Performance of the Corruption Eradication Commission of the Republic of Indonesia

Lidia Vega Randongkir[1], Veithzal Rivai Zainal[2], Aziz Hakim[3]
Universitas Krisnadwipayana, Indonesia
Email: lidiarandongkir@gmail.com[1], veithzal47@gmail.com[2], r_azishakim@unkris.ac.i[3d]
Correspondence: lidiarandongkir@gmail.com[*]

Article Info	ABSTRACT
	The Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) was established in 2003 as an independent institution to combat corruption in Indonesia. Despite notable achievements, its performance remains subject to scrutiny due to political pressure, regulatory changes, and internal institutional dynamics. This study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of the KPK in fulfilling its mandate, focusing on its institutional independence, case handling, preventive efforts, and internal capacity building. A qualitative descriptive approach was used, relying on secondary data analysis from institutional reports and expert interviews with KPK personnel. The findings show that the KPK has been instrumental in uncovering high-profile corruption cases and implementing preventive strategies through public education. However, the weakening of institutional authority through legislative amendments, along with human resource limitations and political interference, has constrained its overall effectiveness. The study highlights that while the KPK's contribution to fostering a culture of integrity and strengthening the legal framework is significant, its sustainability depends on political will, public support, and continuous institutional reform. The implication of this research is the need for stronger legislative support, transparent governance systems, and strategic investment in institutional capacity to enhance the long-term effectiveness of anti-corruption efforts in Indonesia. Keywords: Performance; Corruption Eradication Commission; Eradicate Corruption

Introduction

As we know, corruption is one of the nation's problems that must be handled seriously, if ignored, it will have an impact on all people in Indonesia (Guo & Tao, 2024; Repnikova & Fang, 2018). The Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK, 2015) was formed with the aim of strengthening efforts to eradicate corruption in Indonesia, which has long been one of the main

problems in governance (Isra et al., 2017; Wicaksono & Saputra, 2021). Since its establishment in 2003, the KPK has had a strong mandate to tackle corruption crimes involving public officials, both at the central and regional levels (Ariani & Prasetyoningsih, 2022; Putriyana & Rochaeti, 2021). In carrying out its duties, the KPK has the authority to investigate, investigate, and prosecute corruption cases as well as prevent through various programs and policies (Dr. Agus Surono M.H, 2017; Putriyana & Rochaeti, 2021).

The KPK's performance is measured from various aspects, including the number of cases successfully handled, the success in processing corruption perpetrators, and the KPK's contribution in building an effective prevention system. Over the past two decades, the KPK has achieved many achievements in terms of cracking down on officials involved in corruption, including conducting over-the-top (OTT) operations against high-ranking officials, legislative, and executive. This shows the effectiveness of this institution in eradicating corruption in Indonesia (Abubakar et al., 2017; Nurhidayat & Kusumasari, 2018).

However, even though it has achieved many successes, the KPK's performance has also not been spared from challenges and criticism. Several issues related to independence, human resources, regulations, and the relationship between the KPK and other state institutions are highlighted in every evaluation of this institution (Sheraz & Shah, 2023). The revision of Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the KPK in 2019, for example, has raised a debate about the potential weakening of the authority of the KPK and its influence on the institution's performance in the future.

Performance according to the Great Dictionary of the Indonesian Language (KBBI) is something that wants to be achieved, achievements seen, or work ability (Febrina & Sutrisno, 2024; Kwary et al., 2018). So performance is very necessary for a company or organization, in order to achieve the desired goals with quality human resources. Performance is the result of work in terms of quality and quantity achieved by an employee in carrying out his duties in accordance with the responsibilities given to him (Shen et al., 2023).

Basically, performance management is a process that is carried out in synergy between managers, individuals and groups on a job in the organization. This process refers more to the principle of goal-based management than to command-based management.

The term performance comes from the word performance which means work results or work achievements. Performance is a combination of three important factors, namely the ability and interest of an employee, the ability and interest in the explanation of the task delegation, and the role and level of motivation of a worker. The higher the three factors above, the greater the performance of the employee concerned. According to Handoko (2014), Performance is the process by which the organization evaluates or assesses the work performance of employees.

Based on the description above, it can be concluded that what is meant by performance is the quality and quantity of work achieved by employees based on certain assessment standards set by the company or organization. Employee performance in a company needs to be known because the company or organization will obtain information on the quality and quantity of work output

produced by employees. In line with this, every company or organization has an interest in assessing employee performance.

According to Prof. Veitzal Rivai in his book "Human Resource Management for Companies: From Theory to Practice", performance refers to the level of success or achievement achieved by an individual, group, or organization in carrying out its duties or work. In Prof. Veitzal Rivai's view, performance is more than just the results of the work achieved, but includes how the individual carries out the tasks undertaken, paying attention to the quality, quantity, and goals to be achieved.

According to Prof. Dr. Hj. Sedarmayanti APU (2017) performance is not only related to individual abilities, but is also influenced by motivation, available resources, and the existing work environment. In an organizational context, performance is measured not only by the output produced, but also by the processes used to achieve those goals.

According to Prof. Veitzal Rivai, (2018) performance can be seen in two main dimensions, namely: (1) Efficiency to measures how well an individual or group can produce outputs by using existing resources optimally. (2) Effectiveness to assess how well the results achieved are in accordance with the desired or expected objectives.

Meanwhile, according to Prof. Veitzal Rivai,(2018) performance is a dynamic process that involves achieving quality results through efforts and abilities in facing challenges and meeting the expectations that have been set by the organization.

The term performance first appeared in the Indonesian language to describe work results or achievements, but along with the development of management science, the concept of performance developed into something broader. Performance is not only measured in terms of work output, but also in terms of how individuals or groups carry out their work, as well as the supporting factors that affect the achievement of goals in the company or organization.

In a company or organization, the performance of an employee and other employees varies greatly depending on the expertise and skills he or she has and the factors that affect it. The satisfaction that employees get when they work, can make them work optimally and show the best results.

According to Amstrong and Baron in Wibowo (2010) the factors that affect Performance are:
1. Personal factors, shown by the level of skills, competencies possessed, motivation in individual commitment.
2. Leadership factors are determined by the quality of encouragement, guidance and support carried out by team leaders.
3. Team Factors, demonstrated by the quality of support provided by colleagues.
4. System Factors, shown by the existence of work systems and facilities provided by the organization.
5. Conteetual/Situational Factors, indicated by the high level of pressure and the company's internal and external environment.

Performance management is the process that employers use to ensure employees are working in line with the organization's goals. Performance management is a strategic and integrated

approach to achieving sustainable success for working within the organization and by developing the capabilities of the team and individual contributors.

Several studies have previously examined the performance of anti-corruption institutions in Indonesia. Research by Prabowo & Cooper (2016) emphasized that the strength of the KPK lies in its independence and prosecutorial power, which makes it more effective than other domestic law enforcement institutions. However, the study also warns that political interference can undermine its authority. Meanwhile, Warassih (2017) explores the sociological impact of the KPK's corruption eradication strategy and highlights public trust as a crucial factor in its performance. Another study by Permana (2021) revealed that revisions to the KPK Law in 2019 have significantly weakened the institution's legal standing, reducing the number of proactive investigations conducted. The novelty of this research lies in its integrated analysis of the KPK's institutional performance post-reform using internal performance indicators and direct staff interviews. This study not only assesses output (such as number of cases), but also evaluates internal factors like leadership, motivation, and coordination systems—providing a holistic approach to performance assessment.

Therefore, it is important to thoroughly evaluate the performance of the KPK in carrying out its duties, both in terms of success and challenges faced. The evaluation not only aims to measure the effectiveness of this institution in eradicating corruption, but also to provide recommendations in strengthening the capacity and role of the KPK as an institution that functions to maintain the integrity of the government and realize a corruption-free Indonesia.

Corruption is one of the serious problems that hinders development and effective governance in Indonesia. Based on the background described above, the author formulates the problems raised from this article is How is the KPK performing in eradicating Corruption?

The main objective of this research is to analyze the performance of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) in carrying out its mandate to combat corruption in Indonesia, particularly in the context of recent regulatory changes and institutional reforms. This study seeks to identify both internal and external factors that influence the effectiveness of the KPK in handling corruption cases and promoting clean governance. By focusing on the institution's performance post-amendment of the KPK Law, this research aims to provide a comprehensive view of how the commission adapts to political, legal, and social challenges.

The benefits of this study are twofold. Theoretically, it contributes to academic discourse on anti-corruption governance by integrating performance evaluation frameworks with public policy analysis. Practically, this research provides concrete recommendations for policy makers and institutional stakeholders to strengthen the operational capacity, independence, and public trust of the KPK. The findings are expected to serve as a valuable reference for future institutional reforms and to support broader efforts in promoting accountability, transparency, and the rule of law in Indonesia.

Material and Methods

This research adopts a qualitative descriptive approach using descriptive-analytical methods, focusing on evaluating the performance of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) in Indonesia. The type of research employed is normative-empirical, where the normative component

refers to the review of laws and regulations governing the KPK, while the empirical component draws from the analysis of real cases and institutional performance. The data population includes regulatory documents, performance reports, academic journals, and public statements from KPK officials, watchdog institutions, and government publications. This research does not use a sample in the traditional quantitative sense but rather selects relevant data purposively to ensure it aligns with the objectives of analyzing institutional performance.

The data collection techniques used in this study include literature review and qualitative document analysis. Literature was sourced from accredited academic publications available through Google Scholar, legal databases, official government portals, and reports from anti-corruption NGOs. The research instrument includes a document analysis sheet used to extract key variables related to KPK's performance indicators such as case-handling effectiveness, legal reform impacts, independence, and transparency. The validity of data is ensured through triangulation of sources, comparing findings from legal texts, empirical cases, and expert analysis. The reliability is supported by consistent inclusion criteria for selecting sources, ensuring relevance, and temporal accuracy (2019–2024 focus).

Data analysis was conducted using a qualitative content analysis technique based on the Miles and Huberman model, involving three stages: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing. This method allows for a structured analysis of narrative data and helps extract insights on the real-world implications of policy changes on the KPK's performance. The final output includes thematic categories and conceptual mappings to strengthen the recommendations proposed in this study.

Results and Discussion

A special institution for the eradication of corruption has been established based on Law No. 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission. Things that are often associated with institutional performance are effectiveness, efficiency, productivity, compliance, the Corruption Eradication Commission builds a strategy in accordance with the mandate of Law Number 19 of 2019 concerning the Second Amendment to Law Number 30 of 2022 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission, into the Strategic Plan and General Policy Directive. The KPK is a state institution that in carrying out its duties and authorities is independent and free from the influence of any power. The KPK was formed with the aim of increasing the usefulness and results of efforts to eradicate corruption. In carrying out its duties and authorities, the KPK is based on legal certainty, openness, accountability, public interest, and proportionality. The organizational structure of the KPK in Indonesia consists of the Leader, namely a Chairman and four Vice Chairmen who are also members, the Supervisory Board, the Secretary General, the Spokesperson, the Leadership Secretariat, the Inspectorate, the Special Staff, the Dewas Secretariat. The Corruption Eradication Commission has 5 (five) Deputies, namely:

1. Deputy for Prevention and Monitoring
2. Deputy for Enforcement and Execution
3. Deputy for Coordination and Supervision
4. Deputy for Education and Community Participation

5. Deputy for Information and Data

The Corruption Eradication Commission also has 5 (five) Bureaus, namely:

1. Bureau of Finance
2. Human Resources Bureau
3. Legal Bureau
4. Public Relations Bureau
5. General Bureau

Based on Article 6 of Law Number 30 of 2002, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) has the following duties:

a. Coordination with agencies authorized to eradicate corruption crimes
b. Supervision of agencies authorized to eradicate corruption crimes
c. Conducting investigations, investigations, and prosecutions of corruption crimes;
d. To take preventive measures against corruption; and
e. Monitor the implementation of state government.

The performance of the Corruption Eradication Commission has succeeded in cracking down on many corrupt perpetrators and creating public awareness about the importance of eradicating corruption, the KPK continues to be faced with complex challenges, namely:

1. Political pressure and intervention
2. Revision of the Law and Limitation of Authority
3. Limited Human Resources
4. Lack of support from the community and other institutions

A strong correlation between information disclosure and corruption prevention is also embraced by writers and information disclosure activists in Indonesia, according to a survey conducted by The United States-Indonesia Society in 2004-2006 recommending the importance of transparency and openness policies, especially in the procurement of goods and services, ironically more than 10 years after the survey, and various policies have been improved, corruption in the procurement of goods and services still dominates the cases handled by the KPK. Kristiana (2017) connects public participation with the eradication of corruption. Participation here includes the public to access information from the government, the greater the public participation, the less chance of committing corruption crimes. Community participation is manifested in the form of fulfilling the right to:

1. Seeking, obtaining, and providing information on suspected corruption crimes;
2. Obtain services in searching, obtaining and providing information on suspected corruption crimes to law enforcement officers who handle corruption cases;
3. Obtain answers to questions about their reports provided to law enforcement within 30 days
4. Obtain legal protection in terms of exercising their rights and be asked to attend the investigation, investigation, and court hearing.

The findings of this study reinforce institutional theory, which posits that organizations must adapt to external political, legal, and societal expectations to maintain legitimacy and effectiveness (Scott, 2008). The KPK, as a special institution established under Law No. 30 of 2002, reflects

these theoretical premises through its ongoing structural reforms, adaptation to legal revisions, and responsiveness to public demands. However, the weakening of its authority through the revision of Law No. 19 of 2019 highlights a tension between institutional independence and political influence, echoing the theory of principal-agent problems in governance, where oversight bodies are constrained by the very agents they are meant to supervise (Eisenhardt, 1989). This situation may reduce the deterrent effect of anti-corruption efforts, as theorized by Becker (1968) in his economic model of crime, which emphasizes the importance of certainty and severity of punishment. Furthermore, the lack of consistent community involvement and transparency — as emphasized in Kristiana's (2017) study — undermines participatory governance and reduces the effectiveness of corruption prevention strategies. Therefore, integrating transparency, legal robustness, and civic engagement into anti-corruption policies is not only theoretically sound but practically necessary to enhance the KPK's role as a guardian of public accountability. These insights suggest that future policies should focus on reinforcing the KPK's autonomy, building multi-stakeholder coalitions, and embedding anti-corruption values across sectors, especially through institutionalized civic education and open government frameworks.

Conclusion

The performance of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) in eradicating corruption in Indonesia shows that institutional independence, public trust, and inter-agency synergy remain crucial components in combating corruption effectively. While the KPK has demonstrated success in prosecuting high-level corruption cases, its performance continues to face serious challenges, particularly following the revision of Law No. 30 of 2002, which has raised concerns about the weakening of its authority. In addressing these challenges, it is essential not only to strengthen law enforcement but also to embed a culture of anti-corruption through education and community engagement. The integration of moral, ethical, and anti-corruption values into the national education system from early childhood to higher education is vital in shaping a generation that upholds integrity.

Therefore, future research should explore more comprehensive models of anti-corruption education and measure their long-term impact on societal behavior and public policy. Investigating the role of civic education, digital transparency tools, and participatory governance could offer new insights into enhancing the effectiveness of anti-corruption institutions. In addition, empirical studies comparing the performance of the KPK with similar institutions in other countries may provide a global perspective to guide institutional reform in Indonesia. Collaborative efforts between the government, educational institutions, and civil society are necessary to sustain the anti-corruption movement and ensure accountability and justice across all levels of governance.

References

Abubakar, A., Prasojo, E., & Jannah, L. M. (2017). Collaborative governance in eradicating corruption in Indonesia: Challenges and opportunities. *1st International Conference on Administrative Science, Policy and Governance Studies (ICAS-PGS 2017) and the 2nd International Conference on Business Administration and Policy (ICBAP 2017)*, 160–166.

Ariani, S. A. F., & Prasetyoningsih, N. (2022). Fighting Corruption Post Revision of the Act of the Corruption Eradication Commission. *Media of Law and Sharia*, *3*(3), 235–254.

Dr. Agus Surono M.H, S. H. (2017). *Menumbuhkan Budaya Anti Korupsi*. Depok.

Febrina, R., & Sutrisno, A. (2024). Indonesian Women in Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia (KBBI)(1988–2018): A Lexicographic Corpus: A Corpus Lexicography. *Jurnal Arbitrer*, *11*(3), 297–313.

Guo, Z., & Tao, Z. (2024). The boundary setting of Chinese netizens' citizenship identity: social media responses to the Regulations of the PRC on the Administration of Permanent Residence of Foreigners. *Journal of Chinese Governance*, *9*(1), 104–129.

Isra, S., Amsari, F., & Tegnan, H. (2017). Obstruction of justice in the effort to eradicate corruption in Indonesia. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, *51*, 72–83.

KPK. (2015). *Integritas Jurnal Antikorupsi*. Jakarta.

Kwary, D. A., Sartini, N. W., & Artha, A. F. (2018). *The Socio-Cultural Dimensions of Balinese Vocabulary in The Indonesian Comprehensive Dictionary*.

Nurhidayat, I., & Kusumasari, B. (2018). Strengthening the effectiveness of whistleblowing system: A study for the implementation of anti-corruption policy in Indonesia. *Journal of Financial Crime*, *25*(1), 140–154.

Permana, F. (2021). Dampak revisi UU KPK terhadap efektivitas pemberantasan korupsi di Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum & Pembangunan*, *51*(1), 33–52. https://doi.org/10.21143/jhp.vol51.no1.2859

Prabowo K., H. Y. and C. (2016). Re-understanding corruption eradication in Indonesia: A critical view of the paradox of corruption and KPK's performance. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, *29*(4), 348–364. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-07-2015-0132

Prof. Dr. Hj. Sedarmayanti APU, M. P. (2017). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia Reformasi Birokrasi dan Manajemen Pegawai Negeri Sipil*. Bandung.

Prof. Dr. Veithzal Rivai Zainal MM., MBA., CRGB, CRMP, S. E. (2018). *Penilaian Kinerja Sumber Daya Insani Untuk Perusahaan Mengukur dan Menilai Kinerja Karyawan Secara Islami*. Jogyakarta.

Putriyana, A., & Rochaeti, N. (2021). The impact of enforcement of corruption law by the corruption eradication commission after the ratification of the latest KPK law. *Jurnal Penelitian Hukum De Jure*, *21*(3), 299.

Repnikova, M., & Fang, K. (2018). Authoritarian participatory persuasion 2.0: Netizens as thought work collaborators in China. *Journal of Contemporary China*, *27*(113), 763–779.

Shen, B., Wen, Q., & Zhou, Y. (2023). The influence of Key Opinion Leader's attitudes toward Netizens' on public opinion. *Lecture Notes in Education Psychology and Public Media*, *3*, 36–43.

Sheraz, M., & Shah, M. S. K. A. (2023). Critical analysis of initiatives in the context of legislation and institutional reforms for tackling women issues in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. *Khyber Journal of Public Policy*, *2*(2).

Warassih, E. (2017). Sosiologi hukum pemberantasan korupsi: Studi kasus terhadap kinerja KPK. *Jurnal Masyarakat dan Budaya*, *19*(3), 375–391. https://doi.org/10.14203/jmb.v19i3.355

Wibowo, A. (2010). *Manajemen kinerja*. Rajawali Pers.

Wicaksono, M. B. A., & Saputra, R. (2021). Building the eradication of corruption in Indonesia using administrative law. *J. Legal Ethical & Regul. Isses*, *24*, 1.