

The Urgency of Anti-Corruption Education as a Preventive Instrument for Law Enforcement in Indonesia: A Normative Study of the Provisions of Articles 2, 3, and 12B of the Anti-Corruption Law

Ardhian Lukman Hakim¹
Suyanto²

^{1,2}Faculty of Law, Gresik University, Gresik, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Corruption remains a persistent structural problem in Indonesia's legal system and continues to undermine public trust, state finances, and the integrity of governance. Efforts to combat corruption have predominantly relied on repressive criminal law enforcement, yet such measures have not been sufficient to reduce corruption in a sustainable manner. This study examines the urgency of anti-corruption education as a preventive instrument in law enforcement and analyzes the relevance of Articles 2, 3, and 12B of Indonesia's Anti-Corruption Law in supporting preventive efforts. This research employs a normative legal method using statutory and conceptual approaches. The legal materials consist of primary, secondary, and tertiary sources, which are analyzed qualitatively through legal interpretation. The findings show that anti-corruption education occupies a strategic position in the law-enforcement system because it strengthens legal awareness, integrity, and public responsibility as essential elements of corruption prevention. The study also finds that the provisions concerning unlawful enrichment, abuse of authority, and gratification contain not only punitive functions but also preventive values that can be internalized through education. These norms provide a legal and ethical basis for cultivating anti-corruption behaviour and clarifying the boundaries between acceptable conduct and corrupt practices. Therefore, anti-corruption education should be understood as an integral part of a broader anti-corruption legal strategy that combines penal and non-penal approaches in order to create a more effective, comprehensive, and sustainable law-enforcement system in Indonesia.

Keywords: anti-corruption education, corruption, law enforcement, legal awareness, preventive

1. INTRODUCTION

Corruption remains one of the most persistent structural problems in Indonesia's legal system. It not only causes financial losses to the state, but also undermines public

^{1*}Corresponding author, email: hakim.nusantaraproperty@gmail.com

Citation in APA style: Hakim, A.L., Suyanto. (2026). The Urgency of Anti-Corruption Education as a Preventive Instrument for Law Enforcement in Indonesia: A Normative Study of the Provisions of Articles 2, 3, and 12B of the Anti-Corruption Law. *JOSAR*, Vol. 11. No. (1):83-96.

Received:
January, 25th 2026

Revised:
February, 28th 2026

Published:
April, 09th 2026

trust in legal institutions, weakens democratic governance, and hinders sustainable national development. In Indonesian positive law, corruption is primarily regulated under Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Corruption Crimes, as amended by Law Number 20 of 2001. These legal instruments provide the main normative framework for identifying prohibited acts, including unlawful enrichment, abuse of authority, and gratification related to public office. In this regard, the legal regulation of corruption demonstrates that corruption is not merely an ethical deviation, but a serious legal offence that directly threatens the integrity of public administration.

To facilitate readers' understanding of the statutory framework discussed in this article, the following Table 1 summarizes the main anti-corruption provisions examined in this study and their relevance to anti-corruption education.

Table 1. Selected Provisions of the Anti-Corruption Law and Their Relevance to Anti-Corruption Education

Provision	Substantive Content	Legal Focus	Relevance to Anti-Corruption Education
Article 2	Criminalizes unlawful acts of enriching oneself, another person, or a corporation that cause losses to state finances or the national economy.	Unlawful enrichment and state financial loss	Serves as a normative basis for teaching honesty, accountability, and awareness that corruption harms public resources and collective welfare.
Article 3	Criminalizes the abuse of authority, opportunity, or means attached to office or position for personal, corporate, or third-party benefit that causes state financial loss.	Abuse of authority and misuse of public office	Supports the development of integrity, responsibility in exercising authority, and ethical awareness regarding the limits of public power.
Article 12B	Treats gratification received by a civil servant or state official as bribery when it is connected to office and contrary to official duties or obligations.	Gratification, bribery, and conflict of interest	Provides an educational basis for explaining the boundary between social courtesy and corrupt conduct, especially in practices often normalized in daily life.

As shown in the Table 1 above, the selected provisions do not merely function as punitive norms, but also contain preventive values that may be internalized through anti-corruption education.

So far, efforts to combat corruption in Indonesia have largely relied on repressive mechanisms through criminal law enforcement, such as investigation, prosecution, and punishment. Although this approach is necessary, it has not been fully effective in reducing corruption in a sustainable manner. The persistence of corruption cases indicates that punitive measures alone are insufficient if they are not supported by preventive efforts aimed at strengthening legal awareness, moral responsibility, and personal integrity. Therefore, corruption eradication requires a more comprehensive strategy that combines penal and non-penal approaches in an integrated manner.

In this context, anti-corruption education plays a strategic role as a preventive instrument in law enforcement. It does not merely function as a means of transmitting knowledge about corruption, but also as a mechanism for internalizing values such as honesty, responsibility, integrity, and respect for the rule of law. From the perspective of

legal effectiveness, Soerjono Soekanto argues that the functioning of law is influenced not only by legal norms and law enforcement institutions, but also by the level of public legal awareness (Soekanto, 2008). This means that legal rules will not operate effectively unless they are supported by a society that understands, accepts, and complies with them. Accordingly, education becomes an important medium for cultivating a legal culture oriented toward integrity and compliance.

Furthermore, Barda Nawawi Arief emphasizes that crime prevention policy should not rely exclusively on penal measures, but must also be supported by non-penal measures that are preventive in nature, including education and moral development (Arief, 2010). From this perspective, anti-corruption education forms an integral part of criminal policy because it addresses the roots of corruption before such conduct materializes into criminal acts. It is therefore insufficient to view anti-corruption education merely as a complementary moral discourse; rather, it should be understood as a preventive legal instrument that supports the broader objective of corruption law enforcement.

This argument is also reinforced by Satjipto Rahardjo's progressive legal thought, which views law not simply as a body of written rules, but as an instrument for achieving justice through value-oriented human conduct (Rahardjo, 2009). In other words, the success of law is not determined solely by the existence of legal texts, but also by the human capacity to embody the values underlying those norms. In the context of corruption prevention, the existence of anti-corruption provisions will be less effective if individuals do not possess the ethical awareness and integrity necessary to avoid corrupt practices. Anti-corruption education is therefore essential because it contributes to the formation of legal behaviour that is consistent with justice, accountability, and public responsibility.

From the standpoint of positive law, anti-corruption education is particularly relevant to the legal provisions governing acts that unlawfully enrich oneself or another person, misuse authority attached to office, and normalize gratification in connection with official duties. These forms of corruption illustrate that corruption may arise not only from explicit criminal intent, but also from weak integrity, abuse of power, and socially tolerated practices that gradually become institutionalized. In particular, gratification is often perceived as part of social courtesy or cultural reciprocity, even though legally it may constitute corruption when connected with office and contrary to official obligations. This condition reveals a gap between legal norms and social understanding. Accordingly, anti-corruption education becomes necessary to provide an early and systematic understanding of the boundaries between acceptable conduct and conduct prohibited by law.

As a state based on the rule of law, as affirmed in Article 1 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, Indonesia places law as the foundation for the administration of state and national life. Nevertheless, the success of law enforcement depends not only on the existence of legislation, but also on the quality of human resources who possess integrity, legal awareness, and a strong sense of public ethics. In this respect, anti-corruption education has an important role in building a sustainable legal culture that supports the effective enforcement of anti-corruption norms.

Previous studies have examined corruption from various legal, political, and educational perspectives. However, most of them tend to focus either on repressive law enforcement or on anti-corruption education as a general form of character education.

Studies that specifically examine the relationship between anti-corruption education and the normative substance of corruption offences under the Anti-Corruption Law remain limited. In addition, previous scholarship often places penal and non-penal approaches in separate analytical frameworks, rather than examining their interrelationship within a comprehensive law-enforcement strategy. This limitation creates a research gap, particularly with regard to how anti-corruption education may be theoretically and normatively positioned as a preventive instrument within Indonesia's anti-corruption legal framework.

Based on this gap, the novelty of this study lies in its attempt to analyze anti-corruption education not merely as a moral or pedagogical agenda, but as a preventive legal instrument that is normatively connected to the provisions of Articles 2, 3, and 12B of the Anti-Corruption Law. This study seeks to show that those provisions do not only function as the basis for punitive action, but also contain preventive values that may be internalized through anti-corruption education in order to strengthen legal awareness, integrity, and anti-corruption culture in society.

Based on this background, the research problems formulated in this study are as follows:

1. How is the position of anti-corruption education as a preventive instrument in law enforcement in Indonesia?
2. How relevant are the provisions of Articles 2, 3, and 12B of the Anti-Corruption Law in supporting preventive efforts through anti-corruption education?

This study aims to analyze the urgency of anti-corruption education in the law enforcement system and to examine its relationship with applicable legal norms. To achieve these objectives, this research employs a normative legal research method using a statute approach and a conceptual approach, as commonly applied in legal studies focusing on written legal norms and their interpretation. Through these approaches, this study systematically examines the relationship between anti-corruption regulation and education as a preventive instrument in law enforcement.

Thus, this study is expected to provide both theoretical and practical contributions, particularly to the development of legal scholarship on anti-corruption education as part of a more effective, comprehensive, and sustainable law-enforcement strategy in Indonesia.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 The Concept of Corruption in Indonesian Law

Corruption is categorized as an extraordinary crime because of its broad and multidimensional impact on the social, economic, and political life of the state. In the Indonesian legal system, corruption is principally regulated under Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Corruption Crimes, as amended by Law Number 20 of 2001. These statutes establish the primary legal basis for identifying conduct that constitutes corruption and for imposing criminal sanctions against offenders.

Within this legal framework, the Anti-Corruption Law criminalizes conduct through which a person unlawfully enriches himself or herself, another person, or a corporation in a manner that causes losses to state finances or the national economy. This norm reflects the idea that corruption is not limited to direct theft of public funds, but includes broader forms of unlawful enrichment that injure public interests. In addition, the law also criminalizes the misuse of authority, opportunity, or facilities attached to

office or position for personal or corporate benefit where such conduct results in state loss. This shows that corruption in Indonesian law is closely related not only to unlawful gain, but also to the abuse of public power and official discretion.

Furthermore, the amendment introduced through Law Number 20 of 2001 strengthened the regulation of gratification by treating benefits received by civil servants or state officials as bribery when such benefits are related to office and are contrary to official duties or obligations. This provision is significant because gratification is often socially perceived as a normal form of courtesy or reciprocity, even though it may legally fall within the category of corruption. Accordingly, the Indonesian positive legal framework addresses corruption not only in the form of large-scale misappropriation and abuse of authority, but also through everyday practices that may normalize conflicts of interest.

2.2 Law Enforcement in Combating Corruption

Law enforcement refers to the process of translating legal norms into actual social practice. In the context of combating corruption, law enforcement in Indonesia has historically been dominated by a repressive orientation, particularly through investigation, prosecution, adjudication, and punishment. This approach is indispensable because corruption directly harms the state and undermines public trust in government institutions.

However, a purely repressive model has important limitations. Criminal sanctions operate after corruption has already occurred, which means that law enforcement is often reactive rather than preventive. The continued persistence of corruption cases indicates that the effectiveness of anti-corruption law enforcement cannot be assessed solely by the severity of punishment, but must also be measured by the extent to which the legal system is able to prevent corrupt conduct from emerging in the first place. In this respect, anti-corruption efforts require a broader strategy that integrates legal enforcement with preventive instruments such as education, institutional ethics, and the cultivation of public integrity. This view is increasingly reflected in recent anti-corruption scholarship that calls for harmonizing criminal policy with non-penal approaches based on public awareness and institutional culture.

As a state based on the rule of law, as affirmed in Article 1 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution, Indonesia places law as the foundation of governance. Nevertheless, effective law enforcement requires more than legislation and punishment. It also depends on the quality of legal culture, public trust, and the willingness of individuals and institutions to internalize anti-corruption norms in everyday conduct.

2.3 Theory of Legal Awareness and Legal Culture

Legal awareness is an important factor in determining the effectiveness of law. Soerjono Soekanto explains that law enforcement is influenced not only by legal rules and institutions, but also by community awareness and willingness to comply with the law. Without legal awareness, legal norms may remain formal commands that are ineffective in practice. For this reason, legal awareness is closely related to the broader issue of whether society recognizes law as a binding standard of conduct. The

bibliographic record for Soekanto's *Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Penegakan Hukum* is available in Indonesian legal and library catalogues.

The notion of legal culture can be further explained through Lawrence M. Friedman's theory of the legal system, which identifies legal culture as one of the principal components of law alongside legal structure and legal substance. In Friedman's formulation, legal culture refers to the attitudes, values, and social expectations that shape how law is understood, accepted, and applied in society. A strong legal culture supports compliance and institutional integrity, whereas a weak legal culture may normalize violations, including corrupt behaviour. This theoretical perspective is especially relevant in anti-corruption studies because corruption often persists not merely due to weak legal rules, but because deviant practices are socially tolerated or institutionally rationalized. The foundational bibliographic description of Friedman's *The Legal System: A Social Science Perspective* highlights its treatment of legal culture as a central element of how legal systems operate.

In this context, education becomes strategic because it shapes legal awareness and legal culture simultaneously. Through education, values such as honesty, responsibility, integrity, and respect for public duties may be internalized from an early stage. Anti-corruption education is therefore not merely an ethical supplement, but a mechanism for forming a legal culture that supports the effective operation of anti-corruption law.

2.4 Penal and Non-Penal Policies in Combating Corruption

Barda Nawawi Arief argues that crime prevention policy should be implemented through both penal and non-penal approaches. The penal approach emphasizes the use of criminal law to investigate, prosecute, and punish offenders, whereas the non-penal approach focuses on preventive efforts such as education, social policy, and moral development. In this framework, the success of criminal policy depends on the ability to balance repressive enforcement with preventive intervention. The bibliographic record for Arief's *Bunga Rampai Kebijakan Hukum Pidana* identifies it as a monograph published by Kencana in 2010.

The penal approach is necessary because corruption requires firm legal sanctions in order to maintain deterrence and uphold public accountability. However, penal measures are inherently reactive because they operate after the offence has occurred. By contrast, the non-penal approach seeks to reduce the social and institutional conditions that enable corruption. In the context of corruption, this preventive dimension is particularly important because corruption is frequently rooted in weak integrity, permissive institutional culture, and the normalization of conflicts of interest.

Accordingly, anti-corruption education may be positioned as part of the non-penal policy of corruption prevention. It contributes to shaping values, behaviour, and institutional ethics before legal violations take place. This integrated perspective also resonates with more recent scholarship that emphasizes the need to align criminal policy with broader non-penal prevention efforts rooted in public awareness and social norms.

2.5 Anti-Corruption Education as a Preventive Instrument

Anti-corruption education is a systematic effort to cultivate honesty, integrity, responsibility, and rejection of corrupt practices. Its aim is not limited to cognitive

knowledge about corruption offences, but extends to the formation of moral judgement and behavioural commitment. In this sense, anti-corruption education functions as a preventive instrument because it addresses corruption at the level of values and legal consciousness rather than merely at the level of punishment.

Recent scholarship has strengthened this perspective. Sumaryati et al. developed a project-based anti-corruption education model and found that anti-corruption learning should go beyond cognitive content by emphasizing affective and practical dimensions of integrity formation. Nasution et al. proposed an integrity measurement framework for the education sector, arguing that integrity in schools and universities must be assessed not only in academic misconduct but also in administrative, financial, and procurement dimensions. Salimah and Suyanto, through a systematic literature review, show that the insertion of anti-corruption values can be carried out through both curricular and extracurricular mechanisms. These studies indicate that anti-corruption education is increasingly understood as an institutional and pedagogical strategy, not merely as moral rhetoric.

In legal terms, anti-corruption education is also closely related to the prohibition of gratification and other corruption offences under the Anti-Corruption Law. By clarifying the boundaries between acceptable conduct and prohibited conduct, education helps reduce the social ambiguity that often surrounds everyday corruption risks. The preventive value of anti-corruption education therefore lies in its capacity to bridge the gap between legal norms and ordinary social behaviour.

2.6 Law as a Means of Shaping Social Behavior

Satjipto Rahardjo's theory of progressive law views law not merely as a set of written rules, but as an instrument for realizing substantive justice through value-oriented human conduct. In this perspective, law should serve human welfare and social transformation rather than become a rigid and formalistic command detached from social realities. The bibliographic records of *Hukum Progresif: Sebuah Sintesa Hukum Indonesia* identify Satjipto Rahardjo's 2009 work as a principal source for this line of thought.

This theoretical framework is relevant to anti-corruption studies because corruption cannot be effectively prevented through legal texts alone. Legal norms require individuals who are capable of embodying the ethical values underlying those norms. Thus, the law's effectiveness depends in part on whether the society being regulated is equipped with the moral and institutional resources necessary to resist corruption. Anti-corruption education contributes to this objective by transforming legal norms into practical ethical standards that guide everyday conduct.

In this sense, anti-corruption education supports a substantive understanding of law. It helps ensure that the law is not reduced to punishment after the fact, but becomes part of a broader social process of shaping behaviour, building public responsibility, and promoting justice-oriented legal culture.

2.7 Previous Studies and Research Gap

Various recent studies have discussed anti-corruption education from different perspectives. Sumaryati et al. focus on pedagogical design through a project-based anti-corruption learning model. Nasution et al. develop an integrity measurement approach for educational institutions. Sanjaya and Trifena compare anti-corruption education in Indonesia and Hong Kong and show that comparative institutional learning may strengthen Indonesia's preventive strategy. Salimah and Suyanto review the insertion of anti-corruption values in educational institutions, while Kholiq and Permata examine anti-corruption education ecosystems in State Islamic Universities in Indonesia. More recently, Permana and Setiawan analyze the realities, causes, and solutions of corruption in Indonesia's education sector, and Angraeni conceptualizes anti-corruption education as a form of collective action requiring coordinated institutional support. Zulaiha also adds a philosophical dimension by discussing the ontology, epistemology, and axiology of anti-corruption education.

These studies make an important contribution by showing that anti-corruption education is relevant to pedagogy, institutional design, comparative policy, and the governance of educational spaces. However, the existing literature still tends to treat anti-corruption education either as a general character-building programme or as an institutional prevention policy. What remains insufficiently explored is the doctrinal relationship between anti-corruption education and the normative content of specific corruption offences under the Anti-Corruption Law.

Accordingly, the research gap in this study lies in the limited scholarship that systematically connects anti-corruption education with the legal substance of corruption offences, particularly those concerning unlawful enrichment, abuse of authority, and gratification. Previous research has not sufficiently demonstrated how these offence provisions may be interpreted not only as grounds for criminal punishment, but also as normative sources for preventive education. On that basis, this study offers novelty by analyzing anti-corruption education as a preventive legal instrument that is normatively linked to the provisions of Articles 2, 3, and 12B of the Anti-Corruption Law.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a normative legal research method, which focuses on examining written legal norms (law in books) through the analysis of legislation, legal doctrines, and relevant legal literature. This method is chosen because the issue under study relates to the legal construction of anti-corruption education as a preventive instrument in law enforcement, which requires an analysis of applicable legal norms as well as the underlying legal concepts.

The approaches used in this research include the statute approach and the conceptual approach. The statute approach is conducted by reviewing various legal provisions related to corruption, particularly Law Number 31 of 1999 in conjunction with Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning the Eradication of Corruption, as well as other relevant regulations within the national legal system. Meanwhile, the conceptual approach is used to examine the concepts of anti-corruption education, legal awareness, and the preventive role in law enforcement based on the perspectives of legal scholars.

The legal materials used in this study consist of primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials. Primary legal materials include laws and regulations related to corruption, such as Law Number 31 of 1999 in conjunction with Law Number 20 of 2001, as well as the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. Secondary legal materials consist of books, scientific journals, and expert opinions relevant to the research topic, particularly those related to anti-corruption education and law enforcement. Tertiary legal materials include legal dictionaries, encyclopedias, and other sources used to clarify legal terms and concepts employed in this study.

The technique of collecting legal materials is carried out through library research, namely by collecting, reading, and examining various literature and legal documents relevant to the research problem. The collected legal materials are then analyzed qualitatively using a descriptive-analytical method, by describing and interpreting existing legal provisions and concepts to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the role of anti-corruption education as a preventive instrument in law enforcement.

The analysis technique in this study is conducted through legal interpretation, both systematic and conceptual. Systematic interpretation is used to examine the relationship between laws and regulations within the legal system, while conceptual interpretation is used to understand the meaning and purpose of anti-corruption education in the context of law enforcement. The results of the analysis are then used to answer the research questions and to draw conclusions relevant to the objectives of the study.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 The Position of Anti-Corruption Education as a Preventive Instrument in Law Enforcement in Indonesia.

Anti-corruption education occupies a fundamental position within the law-enforcement system in Indonesia, particularly in its preventive dimension. In practice, anti-corruption law enforcement has long been dominated by a repressive approach through investigation, prosecution, adjudication, and punishment. Although such mechanisms remain essential for maintaining deterrence and legal accountability, they are inherently reactive because they operate only after corruption has already occurred. This limitation demonstrates that the effectiveness of anti-corruption law enforcement cannot depend solely on penal sanctions, but must also be supported by preventive measures capable of shaping legal awareness, ethical responsibility, and institutional integrity before corrupt conduct materializes. The Anti-Corruption Law itself provides the punitive framework for corruption control, while the broader legal policy of corruption prevention increasingly recognizes the need to complement repression with educational and cultural strategies.

From the perspective of legal theory, the preventive role of anti-corruption education may be understood through the concept of legal effectiveness. Soerjono Soekanto argues that the functioning of law is influenced not only by legal norms and law-enforcement institutions, but also by the level of public legal awareness. In the same vein, Lawrence M. Friedman's theory of the legal system emphasizes that legal substance and legal structure will not operate effectively without the support of legal culture. This means that anti-corruption law cannot achieve its objectives merely by prescribing prohibitions and sanctions; it must also be internalized by citizens and public officials as

a normative standard of conduct. In this context, anti-corruption education serves as a strategic medium for embedding the values of honesty, responsibility, integrity, and respect for public duties into the legal consciousness of society.

Within the framework of criminal policy, anti-corruption education is best positioned as part of the non-penal strategy of corruption prevention. Barda Nawawi Arief explains that crime prevention policy should not rely exclusively on penal measures, but must also incorporate non-penal approaches, including education and moral development (Arief, 2010). This framework is especially relevant in corruption cases because corruption is not merely the product of individual intent, but often arises from permissive institutional culture, weak ethical controls, and the normalization of deviant practices. Therefore, anti-corruption education should not be seen merely as a supplementary moral discourse external to law enforcement. Rather, it must be understood as an integral preventive instrument that addresses the social and ethical conditions enabling corruption. Recent scholarship on anti-corruption policy likewise stresses that criminal policy should be harmonized with broader preventive interventions rooted in public awareness and institutional culture.

Normatively, the position of anti-corruption education in Indonesia is reinforced by sectoral regulation. Minister of Research, Technology, and Higher Education Regulation Number 33 of 2019 expressly defines anti-corruption education as a process of learning and behavioural formation in higher education related to the prevention of corrupt behaviour and corruption offences. This is important because it places anti-corruption education not merely in the realm of ethical recommendation, but within the framework of public policy and formal educational governance. In other words, Indonesian law has begun to acknowledge that corruption prevention requires educational institutionalization, especially in universities as spaces for shaping future public officials, professionals, and citizens. The preventive position of anti-corruption education is therefore supported not only by legal theory, but also by a concrete regulatory basis within the national education system.

The strategic position of anti-corruption education is further strengthened by recent empirical and policy developments. The Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) reported that during 2020–2024 anti-corruption education had been implemented in tens of thousands of educational units in Indonesia, ranging from early childhood education to higher education. This institutional expansion shows that anti-corruption education is increasingly treated as part of Indonesia's long-term corruption-control strategy rather than as an incidental academic initiative. At the same time, recent studies indicate that anti-corruption education remains necessary because social tolerance toward corrupt or quasi-corrupt practices has not disappeared. A systematic review of anti-corruption education research also shows that implementation has developed through curricular, extracurricular, and institutional approaches, indicating that preventive education works most effectively when it is embedded across educational environments rather than confined to classroom instruction alone.

This preventive position becomes even more significant when viewed through the lens of progressive law. Satjipto Rahardjo's concept of progressive law holds that law should not be understood merely as a body of written commands, but as an instrument for achieving justice through value-oriented human behaviour (Rahardjo, 2009). Applied to corruption prevention, this means that the success of anti-corruption law depends not only on the existence of statutory prohibitions, but also on whether individuals have the ethical

capacity to reject opportunities for unlawful enrichment, abuse of authority, and gratification. Anti-corruption education contributes precisely to this process by translating abstract legal norms into concrete behavioural standards. It functions as a bridge between legal substance and social practice, thereby reducing the gap between what the law prohibits and what society may still tolerate.

Accordingly, anti-corruption education should be positioned as a preventive instrument that is integral to the law-enforcement system in Indonesia. Its role is not limited to informing students or citizens about the dangers of corruption, but extends to shaping legal awareness, ethical discipline, and anti-corruption culture in a sustained manner. In that sense, anti-corruption education complements penal law enforcement by operating at an earlier stage of prevention, namely before corrupt behaviour becomes institutionalized or criminally manifested. Therefore, a comprehensive anti-corruption strategy in Indonesia requires the integration of repressive enforcement and preventive education, so that the fight against corruption is not only punitive in character but also transformative in its social and legal impact.

4.2 The Relevance of Articles 2, 3, and 12B of the Anti-Corruption Law in Supporting Preventive Efforts through Anti-Corruption Education

The relevance of the Anti-Corruption Law to anti-corruption education lies not only in its punitive character, but also in the preventive values embedded in its substantive norms. In doctrinal terms, the law does more than define prohibited conduct and prescribe sanctions; it also identifies the ethical boundaries that should guide the behaviour of citizens, public officials, and future state actors. For that reason, the provisions examined in this study are important not merely because they criminalize corruption, but because they provide normative content that can be translated into educational values such as honesty, accountability, integrity, and resistance to conflicts of interest.

First, the Anti-Corruption Law criminalizes conduct by which a person unlawfully enriches himself or herself, another person, or a corporation in a manner that may harm state finances or the national economy. This provision is highly relevant to anti-corruption education because it affirms that the misuse of public resources for private gain is not only legally prohibited but socially destructive. In educational terms, this norm can be transformed into a preventive teaching framework that emphasizes honesty in the management of public resources, rejection of illicit gain, and awareness that corruption injures collective welfare rather than merely violating formal legal rules. The explanatory section of the law also indicates that this provision is drafted as a formal offence, meaning that the fulfilment of the prohibited act is central to liability. This strengthens its preventive function because it teaches that unlawful enrichment must be rejected at the stage of conduct itself, before broader public harm becomes normalized.

Second, the law also criminalizes the misuse of authority, opportunity, or facilities attached to office or position for the benefit of oneself, another person, or a corporation where such conduct may harm state finances or the national economy. The preventive significance of this norm is particularly strong because it addresses corruption as an abuse of entrusted power rather than merely as unlawful enrichment. In this sense, anti-corruption education can use this provision to teach that public office is fiduciary in nature: authority is granted to serve the public interest, not to produce personal advantage.

Thus, the educational value derived from this norm includes responsibility in the exercise of power, ethical limits on discretion, and early awareness of how administrative authority may be distorted into corrupt practice. Read preventively, this provision supports character formation for future office-holders and professionals by emphasizing that corruption often begins with the misuse of institutional opportunity rather than with overt criminal intent alone.

Third, the law treats gratification received by a civil servant or state official as bribery when it is connected with office and is contrary to the recipient's duties or obligations. This provision has especially strong relevance to anti-corruption education because it addresses forms of corruption that are often socially ambiguous. Unlike blatant embezzlement or direct abuse of authority, gratification may be disguised as courtesy, gratitude, hospitality, or social reciprocity. Yet the statutory formulation makes clear that when a benefit is linked to office and conflicts with official duty, it enters the sphere of corruption. The rule is further refined by evidentiary thresholds in the amended law, and subsequent KPK regulations reinforce the preventive obligation to report or reject gratification connected to office and contrary to duty. For educational purposes, this norm is crucial because it helps students and future public servants distinguish between socially tolerated gift-giving and legally impermissible benefits.

The educational relevance of gratification norms is also supported by recent anti-corruption scholarship. Studies published by KPK's *Integritas* journal have highlighted that tolerance toward gratification can function as a proxy for tolerance toward corruption, while more recent work on the "gratification paradox" in anti-corruption education shows that gift-related dilemmas remain a practical pedagogical challenge in Indonesian educational settings. These findings are important because they confirm that anti-corruption education must not remain abstract or purely moralistic. Instead, it should engage directly with the grey areas of everyday practice where corruption is often normalized through habit, culture, or institutional convenience.

From the standpoint of legal theory, the connection between these statutory norms and anti-corruption education can be understood through the concept of legal awareness. Legal norms become effective only when they are understood, internalized, and reflected in social behaviour. For that reason, the norms concerning unlawful enrichment, abuse of authority, and gratification should not be read solely as bases for criminal prosecution. They also function as normative references for preventive education because they define the moral and legal boundaries that ought to be recognized long before criminal proceedings become necessary. In this respect, anti-corruption education acts as the medium through which the repressive content of the law is transformed into a preventive culture of compliance and integrity.

Accordingly, the relevance of Articles 2, 3, and 12B of the Anti-Corruption Law to preventive efforts through anti-corruption education is both doctrinal and practical. Doctrinally, these provisions define the core forms of corruption that must be prevented: illicit enrichment, abuse of public authority, and office-related gratification. Practically, they offer concrete normative material for educational programmes aimed at building honesty, public accountability, integrity in office, and sensitivity to conflicts of interest. Therefore, these provisions should not be understood merely as punitive norms within the criminal justice system, but also as legal foundations for anti-corruption education as part of a broader and more sustainable prevention strategy in Indonesia.

5. CONCLUSION

Anti-corruption education occupies a highly strategic position as a preventive instrument within the law-enforcement system in Indonesia. The persistence of corruption demonstrates that law enforcement cannot rely solely on repressive mechanisms through investigation, prosecution, and punishment. Although penal measures remain necessary to ensure accountability and deterrence, they are not sufficient to address the cultural, ethical, and structural conditions that enable corruption to persist. In this context, anti-corruption education serves as an essential preventive mechanism because it contributes to the formation of legal awareness, integrity, responsibility, and respect for public values, thereby strengthening the legal culture required for the effective enforcement of anti-corruption norms.

Furthermore, the provisions of Articles 2, 3, and 12B of the Anti-Corruption Law demonstrate that corruption is legally understood not only as unlawful enrichment and abuse of authority, but also as conduct that may arise through socially normalized practices such as gratification connected to office. These provisions therefore possess not only punitive significance, but also preventive value. They provide normative guidance that may be internalized through anti-corruption education in order to cultivate honesty in relation to public resources, responsibility in the exercise of authority, and sensitivity to conflicts of interest in public life. In this sense, the Anti-Corruption Law does not merely function as a basis for criminal sanctions, but also as a normative foundation for shaping anti-corruption behaviour and legal consciousness in society.

Accordingly, this study concludes that anti-corruption education should be understood as an integral component of Indonesia's broader anti-corruption legal strategy. Its urgency lies in its capacity to bridge the gap between statutory prohibition and social practice by translating legal norms into values and behavioural standards that can be understood and applied in everyday life. Therefore, the integration of penal and non-penal approaches is indispensable for creating a more effective, comprehensive, and sustainable law-enforcement system in Indonesia, one that is not only punitive in responding to corruption, but also preventive in reducing the conditions that allow corruption to develop.

REFERENCES

- Angraeni, S. (2024). Collective action management of Anticorruption Education (ACE) from an organizational sociology perspective: A proposed institutional strategy for ACE. *Integritas: Jurnal Antikorupsi*, 10(2), 269–284.
- Arief, B. N. (2010). *Bunga rampai kebijakan hukum pidana*. Kencana.
- Friedman, L. M. (1975). *The legal system: A social science perspective*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Indonesia. (1945). *Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945*.
- Indonesia. (1999). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 31 Tahun 1999 tentang Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi*.
- Indonesia. (2001). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 20 Tahun 2001 tentang Perubahan atas Undang-Undang Nomor 31 Tahun 1999 tentang Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi*.

- Indonesia. Kementerian Riset, Teknologi, dan Pendidikan Tinggi. (2019). *Peraturan Menteri Riset, Teknologi, dan Pendidikan Tinggi Republik Indonesia Nomor 33 Tahun 2019 tentang Penyelenggaraan Pendidikan Antikorupsi di Perguruan Tinggi*.
- Kholiq, A., & Permata, K. I. (2023). Anticorruption education ecosystems at State Islamic Universities in Indonesia. *Integritas: Jurnal Antikorupsi*, 9(2), 283–292.
- Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi. (2024, December 18). *Kinerja KPK 2020–2024: Pendidikan antikorupsi diterapkan di puluhan ribu satuan pendidikan di Indonesia*.
- Nasution, Z., Angraeni, S., Zulaiha, A., Matan, H. M., Purbowati, P., Patimah, S., & Nagara, G. (2022). Education integrity survey: A suggested measurement of integrity in education sector. *Integritas: Jurnal Antikorupsi*, 8(2), 221–236. <https://doi.org/10.32697/integritas.v8i2.954>
- Permana, S., & Setiawan, M. (2024). Corruption in the education sector in Indonesia: Reality, causes, and solutions. *Integritas: Jurnal Antikorupsi*, 10(2), 249–268. <https://doi.org/10.32697/integritas.v10i2.1326>
- Rahardjo, S. (2009). *Hukum progresif: Sebuah sintesa hukum Indonesia*. Genta Publishing.
- Salimah, Z., & Suyanto, S. (2023). Systematic literature review: Implementation of anti-corruption value insertion in educational institutions. *Integritas: Jurnal Antikorupsi*, 9(2), 257–270.
- Sanjaya, A. P., & Trifena, I. (2023). The role of education in curbing corruption: A comparison of Indonesia and Hong Kong. *Integritas: Jurnal Antikorupsi*, 9(2), 241–256. <https://doi.org/10.32697/integritas.v9i2.992>
- Soekanto, S. (2008). *Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi penegakan hukum*. RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Sumaryati, S., Suyadi, S., Nuryana, Z., & Asmorojati, A. W. (2022). Anti-corruption action: A project-based anti-corruption education model during COVID-19. *Frontiers in Education*, 7, Article 907725. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.907725>
- Suyanto. (2022). *Metode penelitian hukum: Pengantar penelitian normatif, empiris, dan gabungan*. UNIGRES Press.
- Zulaiha, A. R. (2025). Philosophy of ontology, epistemology, and axiology of anti-corruption education. *Integritas: Jurnal Antikorupsi*, 11(1), 109–130. <https://doi.org/10.32697/integritas.v11i1.1425>