

Strengthening the Role of the Corruption Eradication Commission in Combating Corruption Crimes and Evaluating Its Effectiveness in Addressing Corruption Cases

Anton Prasetyo¹, KMS Herman²

Universitas Borobudur, Indonesia

Email: Antonprasetyo.170809@gmail.com¹, kms_herman@borobudur.ac.id²

ABSTRACT

KEYWORDS

corruption eradication; commission; criminal law; institutional effectiveness

ARTICLE INFO

Accepted: 13-06-2025

Revised: 19-06-2025

Approved: 01-07-2025

Corruption is a serious issue that hinders development in Indonesia, affecting the economy, politics, and social sectors. To address this issue, the government established the Corruption Eradication Commission (Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi, KPK) as an independent institution tasked with the prevention, investigation, prosecution, and handling of corruption crimes. However, over time, the role and performance of the KPK have faced various challenges, including political intervention, regulatory changes, and obstacles in law enforcement. Therefore, this study aims to analyze the role and performance of the KPK in eradicating corruption crimes in Indonesia, as well as to evaluate its effectiveness in addressing corruption cases. This research uses both normative juridical and empirical methods. The normative juridical approach is carried out by analyzing various regulations related to corruption eradication, such as Law Number 31 of 1999 in conjunction with Law Number 20 of 2001 on Corruption Eradication, as well as Law Number 19 of 2019 on amendments to the KPK Law. Additionally, this research also adopts an empirical approach by reviewing secondary data from official KPK reports and various case studies that illustrate the patterns and effectiveness of law enforcement in corruption cases in Indonesia. Through the analysis of regulations and the implementation of the KPK's authority, this study aims to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the institution's role in corruption eradication. The results of this research also aim to identify the challenges faced by the KPK and provide strategic recommendations to strengthen the effectiveness of the institution in carrying out its duties. Thus, this research contributes to reinforcing efforts to combat corruption in Indonesia and improving policies related to the independence and performance of the KPK.

INTRODUCTION

Corruption is a systemic problem that has long been deeply rooted in Indonesia and remains a major obstacle to national development (Paranata, 2025). Corruption occurs not only in the government sector but also in various aspects of life, including the private sector, law enforcement agencies, and the education system (Rachmawati, 2022). This phenomenon occurs due to several factors, such as weak law enforcement, a bureaucratic culture that remains vulnerable to bribery and gratuity practices, and a lack of transparency in managing national resources. As a result, corruption not only harms the state's finances but also undermines public trust in the government and legal institutions (Salmon, 2024).

The impacts of corruption are vast and influence various aspects of societal life. Economically, corruption leads to budget leaks, hinders investment, and creates inequalities in the distribution of resources (Sofar, 2025). Many infrastructure projects are left unfinished or

fail to meet standards due to corruption in the procurement of goods and services. Politically, corruption worsens the quality of democracy by introducing practices such as vote-buying, collusion, and nepotism, which ultimately damage a government system that should prioritize the public's interests (Sukiyat, 2020). Meanwhile, from a social perspective, corruption contributes to rising poverty levels and social inequalities, as funds that should be allocated for the welfare of the people are misused for personal or group interests (Simarmata, 2024).

Given the significant negative impacts, corruption eradication is a highly urgent issue that must be carried out systematically and sustainably. The Indonesian government has taken various steps to reduce corruption rates, one of which is by establishing the Corruption Eradication Commission (Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi, KPK) as an independent institution with specific authority in the investigation, prosecution, and handling of corruption cases (Saragih, 2018). The existence of the KPK is expected to strengthen law enforcement and create a deterrent effect for corruption offenders. However, in its journey, the KPK has faced various challenges, including efforts to weaken it through regulatory changes and political intervention that hinder its performance.

The Corruption Eradication Commission (Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi/KPK), established as an independent body to combat corruption in Indonesia, has encountered a range of significant challenges that impede its performance. One of the foremost issues is political interference, which directly or indirectly undermines the Commission's institutional independence. Such interference is often exerted through political pressure and manipulation of public opinion, particularly when the KPK investigates high-profile cases involving political elites or senior government officials. Furthermore, the enactment of Law No. 19 of 2019, which amended the previous KPK Law, has been widely criticized as a regressive measure in the fight against corruption. The revised law introduces additional layers of bureaucracy into the Commission's operations, most notably the requirement for prior approval from the newly established Supervisory Board for critical investigative measures such as wiretapping and seizure. These procedural constraints have restricted the Commission's operational flexibility and slowed its investigatory processes. In addition to regulatory obstacles, the KPK faces systemic impediments within the broader law enforcement framework, including an often-uncooperative bureaucracy and suboptimal coordination with other key legal institutions such as the Attorney General's Office and the National Police.

The amendments to the KPK Law have had a significant impact on the structure and operational procedures of the Commission, particularly with the establishment of the Supervisory Board, which now holds substantial authority in overseeing every step taken by the KPK. This Board does not function merely as an external auditor but also acts as a regulatory body that grants approvals for critical operational activities such as wiretapping, searches, and seizures. This arrangement has sparked considerable debate, as it is perceived to undermine the KPK's operational flexibility and independence—attributes that are essential for ensuring the speed and confidentiality of investigations. The added bureaucratic layers in decision-making processes have also increased the risk of information leaks, potentially jeopardizing anti-corruption efforts. As a consequence, the effectiveness of the KPK in addressing corruption cases has declined, as evidenced by the decreasing number of sting operations (Operasi Tangkap Tangan) and the limited exposure of high-profile cases in recent

years. These regulatory changes have further weakened public perception of the KPK's strength and resolve in combating corruption indiscriminately.

An evaluation of the KPK's effectiveness can be approached from various perspectives, one of which is the institution's track record in prosecuting major corruption cases involving high-ranking officials, members of parliament, and regional heads. Since its establishment, the KPK has successfully uncovered several high-profile corruption scandals, such as the e-ID project (e-KTP) case, the beef import bribery case, and the procurement of medical equipment. However, in recent years, the Commission's effectiveness has come under scrutiny due to a noticeable decline in the number of investigations, prosecutions, and convictions. The mechanisms that once enabled swift and efficient operations have become increasingly sluggish, hampered by internal bureaucratic procedures. On the other hand, the KPK's preventive programs, such as anti-corruption education, public awareness campaigns, and the establishment of integrity zones within government institutions, are still ongoing but have yet to demonstrate a significant impact in reducing systemic corruption. This evaluation is crucial in determining whether the KPK continues to serve its strategic role as the spearhead of anti-corruption efforts, or whether it has begun to lose its edge under the weight of external pressures and internal structural changes.

However, despite these extensive studies, there is a lack of comprehensive analysis that evaluates the current effectiveness of the KPK in the context of these regulatory changes and external interferences. Research gaps exist regarding the practical implications of the KPK's recent struggles, especially in the wake of its institutional changes. Furthermore, while prior studies have highlighted systemic issues, few have proposed actionable recommendations that would improve the KPK's performance in the face of these challenges.

This study aims to address these gaps by providing a critical evaluation of the KPK's effectiveness in handling corruption cases post-2019 regulatory revisions. By analyzing the impact of the revised KPK Law, the role of political interference, and the challenges faced by the Commission in implementing its duties, this research will offer a fresh perspective on the institution's current capacity. The objectives of this research are twofold: (1) to evaluate the effectiveness of the KPK in combating corruption in Indonesia under the new regulatory framework, and (2) to propose strategic recommendations to enhance its operational autonomy and effectiveness. The benefits of this research include strengthening the public's understanding of the KPK's evolving role and providing policy recommendations that could support its independence and improve its operational efficiency.

Through this study, we hope to contribute to the ongoing discourse on corruption eradication in Indonesia, offering insights that may influence both future legal reforms and the strengthening of anti-corruption institutions.

METHOD

This study employed a combination of normative juridical and empirical legal research methods to analyze the role and performance of the KPK in combating corruption in Indonesia. The normative juridical approach involved an examination of relevant anti-corruption legislation. This approach also included the analysis of various legal documents such as implementing regulations, constitutional provisions, and legal principles relevant to the context of corruption eradication. Meanwhile, the empirical approach was employed to assess how

these regulations were implemented in practice and to evaluate the KPK's effectiveness in handling corruption cases. The study analyzed secondary data obtained from official KPK reports, academic publications, and data from government agencies and civil society organizations working in the field of anti-corruption. Case studies of selected corruption cases handled by the KPK were also used to examine patterns of law enforcement, success rates, and the challenges faced by the institution. Through this combined methodology, the research aimed to provide a comprehensive overview of the KPK's role and effectiveness in eradicating corruption in Indonesia and to formulate recommendations to strengthen future law enforcement efforts.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The Role and Effectiveness of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) in Combating Corruption Crimes in Indonesia

The Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) holds primary authority and functions in combating corruption crimes in Indonesia, as stipulated in Law No. 19 of 2019, which amends Law No. 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission. One of the KPK's core authorities is to conduct investigations, inquiries, and prosecutions of corruption cases that meet certain criteria, such as cases involving state officials, cases with widespread impact, or those causing significant financial losses to the state (Badjuri, 2011). This authority is explicitly outlined in Article 6(c) of the KPK Law, which grants the Commission the right to independently handle corruption crimes without interference from other institutions.

In addition, the KPK plays a coordinating and supervisory role over other law enforcement agencies, such as the National Police and the Attorney General's Office, as regulated in Article 6 (b) and (d) of the KPK Law. This coordination function aims to ensure that corruption cases handled by other agencies are processed in accordance with prevailing legal principles and to avoid overlapping jurisdictions (Sugiarto, 2013). In exercising this function, the KPK is authorized to take over corruption cases from other institutions if there is evidence that the case is not being handled effectively or if there are indications of efforts to obstruct the legal process (Sumakul, 2012).

In addition to its repressive measures, KPK is also tasked with corruption prevention and anti-corruption education, as stipulated in Article 6(e) of the KPK Law. These efforts are carried out by providing recommendations for systemic reforms to government institutions to close gaps that allow for corrupt practices in public administration. Moreover, the KPK actively engages in anti-corruption campaigns and educational initiatives across various sectors—including education, the private sector, and the broader public—in an effort to foster an anti-corruption culture in Indonesia (Pahlevi, 2022).

In addition to a repressive approach, KPK also employs a prevention strategy through strengthening integrity systems within the government. This initiative involves building transparency systems, enhancing accountability across various institutions, and encouraging the implementation of procurement systems that are more open and freer from conflicts of interest. One of the key programs implemented is the Asset Wealth Report for State Officials (LHKPN), which requires public officials to report their assets periodically in order to prevent corruption and money laundering (Saputra, 2024).

Additionally, KPK has established cooperation with international organizations in the fight against corruption, particularly in efforts to recover assets from corruption that are hidden abroad. This cooperation involves various international organizations, such as the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) (Simandjuntak, 2013). Furthermore, Indonesia is bound by international conventions, such as the United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC), which forms the basis for collaboration between the KPK and law enforcement agencies in various countries in efforts related to the extradition of corruption suspects and the recovery of state assets held abroad (Mamesah, 2024). With its various powers and strategies, the KPK is expected to continue playing a central role as the leading institution in corruption eradication in Indonesia.

Challenges Faced by the KPK in Fulfilling Its Duties and Strategies to Strengthen Its Role and Independence in Corruption Eradication

Since its establishment in 2003, the KPK has handled various high-profile corruption cases involving top government officials, regional leaders, legislators, and corporations (Zuber, 2018). According to data from the KPK's Annual Report, the institution has handled thousands of corruption cases with a relatively high success rate in securing guilty verdicts in court. The KPK is also known for its Operation Catching Hands (OTT) strategy, which has been effective in uncovering bribery practices across various sectors, from procurement to the buying and selling of positions. Article 12 of the KPK Law states that the KPK has the authority to take legal action in cases of being caught in the act, which forms the basis for the implementation of OTT in efforts to prevent and eradicate corruption (Umar, 2021).

The success of KPK can also be seen in the impact of court verdicts on deterring corruption perpetrators. With heavy sentences for corrupt individuals, such as long prison terms and the obligation to return state losses, it is hoped that corruption rates in Indonesia will decrease. However, the effectiveness of these punishments remains a subject of debate, especially due to the continued existence of cases involving remission and reductions in sentences for corruption convicts (Rori, 2013).

Although KPK has a good track record in handling corruption cases, the institution faces increasingly complex challenges. One of the main challenges is political intervention and the weakening of KPK's authority, particularly after the revision of Law No. 30 of 2002 through Law No. 19 of 2019. This revision introduced several changes that are seen as undermining KPK's independence, such as the establishment of the Supervisory Board, which has authority over the approval of wiretapping, searches, and seizures (Article 37B). This provision has lengthened KPK's investigation process and potentially hampers the effectiveness of the institution's work (Simbolon, 2020).

Additionally, legal and bureaucratic obstacles also serve as significant barriers to the eradication of corruption. The KPK often faces challenges in the legal process, particularly when dealing with powerful political forces and major economic interests. The lengthy judicial processes, difficulty in accessing certain financial data, and gaps in legal regulations often impede the resolution of corruption cases. KPK also encounters difficulties in coordinating with other institutions, particularly the Police and the Attorney General's Office. Although Article 6(b) and (d) of the KPK Law stipulates that the KPK has the authority to coordinate and supervise other law enforcement agencies, in practice, this coordination does not always

run smoothly. Conflicts of interest and disagreements in handling cases often become obstacles, which in turn weakens the overall efforts to combat corruption (Marzuki, 2024).

The revision of KPK Law through Law No. 19 of 2019 has had a substantial impact on the independence of the institution. One of the most significant changes is the alteration of KPK employees' status to Civil Servants (ASN), as outlined in Article 1, paragraph 6 of the KPK Law. This change has raised concerns regarding the independence of KPK employees in handling corruption cases, particularly because the ASN status makes KPK personnel more susceptible to governmental intervention. Furthermore, the newly established KPK Supervisory Board has come under scrutiny in evaluations of the institution's performance. As stipulated in Article 37B of the KPK Law, the Supervisory Board has the authority to approve wiretaps, searches, and seizures, powers that were previously solely within the KPK's remit. This new mechanism introduces additional bureaucratic procedures that may slow down the investigative process, particularly in cases that require swift action. Therefore, an assessment of the effectiveness of the Supervisory Board is essential to ensure that its oversight functions do not inadvertently impede efforts to combat corruption (Einstein, 2020).

In recent years, the effectiveness of KPK in tackling corruption has become a subject of public debate, particularly following the revision of the KPK Law in 2019. Although the KPK remains active in handling major corruption cases, several regulatory changes have limited its authority and independence. The establishment of the Supervisory Board and the requirement for authorization in wiretapping and seizures have introduced additional bureaucracy into the investigative process, which could potentially reduce the speed and effectiveness of the KPK's work. Moreover, the decrease in the number of Corruption Eradication Commission's (KPK) operations in recent years also serves as an indicator that the Commission is facing challenges in implementing its enforcement strategies (Manullang, 2023).

When compared to anti-corruption agencies in other countries, such as the Corrupt Practices Investigation Bureau (CPIB) in Singapore or the Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC) in Hong Kong, the KPK still has several weaknesses. Both the CPIB and ICAC possess full authority to carry out investigations and prosecutions without interference from external parties, whereas the KPK must now obtain approval from the Supervisory Board for certain aspects of its investigations. Additionally, these countries have a more stringent legal framework for imposing penalties on corrupt individuals, thereby delivering a stronger deterrent effect (Sinulingga, 2023).

In order for KPK to remain an effective institution in combating corruption, several recommendations can be considered. First, a review of the KPK Law is necessary, particularly concerning the mechanisms for wiretapping and seizure, to ensure they are not overly bureaucratic while still maintaining the independence of the KPK. Second, the KPK should strengthen its anti-corruption prevention strategies by developing better transparency systems in public governance, such as the implementation of e-governance and the digitalization of procurement processes (Simarmata M. H., 2017).

Third, it is important for the KPK to enhance international cooperation in the recovery of assets from corruption stored abroad. By utilizing international legal instruments such as the United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC), the KPK can collaborate with anti-corruption agencies in other countries to trace and recover illicit funds that have been concealed overseas. Lastly, there is a need to strengthen the role of civil society and the media in

overseeing the performance of the KPK. Public participation in monitoring corruption cases is crucial to ensure that the institution continues to operate transparently and accountably (Mamesah, 2024). With these measures, it is hoped that the KPK can continue to be an effective and integrity-driven institution in combating corruption in Indonesia.

CONCLUSION

The KPK has played a crucial role in combating corruption in Indonesia through its investigative, prosecutorial, and preventive efforts, including anti-corruption education. Despite its success in handling major cases involving high-ranking officials and the private sector, the effectiveness and independence of the KPK have been challenged by regulatory changes particularly Law Number 19 of 2019, which introduced the Supervisory Board and increased bureaucratic hurdles in investigative processes. Additional obstacles such as political intervention, legal barriers, and coordination issues with other agencies have further complicated anti-corruption efforts. To strengthen the KPK's effectiveness, it is essential to reevaluate regulations that restrict its authority, especially regarding investigative mechanisms and wiretapping, while also enhancing transparency, digitalizing public services, and fostering international cooperation for asset recovery. Ongoing public and media oversight is vital to maintain the KPK's transparency and independence. Future research should focus on assessing the long-term impact of regulatory changes on the KPK's performance and exploring innovative strategies for institutional reform and cross-sector collaboration in anti-corruption efforts.

REFERENCES

- Badjuri, A. (2011). Peranan Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi (KPK) sebagai lembaga anti korupsi di indonesia. *Jurnal Bisnis dan Ekonomi*, 18(1).
- Einstein, T. &. (2020). Eksistensi Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi Berdasarkan Undang-Undang Nomor 19 Tahun 2019 Tentang Perubahan Kedua Atas Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2002 tentang Komisi Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi. *National Journal of Law*, 3(2).
- Mamesah, C. N. (2024). Penegakan Hukum Terhadap Kasus Korupsi Sebagai Implementasi The United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC) di Indonesia. *Lex Privatum*, 14(3).
- Manullang, S. O. (2023). Problematika hukum atas pembentukan perubahan kedua atas UU KPK. *Journal on Education*, 5(2), 4885-4897.
- Marzuki, I. (2024). Korupsi sebagai Kejahatan Serius: Evaluasi Peran Lembaga Anti-Korupsi. *Policy and Law Journal*, 1(1), 16-26.
- Pahlevi, F. S. (2022). Strategi Ideal Pemberantasan Korupsi di Indonesia. *Al-Syakhsiyah: Journal of Law & Family Studies*, 4(1), 44-44.
- Paranata, A. (2025). A Systematic Literature Review of Anti-corruption Policy: A Future Research Agenda in Indonesia. *Public Organization Review*, 1-34.
- Rachmawati, A. F. (2022). Dampak korupsi dalam perkembangan ekonomi dan penegakan hukum di indonesia. *Eksaminasi: Jurnal Hukum*, 1(1), 12-19.

- Rori, W. (2013). Kebijakan Hukum Mengenai Syarat Pemberian Remisi Kepada Narapidana Tindak Pidana Korupsi. *Lex Crimen*, 2(7).
- Salmon, H. C. (2024). Hubungan Antara Tindak Pidana Korupsi Dan Kerugian Ekonomi Negara. *LUTUR Law Journal*, 5(2), 97-104.
- Saputra, I. (2024). Fenomena laporan harta kekayaan penyelenggara negara (lhkpn) sebagai pintu masuk penindakan tindak pidana korupsi. *Warta Dharmawangsa*, 18(2), 480-490.
- Saragih, Y. M. (2018). Analisis yuridis kewenangan Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi (KPK) sebagai penuntut pelaku tindak pidana korupsi. *UNIFIKASI: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 5(1), 33-44.
- Simandjuntak, M. E. (2013). Mutual Legal Assistance: Kerjasama Internasional Pemberantasan Korupsi. *Masalah-Masalah Hukum Universitas Diponegoro*, 42(1), 131-138.
- Simarmata, M. &. (2024). Analisis Kebijakan Penanganan Tindak Pidana Ekonomi Khusus Di Indonesia: Studi Kasus Pada Kasus Korupsi Di Sektor Publik. *Jurnal Intelek Insan Cendikia*, 1(9), 5187-5202.
- Simarmata, M. H. (2017). Peranan e-Government dan media sosial untuk Mewujudkan Budaya transparansi dan Pemberantasan Korupsi. *Integritas: Jurnal Antikorupsi*, 3(2), 203-230.
- Simbolon, N. Y. (2020). Politik Hukum Penanganan Korupsi oleh Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi Pasca Disahkannya Undang-undang No. 19 Tahun 2019. *Jurnal Mercatoria*, 13(2), 157-177.
- Sinulingga, M. W. (2023). Perbandingan hukum perampasan aset hasil tindak pidana korupsi di Indonesia, Singapura Dan Hongkong. *Jurnal Normatif*, 3(2), 329-335.
- Sofar, M. S. (2025). Implikasi Praktik Korupsi Terhadap Efektivitas Pengelolaan Keuangan Negara Di Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum dan Kebijakan Publik*, 7(1).
- Sugiarto, T. (2013). Peranan komisi pemberantasan korupsi (KPK) dalam pemberantasan tindak pidana korupsi di Indonesia. *Jurnal Cakrawala Hukum*, 18(2).
- Sukiyat. (2020). Teori dan praktik pendidikan anti korupsi. Surabaya: Jakad Media Publishing.
- Sumakul, A. (2012). Hubungan Dan Kewenangan Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi (KPK) Dan Kejaksaan Dalam Menangani Tindak Pidana Korupsi. *Lex Crimen*, 1(4).
- Umar, H. P. (2021). The new Strategy in Combating Corruption (Detecting Corruption: HU-Model). Medan: Merdeka Kreasi Group.
- Zuber, A. (2018). Strategi anti korupsi melalui pendekatan pendidikan formal dan KPK (Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi). *Journal of Development and Social Change*, 1(2), 178-190.