantees corruption given by certain groups to be the continuity of his position.

In practice, corruption is caused by four things according to GONE theory including G = Greek, O = Opportunity, N = Need (human impulse to meet their needs), E = Exposure (action when corruptors are arrested) (Friedman, 1975). The GONE theory explains that human greed can lead to acts of corruption, especially when individuals have the opportunity, namely as officials. Then the high impulse of life needs is dominated by individual desires, namely the nature of greed. This is the cause of individual acts of corruption and must be responsible for his actions in prison.

The results of a study conducted by the World Bank related to corruption assessment in understanding and improving governance. There are six indicators of corruption in government including (1) voice and accountability, (2) political stability, (3) government effectiveness, (4) regulatory quality, (5) the rule of law, and (6) control of corruption (Bhargava & Bolongaita, 2004).

Corruption Prevention

A person's crime of action is the result of imitation of an act of evil that occurs in the community. Therefore, efforts to prevent and raise awareness of corruption must be made among the public and politicians (Muallifin, 2015). Corruption prevention is a system used to avoid, prevent, and eradicate corruption within an institution (Bhakti & Djauhari, 2017). In implementing the process of preventing corruption the leaders must have the ability and courage to make policies since corruption that occurs in an organization is usually systematic and conducted jointly (Muallifin, 2015). Therefore, a leader must not be selective in judging the perpetrators of corruption, especially in government institutions.

Bhargava & Bolongaita (2004) states that the anticipation of corruption in a country can be done by pillars of actions as follows: (1) Carrying out public services with an effective and transparent development system, (2) providing legal protection on anti-bribery actions, and carrying out a system of integrity in carrying out tasks. And (3) provide active support for public involvement. Meanwhile, Arvis & Berenbeim (2003) stated the concept of anticipating acts of corruption in China namely by avoiding large projects by minimizing the number of large projects so that they become small and many. "If it is a small project you can't ask for a big bribe. All you can afford is a good dinner in a nice restaurant. . . . Going for small things is a good way to protect yourself."

If leaders want to prevent corruption in their institutions, political leaders can adopt three kinds of official policies to eradicate, at least decrease the number of corruption. First, change policies that encourage people or provide opportunities for corruption. Second, restructure the payroll structure and other material incentives that apply to administrative-bureaucratic institutions and other political institutions. Third, reform legal institutions to create, enforce the law, and strengthen the rule of law(Azra, 2002).

METHODOLOGY

This study discussed the potentials for political offices in state institutions, which have the opportunity to commit acts of corruption. In parsing the topic, a qualitative approach that relies on inquiry, discovery, depiction, explanation of privileges, and the quality of unexplained social influences is used to explain the phenomenon of political office and corruption in Indonesia (Creswell, 2013). Furthermore, the method applied in this article is a literature review (Tranfield, Denyer, & Smart, 2003). The use of a literature review is considered appropriate in analysing the phenomenon of political office and corruption in state institutions in Indonesia because it is equipped with detailed and systematic description data. The literature review data used is historical, both descriptive and analytic. The data is sourced from secondary data in the form of books, newspapers, national and international journals.

RESULT & DISCUSSION

Corruption is a social phenomenon that is difficult to eradicate because it has entrenched the government bureaucracy and private companies in this country (Marta & Eliyana, 2019; Sulastri, 2012).In Asia, especially in developing countries, corruption is a governance problem that is often faced (Corolina, 2012). Many high-ranking government officials are involved in corruption scandals aimed at enriching themselves and their groups. However, public awareness about the effects of corruption has been widely carried out by the public, and as a result, corruptors must be careful in carrying out acts of corruption (Bhargava & Bolongaita, 2004).

In the last few decades, corruption cases in Indonesia have increased (Sulastri, 2012). Corruption cases handled by theCorruption Eradication Commissionshowed as if there was a chain of corruption that occurred in state institutions (Bhakti & Djauhari, 2017). According to Suherry (2017), the factors as the main causes of corrupt behaviour include economic demands, environmental influences, weak law enforcement, and lack of anti-corruption socialization in the community. Besides, Atnan (2014) states that thriving corruption in the regions is inseparable from the problems of the systems, both the government/political system and the legal system. Problems with the government system are related to the executive and legislative role of the region, especially regarding unprofessional budgeting, many tricks, and budgeting that tends to be closed.

Besides, the recruitment mechanism of legislative members also becomes a problem since the standards set in political recruitment have not been transparent and are below the ideal size standards for prospective members (Riyadh U.B & Sukmana, 2015). The implementation of political recruitment must be transparent and more concerned with the skills possessed by individuals, not just looking at the popularity and financial ability. Besides, the recruitment process is the

development of individual careers in occupying political offices in government institutions that must pass through the selection of social processes (Aji et al., 2016). Therefore, it is necessary to perform the right recruitment pattern in producing political officials who can make an effort for the welfare of the people. According to Adlin (2011), at least four things can affect the implementation of the recruitment of prospective legislative officials in the body of the party including (1) political system, party system, and an electoral system that describe the opportunities of candidates in the political market space in the country; (2) internal party recruitment process, especially in making and implementing legislative candidate selection rules; (3) Candidates who offer to participate in the election (supply), relate to the level of motivation and political capital they have; (4) Requests of the group of policymakers (demands of gatekeepers) such as party members, voters, party leaders, and party donors have a major contribution in determining legislative candidates.

Furthermore, prospective officials who will occupy political offices in parliament should have the following leadership criteria: (1) have a strong personality, (2) have a background and social position associated with self-motivation, (3) Have a mature social position, and (4) Referred by a credible institution or party (Schwartz, 1969). These characteristics are the conditions in creating leaders of public officials who can serve and advance the State of Indonesia.

On the other hand, the political office has the potential to be involved in corruption practices within government institutions. The concept is explained by Friedman (1975) that the practice of corruption may occur because of four factors, the theory is known by the term GONE: First, G=Greek where a corruptor has the inside nature to own resources so that his life can be worthy for the family and social environment. Second, O=Opportunity. Sometimes a good person commits an act of corruption, but due to corruption is carried out jointly by his group, he is involved in circumstances and deviant actions that can harm himself and his country. Third, Need, which is a human impulse to meet short-term and long-term needs that can simplify their lives and groups. Fourth, E=Exposure which is an act if corruptors are arrested after they commit acts of corruption.

From this concept, it can be explained that greed, opportunity, needs can cause people to commit acts of corruption (Muallifin, 2015). The opportunity for a person in political office to commit acts of corruption is vast. Executive institutions are government executors who have the power to manage resources with the potential to commit acts of corruption. Likewise, with legislative institutions as people's representatives in parliament which also have many opportunities to commit corruption because their central function is to make decisions on funds to be used by executive institutions (Sulastri, 2012).

A study conducted by Diansyah(2009) stated that the institution with the most potential for corruption was the legislative institution. It is also supported by Atnan (2014), who evidenced that corruption cases that occurred in Indonesia mostly involved legislators who were elected through an election. This indicated that the characteristics of regional heads or legislators affiliated with parties indicated to commit acts of corruption (Yusup & Aryani, 2015). Therefore, Sumaryanto (2019) states that corruption in all government institutions namely legislative, executive, and judiciary in Indonesia has become a culture and must be eradicated immediately. Besides, a study conducted by Kurniadi (2017) stated that approximately 60 percent of corruption cases handled by the Indonesian republic's police force was related to the use of State Budget (APBN) or Local Government Budget (APBD) budgets and the most entangled institution was the legislative institution.

Based on GONE theory and the results of previous studies, the legislative and executive institutions have the potential to carry out acts of corruption (Sulastri, 2012). The legislative and executive institutions are the spearhead of the State and have expansive and important powers in building the country to become more advanced (Hadi, 2013). The potential for corruption that can be seen is the potential in Indonesia's financial and resource management. Finance is the power of the State, if corruptors corrupt finances in these institutions, the State will go bankrupt (Setiadi, 2018). Legislative, executive, and judicial institutions must work together to eradicate corruption in Indonesia.

Corruption has become a culture in several communities, especially in several governments. Therefore, eradicating corruption requires a joint commitment of all parties (Alfaqi, Habibi, & Rapita, 2017; Bhakti & Djauhari, 2017). The government must work with its power to eradicate corruption, at least decrease the number of corruption. According to Hamzah (2017), there are three basic steps in eradicating corruption in Indonesia, including (1) Synchronization of Laws and Law Enforcement; (2) Bureaucracy Reformation; (3) Welfare for HR. Meanwhile, according to Setiadi (2018), efforts to eradicate corruption including designing and reorganizing public services, strengthening transparency, supervision, and sanctions, increasing the empowerment of supporting tools in preventing corruption. Meanwhile, if you look at Pacific countries, they use the efforts of (1) Carrying out public services with an effective and transparent development system, (2) Providing legal protection on anti-bribery actions, and carrying out a system of integrity in carrying out tasks. (3) Provide active support for public involvement (Bhargava & Bolongaita, 2004).

Besides, a study conducted by He (2000)held in China explained the right way to prevent corruption that occurred by making economic improvements, political improvements, and improvements in the administrative system. Meanwhile, a study conducted by Michelman, MacArthur, & Shea(2011) showed the prevention efforts to eradicate corruption in China were performed by internal supervision, operational transparency, and holistic approach in understanding the significant risks. Furthermore, the study conducted by Abu-Shanab, Harb, & Al-Zoubi (2013) explained the ways to

prevent corruption in government institutions by using the electronic system. This electronic operating system was evidenced to minimize the incidence of corruption in government institutions.

Based on several theories and study results, the anti-corruption system in Indonesia can be implemented with an approach to political office that becomes the milestone of government executors in Indonesia namely in the legislative (Atnan, 2014), executive (Yusup & Aryani, 2015), and judicial institutions (Kurniadi, 2017). The existing pattern of corruption prevention in Indonesia uses the following steps: First, The expansion of economic reform. The first way to preventing corruption is to expand economic reforms in government to prevent thriving the development of corruption. In economic reform, the leaders try to improve the economic system to create economic advancement. An advanced economy can prevent a person from committing corruption because the State has met all his needs. Second, progressive political reform towards democracy. The second way to prevent corruption is progressive political reform towards democracy as the right way to prevent corruption in State institutions. Political reform means making improvements to the political system in the party so that it can organize a transparent, fair, and legal democratic party. Third, extensive administrative reforms. The third way to prevent corruption is by carrying out extensive administrative reforms. Administrative reforms are intended to shorten long administrative channels with the potential of acts of corruption. Fourth, reinventing and improving anti-corruption institutions. The fourth way in eradicating corruption is the development and improvement of the anti-corruption institution. The institution should be independent so that it can audit government institutions in carrying out their functions. Fifth, anti-corruption campaigns. Conducting anti-corruption campaigns in various social and government activities is the most effective way to prevent corruption. The campaign serves as a reminder that corrupt behaviour can harm others and themselves. Sixth, the deployment of smart technology. The use of smart technology in government can prevent deviant practices that can harm the State. Technology plays a role in controlling the entry and exit of finance in the organization. By using technology, organizations can develop patterns of corruption prevention effectively and efficiently. Seventh, moral education. The final way to prevent corruption is moral education for every political official. The education should be implemented before and after their candidacy to become political officials.

The pattern of preventing corruption through the political office is the most appropriate because political officials control government institutions (Diansyah, 2009; Setiadi, 2018; Suherry, 2017). If political officials have a strong commitment to eradicating corruption in Indonesia, Indonesia will be free from deviant practices that can harm the country. The leaders of legislative, executive, and judiciary institutions have strong opportunities to change and improve Indonesia into a developed country.

CONCLUSION

Finally, this study provides answers that the ideal political office in Indonesia is a political office that oriented on the progress of the State and the welfare of the people of Indonesia. Thus, one of the responsibilities that must be carried out by the State in improving political office is to improve the pattern of recruitment of political offices in the parties, so that officials who occupy political offices have a strong tendency to make positive changes to the institutions where they serve (Aji et al., 2016; Riyadh U.B & Sukmana, 2015; Schwartz, 1969).

Besides, this study also explains that political office in government institutions is indicated to have the opportunity for corruption (Bhakti & Djauhari, 2017; Sulastri, 2012). It is due to the career paths through the political office that is most vulnerable to corruption, especially in the executive and legislative institutions (Bhakti & Djauhari, 2017). These institutions have very high political costs. To be able to become a government official one must spend enormous funds in the campaign to win himself in the election (Sjafrina, 2019).

Political office and corruption showed a close relationship, especially in efforts to prevent and eradicate corruption from the macro-level of the organization (Corolina, 2012). To prevent corruption in developing countries, the State must intervene in improving political offices in State institutions from the legislative, executive, and judiciary (Diansyah, 2009; Setiadi, 2018; Suherry, 2017). Political offices are strategic positions that have the opportunity to eradicate corruption. In essence, the eradication of corruption must start from political officials, because political officials occupy strategic positions in state institutions. The joint commitment of political officials is the most powerful tool in preventing and eradicating corruption. Legislative institutions occupied by political officials and leaders in the executive must always develop an integrated system to develop the country and make an effort for the welfare of the people of Indonesia.

LIMITATION AND STUDY FORWARD

There were three limitations in this study. First, the researcher did not broadly explain the most effective political recruitment in occupying political offices in parliament. Second, a detailed explanation of prevention mechanisms had not been revealed in this article. Third, this study was limited to a literature review that had not explored the aspect of in-depth interviews with political actors in parliament during data collection.

Further studies are expected to complement the limitations of this research by focusing more on the recruitment mechanism of political party members who are the wheels in the General Election. Besides, future researchers are also expected to explain in detail the methods of preventing corruption in State institutions. Corruption prevention must be

described in the form of a systematic model. Furthermore, to strengthen the research methods, future researchers are expected to use an in-depth interview approach to parties involved in State institutions.

AUTHORS CONTRIBUTION

In this study, the first author as a correspondent writer responsible for this research. The second author provides concepts and theories in completing the literature review. The third author, carry out an analysis on the results of the study. The fourth author, determine the research method. And the fifth author provides a reference source in this study.

REFERENCES

1. Abu-Shanab, E. A., Harb, Y. A., & Al-Zoubi, S. Y. (2013). E-government as an anti-corruption tool: Citizens' perceptions. *International Journal of Electronic Governance*, *6*(3), 232–248. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJEG.2013.058410
2. Adelina, F. (2019). Bentuk-Bentuk Korupsi Politik. *Legilasi Indonesia*, *53*(9), 1689–1699. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004
3. Adlin. (2011). *Sistem Kepartaian dan Pemilihan Umum*. Pekanbaru: Alaf Riau.
4. Aji, O. S. L. W., Asy"ari, H., & Tyesta A.L.W, L. (2016). Perwakilan Rakyat Untuk Optimalisasi Tata Cara Partai Politik Dalam Rekrutmen Calon Anggota Dewan Mewujudkan Pemerintahan Yang Baik (Good Governance) Berdasarkan Undang-Undang Nomor 8 Tahun 2012. *Diponegoro Law Journal*, *5*(4), 1–13.
5. Alfaqi, M. Z., Habibi, M. M., & Rapita, D. D. (2017). Peran Pemuda dalam Upaya Pencegahan Korupsi dan Implikasinya Terhadap Ketahanan Wilayah. *Jurnal Ketahanan Nasional*, *23*(3), 320. https://doi.org/10.22146/jkn.27695
6. Alkostar, A. (2009). Korelasi Korupsi Politik Dengan Hukum dan Pemerintahan di Negara Modern (Telaah tentang Praktik Korupsi Politik dan Penanggulangannya). *Jurnal Hukum*, *16*, 155–179.
7. Arvis, J.-F., & Berenbeim, R. E. (2003). *Fighting corruption in East Asia: Solutions from the private sector.* Washington: The World Bank Washington, DC. https://doi.org/10.1596/0-8213-5535-X
8. Astuti, P. (2013). Politik Korupsi : Kendala Sistemik Pemberantasan Korupsi di Indonesia. *Politika: Jurnal Ilmu Politik*, *2*(1), 5–17.
9. Atnan, N. (2014). Fenomena Korupsi Pejabat Publik di Jawa Barat. *JKMP*, *2*(2), 131–146. https://doi.org/10.21070/jkmp.v2i2.434
10. Azra, A. (2002). Korupsi Dalam Perspektif Good Governance. *Jurnal Kriminologi Indonesia*, *2*(I), 31–36.
11. Bhakti, S. A. E., & Djauhari, D. (2017). Upaya Pencegahan Tindak Pidana Korupsi Melalui Peran Serta Masyarakat. *Jurnal Hukum Khaira Ummah*, *12*(2), 307–318.
12. Bhargava, V., & Bolongaita, E. (2004). *Challenging Corruption in Asia: Case studies and a framework for action*. *Regional Studies*. Washington: The World Bank Washington, DC. https://doi.org/10.1596/0-8213-5683-6
13. Corolina, A. (2012). Sistem Anti Korupsi: Suatu Studi Komparatif Di Indonesia, Hongkong, Singapura dan Thailand. *Jurnal InFestasi*, *8*(1), 107–122.
14. Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research Design: Qualitatice, Quantitatice, and Mixed Methods Aprroaches*. *Sage Publication*. California.
15. Diansyah, F. (2009). Senjakala Pemberantasan Korupsi: Memangkas Akar Korupsi dari Pengadilan Tipikor. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, *6*(2), 7–42.
16. Friedman, L. M. (1975). *The legal system: a social science perspective.* New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
17. Friedrich, C. J. (1966). Political pathology. *The Political Quartely*, *37*, 70–85. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-923X.1966.tb00184.x
18. Hadi, S. (2013). Fungsi Legislasi dalam Sistem Pemerintahan Presidensil (Studi Perbandingan Indonesia dan Amerika Serikat). *DIH: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, *9*(18), 78–84. https://doi.org/10.30996/dih.v9i18.275
19. Hamzah, F. (2017). Sistematika Pemberantasan Korupsi. In *Prosiding Seminar nasional* (pp. 1–73). https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004
20. He, Z. (2000). Corruption and anti-corruption in reform China. *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, *33*(2), 243–270. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0967-067X(00)00006-4
21. Imansyah, T. (2012). Regulatory Political Parties to realize Role and Function of Strengthening Institutional Political parties. *Jurnal Rechtsvinding: Media Pembinaan Hukum Nasional*, *1*(3), 375–395.
22. Indonesian Corruption Wacth. (2018). *Outlook Korupsi Politik 2018: Ancaman Korupsi di Balik Pemilu 2018 dan 2019*.
23. Kurniadi, E. (2017). Pemetaan Korupsi di Lembaga Eksekutif Legislatif dan Yudikatif dari Kasus yang Ditangani POLRI. In *Pemetaan Korupsi di Lembaga Eksekutif, Legislatif, dan Yudikatif: Strategi Pencegahan dan Penindakannya* (pp. 13–25). Jakarta: Kepala Pusat Penelitian Badan Keahlian Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Indonesia.
24. Luo, Y. (1997). Guanxi and Performance of Foreign-Invested Enterprises in China. *MIR: Management International Review*, *37*(1), 51–70.
25. Marta, M. S., & Eliyana, A. (2019). Komitmen Organisasi dan Sikap Whistle-Blowing: Apakah Hubungannya Dimoderasi Oleh Persepsi Dukungan Organisasi? *Matrik : Jurnal Manajemen, Strategi Bisnis Dan*

Kewirausahaan, 133. https://doi.org/10.24843/MATRIK:JMBK.2019.v13.i02.p01

26. Michelman, J. E., MacArthur, J. B., & Shea, C. (2011). The Growing Challenges of Corruption in China. *The Journal of Corporate Accounting & Finance*, *22*(6), 17–30. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcaf.20718

27. Muallifin, M. D. A. (2015). Problematika Dan Pemberantasan Korupsi Di Indonesia. *Ahkam: Jurnal Hukum Islam*, *3*(2), 311–325. https://doi.org/10.21274/ahkam.2015.3.2.311-325

28. Nora, G. A. La. (2014). *Ilmu Komunikasi Politik*. Yogyakarta: CV Andi Ofset.

29. Pradano, T. Z. (2018). Korupsi dan Pemilihan Kepala Daerah 2018. *Detiknews*. Retrieved from https://news.detik.com/kolom/d-3886191/korupsi-dan-pemilihan-kepala-daerah-2018

30. Putra, O. E. (2008). Politik dan Kekuasaan Dalam Islam (Pengantar Studi Politik dalam Aspek Manajemen Dakwah). *Jurnal Manajemen Dakwah*, *1*(1), 107–127.

31. Rasyid, F. A., & Marta, M. S. (2020). Impact of organizational politics on proactive behavior of government employees: the moderating role of self-efficacy. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, *18*(1), 385–393. https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.18(1).2020.33

32. Riyadh U.B, A., & Sukmana, H. (2015). Model Rekrutmen Politik Calon Anggota Legislatif Oleh Partai Politik Di Kabupaten Sidoarjo. *JKMP (Jurnal Kebijakan Dan Manajemen Publik)*, *3*(2), 117–240. https://doi.org/10.21070/jkmp.v3i2.191

33. Rosana, E. (1999). Partai Politik Dan Pembangunan Politik. *Jurnal TAPIs*, *8*(1), 135–150.

34. Rose-Ackerman, S. (1978). *Corruption: A Study in Political Economy*. New York: Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-596350-3.50005-3

35. Sanusi, H. M. A. (2009). Relasi Antara Korupsi dan Kekuasaan. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, *6*(2), 83–104.

36. Schwartz, D. C. (1969). Toward a theory of political recruitment. *Political Research Quarterly*, *22*(3), 552–571. https://doi.org/10.1177/106591296902200315

37. Setiadi, W. (2018). Korupsi di Indoensia (Penyebab, Bahaya, Hambatan dan Upaya Pemberantasan, serta Regulasi. *Junal Legislasi Indonesia*, *15*(3), 249–262.

38. Setiyono, B. (2017). Understanding Corruption at Local Level Post Decentralization: Evidence from Four Case Studies. *Politika*, *8*(1), 27–62. https://doi.org/10.14710/politika.8.1.2017.27-62

39. Sjafrina, A. G. P. (2019). Dampak Politik Uang Terhadap Mahalnya Biaya Pemenangan Pemilu dan Korupsi Politik. *Jurnal Antikorupsi INTEGRITAS*, *05*(1), 43–53. https://doi.org/10.32697/integritas.v5i1.389

40. Suherry, S. (2017). Politik Pemberantasan Korupsi di Indonesia. *Otoritas : Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, *7*(1), 46–53. https://doi.org/10.26618/ojip.v7i1.417

41. Sulastri, I. (2012). Perlunya Menanamkan Budaya Antikorupsi Dalam Diri Anak Sejak Usia Dini. *Mimbar Hukum*, *24*(1), 98–109.

42. Sumaryanto, D. (2019). Harmonisasi Pembalikan Beban Pembuktian Tindak Pidana Korupsi. *Supremasi Hukum: Jurnal Penelitian Hukum*, *28*(2), 108–122. https://doi.org/10.33369/jsh.28.2.108-122

43. Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a Methodology for Developing Evidence-Informed Management Knowledge by Means of Systematic Review. *British Journal of Management*, *14*(2), 207–222. https://doi.org/10.2307/249689

44. Underkuffler, L. S. (2009). Defining Corruption: Implacation for Action. In *Corruption, Global, Security and World Order* (pp. 27–46). Brookings Institution Press.

45. Yusup, M., & Aryani, Y. A. (2015). Karakteristik Kepala Daerah, Afiliasi Partai Politik dan Indikasi Korupsi Belanja Modal. *Integritas*, *1*(1), 61–80. https://doi.org/10.32697/integritas.v1i1.114