

Trends in Corruption Reporting in State-Owned Enterprises and Ministry Institutions in Indonesia 2020-2024

Gita Astrianingsih¹, Nahya Yuliani Pratiwi^{2*}, Farhah Novia Sabrina Maharani³,
Nurfadilla Alya Kirani⁴, Rifa Anggraeni⁵, Anis Kusuma Wardani Widodo⁶

Universitas Jenderal Soedirman, Indonesia

Email : agitast5@gmail.com¹, nahyapратиwi256@gmail.com^{2*}, farhahnovia123@gmail.com³,
nuralya8896@gmail.com⁴, rifaanggraeni003@gmail.com⁵, kusumaanis310@gmail.com⁶

Abstract

This study aims to identify trends in reporting on corruption cases in state-owned enterprises (BUMN) and ministries in Kompas Daily during the 2020–2024 period. The method used was quantitative content analysis with a sample of 250 news items selected using probability sampling (simple random sampling). This study covers the institutions most frequently involved, the types of corruption that occur, the positions of the perpetrators, the modus operandi, and the amount of state losses. The analysis results show that ministries are the institutions most frequently reported on for corruption (59%), while state-owned enterprises (BUMN) are in second place (41%). Overall, these findings indicate that the problem of corruption in both institutions is inseparable from weak internal oversight, high centralization of authority, and governance vulnerabilities. This study emphasizes the importance of strengthening transparency, accountability, and public control in efforts to prevent and eradicate corruption.

Keywords : *corruption, state-owned enterprises, ministerial institutions, media coverage*

Corresponding Author: Nahya Yuliani Pratiwi
E-mail: nahyapратиwi256@gmail.com



INTRODUCTION

In Indonesia, the phenomenon of corruption remains a serious problem that continues to recur year after year. This makes corruption an interesting phenomenon to study further. Corruption is an act of abuse of power, position, or authority for personal or group gain that is detrimental to the public and state interests (Bagaskoro et al., 2024). In general, criminal acts of corruption are a form of deviation that occurs due to the abuse of power by exploiting position or office for personal gain. This action is carried out by public officials who deviate from the purpose of their authority for the public interest, by exceeding or mixing up their authority, or even acting arbitrarily, thereby causing harm to society and the state (Audia, 2025).

Corruption not only leads to abuses of power but also has serious impacts on the country's economy and development. One of the main impacts is inefficiency in the use of the public budget. Corruption leads to increased spending and shifts spending allocations to components more vulnerable to misuse. A one standard deviation increase in corruption is associated with a decrease in the proportion of government capital

expenditure, from 29% to 18% (Sedgo et al. 2022). This means that when corruption increases, less government funds are used for large projects/investments. Budgets intended for infrastructure, education, and health are often reduced due to mark-ups and misuse of funds, thus undermining spending priorities. This results in suboptimal development outcomes and a decline in the quality of public goods and services due to reduced funding.

The inefficiency of budget allocation ultimately reduces investment interest and weakens the performance of the industrial and manufacturing sectors. Officials involved in corrupt practices tend to misuse funds through bribery (Aiman, 2024). In 2023, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) uncovered a bribery practice worth IDR 14.5 billion at the Directorate General of Railways (DJKA) of the Ministry of Transportation to secure a specific rail project. Then, in 2024, the KPK also arrested officials from the PUPR Agency and members of the Ogan Komering Ulu Regency DPRD who received a profit of 20% of the physical project value in exchange for diverting funds to certain projects. Both cases demonstrate that corruption not only causes financial losses for the state but also hinders development that should improve public welfare.

In addition to causing economic losses, corruption also impacts the declining quality of public services and infrastructure. Research conducted at the Semarang Religious Training Center (BDK) involving 404 respondents showed a negative correlation of -0.506 between perceived service quality and perceived corruption, with a significance level of 0.000 ($p < 0.05$). The service quality perception scale uses a range of 1-4, with values closer to 4 indicating better service quality, while perception of corruption also uses a scale of 1-4, with values closer to 1 indicating lower perceptions of corruption (Syaifullah et al., 2022). This negative correlation indicates that the higher the service quality, the lower the perception of corruption in that service, with the assurance dimension (expertise and integrity of officers) having the greatest influence on this result. Thus, these quantitative data support the assertion that corruption can lead to a decline in the quality of public services and infrastructure, worsening the social and economic conditions of the community.

One example is the corruption case involving PT Timah, which engaged in illegal mining. This corruption is estimated to have cost the state Rp 271 trillion, encompassing environmental and economic losses. This corruption also directly impacts economic growth and productivity, as it damages the ecology as a production base, undermines investor confidence, damages the reputation of state-owned enterprises, and places a burden on state finances (KPK, 2024).

Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) data shows that corruption hinders foreign investment in Indonesia by 0.2–0.3% for every 1-point drop in the Corruption Perception Index (CPI) (Fathni et al., 2023). High levels of corruption create a negative reputation for companies, making foreign investment, which is a significant source of capital for increasing production capacity and expanding employment, reluctant to invest (Tolan et al., 2024). This negative reputation impacts foreign investor confidence in companies. If this issue is not addressed immediately, Indonesia risks losing potential investment that

can create jobs, drive industrial development, and transfer technology (Tolan et al., 2024). In this case, companies take steps to terminate employment (PHK), which will impact unemployment and poverty rates in Indonesia.

Corruption in Indonesia has persisted since the colonial era until independence, and its practice continues to recur in various forms to this day (Rahmiati et al., 2024). This practice not only involves government officials but also extends to everyday life, for example through extortion or bribery in administrative matters. This habit has made society accustomed to it and considered it normal. As a result, problems within the government structure and reduced development in various government sectors have resulted in corrupt behavior, which is considered normal by the public, reinforcing corruption that has long been embedded in the Indonesian social system (Muttawakil 2025).

Indonesia Corruption Watch (ICW) data shows that corruption cases in Indonesia increased from 2020 to 2023 (Puspitasari, D., 2024). This can be seen in Table 1. Corruption Cases 2020–2023, which illustrates the increasing trend in the number of cases, suspects, and state losses from year to year. Meanwhile, ICW data for 2024 is not yet available because it has not been published. Therefore, the 2024 data reference is taken from the official KPK report (2024).

Table 1 Corruption Cases 2020-2024

	Corruption in 2020-2024				
	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Number of cases	444	533	579	791	154
Number of suspects	875	1,173	1,396	1,695	-
Amount of state losses	18.6 T	29.4 T	42.7 T	28.4 T	-

Source: ICW, KPK

The corruption cases involved various agencies, including ministerial institutions, state-owned enterprises, provincial governments, and district/city governments. Detailed data on agency involvement each year can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2. Agencies Involved in Corruption Cases in 2020-2024

Agencies Involved in Corruption Cases in 2020-2024					
Agency	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Ministry institutions	12	19	26	52	63
State-Owned Enterprises	27	21	27	54	42
Provincial Government	11	5	16	22	5
Regency/City Government	50	75	65	30	24
Other	355	426	460	633	20
Total	444	533	579	791	154

Source: ICW, KPK

The total number of corruption cases recorded in 2020–2023 was 2,347 with 5,136 suspects (Puspitasari, D., 2024). However, in 2024, data on cases, suspects, and total state losses from all corruption cases handled had not been publicly published. ICW noted that in 2024, the agency successfully recovered approximately IDR 731 trillion in assets. This figure represents funds and assets from corruption that were successfully returned to the state treasury, while the total state losses from corruption cases handled by ICW during that period are believed to be much greater (Ayuningtyas, 2025).

In Indonesia, there are 30 types of corruption crimes that are then simplified into 7 types: corruption that harms state finances, bribery, embezzlement in office, extortion, fraudulent acts, conflicts of interest in procurement, and gratification (Auli, 2025). This statement is also supported by research by Andiyani and Ismunarno (2021) which explains that the 30 types of corruption crimes in Law Number 31 of 1999 in conjunction with Law Number 20 of 2001 are basically grouped into 7 main categories to facilitate law enforcement. The methods frequently used in several corruption cases in state-owned enterprises include manipulating reports, abuse of authority, bribery or gratification, through family ties, collusion, budget mark-ups, and many more (Tetuko and Adam, 2023). In addition to these various methods, the KPK report also noted that the practice of "trusting positions" or appointing incompetent officials to positions is still widespread within the state-owned enterprise environment as an abuse of corruption (Yuanasari, 2024).

The research focuses on state-owned enterprises (BUMN) and ministries because corruption in both institutions has a significant impact on the state. A ministry is a formal state institution with an organizational structure, authority, and responsibility in the general administration of government. Ministerial institutions are divided into several sectors: politics, government, and law, economics and finance, development, infrastructure, and energy, agriculture and food, social and welfare, education, culture, and religion, and the environment. A state-owned enterprise (BUMN) is a business entity whose capital, all or most of it, comes from state assets that are separated and used for specific purposes, whether for public service or profit. BUMNs cover the energy, transportation, health, finance, industry, food, and telecommunications sectors.

Ministerial corruption has a direct impact on the decline in the quality of public services (education, health, and infrastructure). For example, the corruption case of Covid-19 social assistance (2020) involved cutting funds from Rp10,000 to Rp20,000 per package to Rp300,000 for those affected by the pandemic (Sahara, 2021). In state-owned enterprises (SOEs), corruption disrupts state financial stability and undermines public trust. For example, the 2024 corruption case involving PT Timah TBK, with total losses estimated at Rp300 trillion, placed it second in the Indonesian corruption league (Kusnandar, 2025).

Based on the corruption cases at state-owned enterprises and ministries previously described, corruption losses reaching trillions of rupiah reflect not only weak internal oversight but also external parties, such as the public, who play an active role in monitoring corruption cases. In this regard, a platform is needed to foster public

understanding of corruption issues and provide information to monitor corruption cases. In this context, the most accessible platform is the mass media.

The mass media plays a crucial role in providing information that can shape public opinion. The media plays a crucial role in maintaining stability and social conduciveness through information delivery, oversight, and social control (Kurniati et al., 2025). The mass media also serves as a platform capable of highlighting various deviant practices in state administration. Through reporting, investigations, and the formation of public opinion, the media can promote transparency and accountability in every government policy.

Research conducted by Akbar (2024) shows that mass media typically frames news with the aim of emphasizing a particular perspective that influences the perceptions of the public reading the news. This is further clarified by Edy et al. (2024) who state that all media content is the result of a process of constructing reality through framing discourse containing specific messages, and language is a key element in shaping this reality.

This study uses a quantitative content analysis method, focusing on coverage of corruption in state-owned enterprises (BUMN) and ministerial institutions in the mass media, namely [Kompas.com](https://www.kompas.com). Kompas is one of the leading newspapers in Indonesia, which has long been known for its reputation for presenting credible, objective, and comprehensive information. Kompas has a good consistency in highlighting political, legal, and governmental cases. Research related to the coverage of corruption cases through the Kompas news media will provide a comprehensive picture of the role of mass media in overseeing the course of government and strengthening democratic practices in Indonesia.

This study aims to answer several main questions related to reporting patterns on corruption cases in Indonesia, namely:

1. Which institutions were frequently the sites of corruption based on reports in the Kompas Daily in 2020-2024?
2. What types of corruption frequently occurred based on reports in the Kompas Daily in 2020-2024?
3. What are the positions of perpetrators of corruption in Indonesia based on reports in the Kompas Daily in 2020-2024?
4. What corruption methods are frequently used by perpetrators of corruption based on reports in the Kompas Daily in 2020-2024?
5. What is the value of losses caused by corruption based on reports in the Kompas Daily in 2020-2024?

RESEARCH METHODS

The method used in this study is content analysis. Content analysis is a research technique used to systematically and objectively examine and describe written documents or media, with the aim of identifying specific patterns, trends, and categories within the content (Ahmad, 2018). The data sources for this study were obtained through data

collection techniques by collecting and reviewing various written or digital documents relevant to the research topic, such as news, reports, archives, scientific publications, reports from the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), and official government publications to enrich the analysis. This study also utilized secondary data derived from online news on the Kompas Daily website from 2020–2024. This website was chosen because it is known as one of the national media with a good reputation for presenting accurate and reliable information. In addition, this website also consistently highlights various issues related to law, politics, and corruption practices in government institutions and state-owned enterprises, making it relevant to be the primary source in this study.

The object of this research is the news coverage of corruption cases in the Kompas Daily, specifically the quantitative content aspects of corruption cases involving state-owned enterprises and government institutions in Indonesia. The aspects analyzed include the type, frequency, actors reported, modus operandi, value of losses, and the names of the institutions involved. This research uses content analysis guidelines as an instrument to guide researchers in the process of identifying, categorizing, and interpreting secondary data from KPK reports, ICW publications, and journals related to corruption cases in state-owned enterprises and ministerial institutions in Indonesia.

The sampling technique used in this study was *simple random sampling*, a probability sampling technique in which every member of the population has an equal chance of being selected without exception. All news reports on corruption cases in state-owned enterprises (BUMN) and ministries during the specified period were selected as the research sample. The data analysis technique used was quantitative content analysis. This method was chosen because the data source was mass media. Data were analyzed through news content in the Kompas Daily. Data analysis included calculating the frequency of the type of corruption, the position involved, the name of the institution (BUMN and ministry), the year of the report, and the perpetrator's modus operandi in reporting corruption cases in Kompas Daily.

Based on the data collection and analysis techniques described above, all classified data was then calculated using a frequency distribution. Frequency distribution is used to determine how frequently each category appears in news reports, allowing for clearer identification of patterns such as the dominant type of corruption, the perpetrator's position, or the most involved institutions. The results of the frequency distribution serve as the basis for drawing conclusions regarding trends in corruption reporting in Kompas Daily .

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1) RESULTS

The following frequency distribution table provides an overview of the institutions involved in corruption cases. This table aims to facilitate comparative analysis between state-owned enterprises and ministries.

Table 4. Frequency Distribution of Institutions Involved in Corruption Cases

No	Agency/Institution	Frequency	Presentation
1.	State-Owned Enterprises	124	49.6%
2.	Ministry	126	50.4%
	Total	250	100%

Table 4 shows that the frequency of corruption cases involving ministerial institutions is higher than that involving state-owned enterprises. This data indicates a higher frequency of news coverage of corruption cases within ministerial institutions during the specified period, with ministerial institutions being the institutions most frequently implicated in corruption cases. This is because corruption within ministerial institutions directly impacts the public, so the media tends to focus more on reporting corruption cases within ministerial institutions.

Through analysis in the Kompas Daily, a frequency distribution table of types of corruption is also presented to provide a clearer picture of the trends in cases that occur.

Table 5. Frequency Distribution of Types of Corruption

No	Types of Corruption	Frequency	Presentation
1.	Corruption that harms state finances	133	53.2%
2.	Bribery	42	16.8%
3.	Abuse of Office	16	6.4%
4.	Extortion	3	1.2%
5.	Fraudulent acts	10	4%
6.	Conflict in procurement	24	9.6%
7.	Gratification	22	8.8%
	Total	250	100%

Based on Table 5, it can be seen that corruption involving state financial losses is the type of corruption case with the highest number of cases compared to other types of corruption. This occurs because this type of corruption case (causing state financial losses) is easy to prove and is a focus of corruption eradication due to the large and measurable losses. Therefore, this type of corruption case attracts more public and media attention.

Analysis of the Kompas Daily also produces the frequency of positions of perpetrators of corruption which is presented in the following distribution table to show the position or standing of the perpetrators in the organizational structure, thus facilitating analysis of which positions are most frequently involved in corruption cases.

Table 6. Frequency Distribution of Positions of Corruption Perpetrators

No	Position of the perpetrator	Frequency	Percentage
----	-----------------------------	-----------	------------

1	board of Commissioners	13	5.2%
2	President director	25	10%
3	Director (Finance, Operations, HR, etc.)	26	10.4%
4	Head of Division	8	3.2%
5	Branch head	13	5.2%
6	Senior Staff	29	11.6%
7	Business Partners/External Parties Collaborating in Corruption	30	12%
8	Minister	10	4%
9	Deputy Minister	2	0.8%
10	Secretary General	1	0.4%
11	Inspector General	2	0.8%
12	director General	12	4.8%
13	Director Under Director General	8	3.2%
14	Head of Bureau (Finance, General)	8	3.2%
15	Head of Regional Service	20	8%
16	Special Staff	5	2%
17	ASN	35	14%
18	Private Parties Involved Together	3	1.2%
	Total	250	100%

Table 6 shows that the highest number of perpetrators in civil servant positions is compared to other positions. This is because civil servants occupy strategic positions in various agencies, making them more likely to interact with procurement processes, permits, budget allocations, and administrative processes that are prone to abuse.

Second place is occupied by positions with business partners/external parties collaborating in corruption, which holds the highest ranking. Between 2020 and 2024, ICW recorded 1,189 corruption cases involving positions with external partners (Sari et al., 2025). Business partners or external parties have weak access to projects, contracts, and oversight systems. If there is a conflict of interest, or low morals and integrity, the opportunity for corruption is very high. This is because it generally occurs through collaboration between internal officials and actors from outside the agency, especially in procurement projects, licensing, or business partnerships. Agencies such as the Ministry of Public Works and Public Housing (PUPR) have authority over budgets and licensing, thus opening up opportunities for collusion and bribery (Yustiarini et al., 2020). This confirms that corruption is collusive, structured, and involves a network that is broader than just individuals holding formal positions.

To understand the trends in corruption methods used, the following table also presents the frequency distribution of corruption methods. This presentation aims to demonstrate the variety of methods used by perpetrators in corrupt practices.

Table 7. Frequency Distribution of Corruption Modes

No	Corruption Mode	Frequency	Presentation
1	Manipulating financial reports	23	9.2%
2	Abuse of authority	112	44.8%
3	Bribery or gratuity	56	22.4%

4	Through family ties	14	5.6%
5	Collusion	9	3.6%
6	Budget mark-up	36	14.4%
	Total	250	100%

Table 7 shows that abuse of authority is the most common form of corruption compared to other forms of corruption. This occurs because public officials possess the power and strategic positions. The higher the power, the greater the opportunity for abuse of authority. Weak bureaucratic oversight and blunt law enforcement at the top also contribute to the high prevalence of this type of corruption. Bribery or gratuities rank second. Furthermore, internal oversight, such as management-controlled audits, makes it difficult for auditors to report or take action if violations are committed by senior officials. Weak law enforcement also sometimes makes individuals feel safe accepting gratuities or bribes without fear of consequences.

Through analysis in the Kompas Daily, a frequency distribution table of state losses due to corruption is also presented. This data presentation aims to illustrate the magnitude of losses resulting from each case category, thus facilitating the analysis of the most frequent scale of economic damage.

Table 8. Frequency Distribution of Loss Values Due to Corruption

No	Category of State Loss Value (Rp)	Frequency	Presentation
1	< 1 billion	29	11.6%
2	1 billion - 100 billion	145	58%
3	100.1 billion - 300 billion	23	9.2%
4	300.1 billion - 600 billion	15	6%
5	600.1 billion - 900 billion	5	2%
6	> 900 billion	33	13.2%
	Total	250	100%

Based on Table 8, it can be seen that the value of IDR 1-100 billion represents the highest loss due to corruption cases. This occurs because corruption in this range is easily disguised in bookkeeping compared to embezzlement worth trillions of rupiah, which tends to attract audit attention more quickly. In practice, audit procedures and standards focus more on ensuring that financial statements are fairly presented and that internal control systems are operating properly. Audits are not designed to detect or uncover all forms of fraud, so perpetrators of corruption often exploit loopholes in the auditor's limited reach (Isaca, 2019). Law enforcement factors also influence the high value of losses in the IDR 1-100 billion range. The Supreme Court has a regulation that stipulates that corruption above IDR 100 billion is punishable by life imprisonment. This regulation indirectly results in cases under IDR 100 billion being handled with a different focus.

DISCUSSION

Based on an analysis of Kompas Daily news coverage during the 2020–2024 period, the institutions most frequently involved in corruption were ministries, followed

by state-owned enterprises (SOEs). Of the 250 recorded cases, more than half occurred within ministries, spanning various sectors such as the Ministry of Agrarian Affairs and Spatial Planning, the Ministry of Social Affairs, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Agriculture, and the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources (Arismaya and Utami et al., 2019). Meanwhile, SOEs are also frequently implicated in corruption cases, particularly in strategic companies such as PT Asabri, PT Jiwasraya, PT PAL Indonesia, and PT Pertamina.

The high frequency of corruption in ministries is inseparable from the large budgets they manage. This is evident from the report of Minister of Finance Sri Mulyani Indrawati that as of May 2024, the Indonesian Government had realized Central Government Spending of IDR 824.3 trillion, or 33.4% of the total 2024 State Budget, an increase of 15.4% compared to the same period in 2023. The large allocation and realization of this budget indicate the high volume of funds that must be managed by ministries, thus increasing the potential for irregularities when oversight mechanisms are not running optimally (Ministry of Finance, 2024).

The authority to procure goods and services, as well as the bureaucracy, is vulnerable to bribery, mark-ups, and gratuities. Corruption in state-owned enterprises (SOEs), on the other hand, is generally linked to infrastructure projects, fictitious procurement, and collusion with business partners. Both institutions face challenges in transparency and internal oversight, which exacerbates their vulnerability to corrupt behavior.

Corruption coverage in the Kompas Daily newspaper from 2020 to 2024 shows that corruption involving state losses is the most frequently reported type of corruption, both in ministerial institutions and state-owned enterprises. This pattern is evident in the numerous cases involving budget misuse, project mark-ups, manipulation of accountability reports, and the use of public funds for personal gain. Research by Munafri (2023) confirms that state losses are the most dominant element of corruption in cases involving public officials because their positions are directly linked to large-scale budget management.

In addition to causing financial losses to the state, several news reports also highlight the practice of bribery, particularly in the licensing process for procurement projects and appointments. Corruption in the form of bribery is one of the most common forms of irregularity that emerges in relations of power and economic interests in the public sector. Bribery remains the most common mode of interaction between officials and the private sector, particularly to expedite administrative processes or secure specific projects, demonstrating that profit interests often trump the integrity of government administration (Azzahra et al., 2025). For example, in several cases of procurement of goods and services and the issuance of permits, the offering of bribes is used as a shortcut to gain priority and avoid lengthy procedures.

Other types of corruption that are rampant in the public sector, besides bribery, include conflicts of interest in procurement, gratuities, and embezzlement in office. These three types of corruption remain widespread and trending because they are direct

manifestations of the weak integrity of public officials related to weaknesses in organizational systems and culture. They also represent the abuse of authority and office for personal gain, which undermines the integrity of government systems and institutions.

Conflicts of interest in procurement (Article 12 letter i of Law 20/2001) occur when public officials or related parties have personal interests that can influence the outcome of the goods and services procurement process. This practice often leads to collusion supported by weak internal oversight, as analyzed by research by Hidayatullah, Triono, and Sumarja (2023). The weakness of the Government Internal Control System (SPIP) opens up opportunities for collusion, such as through fixing tender winners and document manipulation, which legally violates Articles 9 and 10 letter c of the PTPK Law. This can be concluded as one of the main causes of goods/services procurement being highly vulnerable to corruption (fraud) due to the lack of checks and balances and transparency in procedures (Ulfa, Masnila, and Aryani 2024).

Gratuities (Articles 12B and 12C of the PTPK Law) are defined as gifts received by civil servants or state officials related to their positions and contrary to their obligations or duties. While the purpose of this practice is not always explicitly bribery, the nature of the gift can influence the recipient's decision, creating a structural loophole for corruption, particularly in organizational cultures that tolerate or even encourage bribery and gratuities (Yuningsih & Ramdani, 2021). Embezzlement in office (Articles 8 and 9 of the PTPK Law) refers to the actions of officials who embezzle money or assets under their control due to their positions, resulting in losses to state finances. Research by Firmansyah et al. (2021) shows that this crime often occurs in institutions with strong hierarchical structures and minimal transparency. Rigid hierarchical structures often limit cross-oversight and accountability, while the lack of transparency, particularly in financial and asset management, provides opportunities for high-ranking officials to abuse their power undetected and increases the perpetrators' incentives due to the belief that their actions will not be revealed (Rusliandy, 2024).

Overall, the patterns seen in Kompas's reporting indicate that corruption in ministerial and state-owned enterprises remains closely tied to budget management and the structural power of officials, with the types of corruption that harm the state being the most prominent findings. This confirms that less-than-transparent public financial governance is a key factor in maintaining the high level of corruption in these two institutions.

Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) data as of April 2025 shows that of the 1,964 corruption cases handled since 2004, 1,385 involved civil servants (ASN). The high level of involvement of ASN in ministerial institutions is related to ASN's position as the primary implementer of the state bureaucracy, directly related to the budget, public services, and government administration processes. ASN, as the party that manages the budget flow from the planning stage to execution, has extensive access to state resources. This access not only grants authority to make strategic decisions but also places ASN in a position vulnerable to abuse of authority, particularly in the procurement of goods and services, licensing, and management of various government programs. This situation

demonstrates that the greater the authority and discretion held, the greater the potential for irregularities if not balanced with integrity and a strong oversight system. This view is further reinforced by research by Priyadi (2021), who identified bureaucratic elites as the actors most vulnerable to corruption due to their direct access to high-value public resources.

Second place is occupied by positions with business partners/external parties of SOEs that Collaborate in Corruption, which holds the highest position. This is because it generally occurs through collaboration between internal officials and external actors, particularly in procurement projects, licensing, or business partnerships. This confirms that corruption is collusive, structured, and involves a network that extends beyond individuals holding formal positions.

Thus, while both ministerial and state-owned enterprises (SOEs) are often sites of corruption, ministerial institutions remain the institutions most involved in the most cases. This suggests that the higher the level of centralization of power within a state institution, the greater the potential for abuse of authority that leads to corruption.

The data in Table 7 shows that abuse of authority is the most frequent mode of corruption, at 44.8%. This dominant figure illustrates that the majority of corruption cases occur due to the improper use of power. In other words, actors in strategic positions tend to have a greater opportunity to exploit their authority for personal gain.

These cases of abuse of power are inextricably linked to a bureaucratic structure that remains centralized and lacking transparency. When important decisions rest solely with individuals or small groups, the opportunity for irregularities increases. Furthermore, suboptimal internal oversight mechanisms make it difficult to detect abuses of power early.

Institutional culture also plays a role, particularly if bureaucratic norms do not emphasize integrity and accountability. In such situations, abuse of authority is more easily perceived as "normal" or even accepted in everyday practice. Therefore, given this frequent abuse of authority, opportunities for corruption need to be reduced through bureaucratic reform, increased transparency, and enforcement of applicable regulations.

Based on corruption case data from 2020 to 2024, the majority of state losses reported in the Kompas Daily were between 1 and 100 billion rupiah. These figures indicate that corruption most frequently occurs in medium-scale projects, such as procurement of goods and services, regional infrastructure development, and the management of ministerial program funds. This suggests that the greatest opportunities for corruption lie in routine budget activities that are frequently conducted and subject to weak oversight, not just in large-scale national projects.

Furthermore, there are quite a number of cases falling into category 1, namely corruption involving amounts under 1 billion rupiah. Although seemingly small in nominal terms, these cases are often committed by executive-level officials or technical staff, such as village heads, state-owned enterprise branch employees, or civil servants in service units. Cases in this category confirm that corruption has become a widespread practice, extending down to smaller levels of government and not limited to strategic

positions. This indicates that even small losses remain significant, demonstrating weak integrity and oversight.

Meanwhile, for major losses falling into categories 3 to 6, reaching hundreds of billions to trillions of rupiah, the frequency of occurrence tends to be much lower but has a tremendous impact on state finances. These major cases involve high-ranking ministry officials, state-owned enterprise directors, or managers of national strategic projects. Despite the low frequency of corruption, each case in this category has significant consequences for state financial management and often indicates a failure of internal control systems in institutions that are supposed to be professional and high-risk. The existence of these major cases demonstrates that corruption patterns are not only widespread but can reach the level of very serious economic crimes when committed by officials with significant authority.

Based on corruption cases from 2020 to 2024, the majority of state losses reported in the Kompas Daily were between 1 and 100 billion rupiah. These figures indicate that corruption most frequently occurs in medium-scale projects, such as procurement of goods and services, regional infrastructure development, and the management of ministerial program funds. This suggests that the greatest loopholes for corruption lie in routine budget activities that are frequently conducted and subject to weak oversight, not just in large-scale national projects.

CONCLUSION

Corruption cases in Indonesia during the 2020–2024 period showed an increasing trend in cases, suspects, and state losses, with ministries being the most frequently reported institutions, followed by state-owned enterprises (SOEs). The study found that the most dominant type of corruption was corruption that harmed state finances, with the primary modus operandi being abuse of authority, involving civil servants in ministries and business partners or external parties in SOEs. State losses generally ranged from IDR 1–100 billion, although there were major cases such as the corruption case at PT Timah Tbk, which reached hundreds of trillions of rupiah. This increase in cases is related to weak internal oversight, centralization of authority, and governance vulnerabilities that impact various sectors, including slowing economic growth, declining foreign investment, declining quality of public services, and instability of state finances. Therefore, the study emphasizes the importance of strengthening transparency, accountability, and public oversight, including the central role of the mass media as an external control in monitoring and shaping public understanding of corruption.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, J. (2018). Content Analysis Research Design. *ResearchGate*, (5). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.12201.08804>
- Aiman, R. (2024). Law and Corruption: Challenges and Solutions in Eradicating Corruption in Indonesia. *PERADABAN JOURNAL OF LAW AND SOCIETY*, 3 (1), 16–30. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.59001/pjls.v3i1.170>

- Akbar, G., & Hidayah, AA (2023). The Role of Mass Media as a Promotional Medium and the Political Interests of Its Owners. *KONTEXTUAL Journal of Communication Science* , 2 (1), 19–31. Retrieved from <https://jurnal.ubl.ac.id/index.php/kontekstual/article/view/3177>
- Andiyani, AR, & Ismunarno. (2021). Comparative Law on Types of Prohibited Acts in Corruption Crimes between Indonesia and Singapore. *Recidive* , 10 (1), 29–36. <https://doi.org/10.20961/recidive.v10i1.58846>.
- Arismaya, AD, & Utami, I. (2019). Facts, causes and corruption prevention: Evidence in Indonesian ministries. *JCA: Journal of Contemporary Accounting* , 1 (2), 95–106. <https://doi.org/10.20885/jca.vol1.iss2.art3>
- Audia, S. (2025). The Meaning of Abuse of Authority in Corruption Cases. *Center for Anti-Corruption Studies (SAKSI), Faculty of Law, Mulawarman University, Indonesia* , 1 (1), 36–53. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.30872/action.v1i1.1665>
- Auli, RC (2025). 7 Types of Corruption and Examples. Retrieved December 8, 2025, from <https://www.hukumonline.com/klinik/a/bentuk-bentuk-korupsi-dan-aturannya-di-indonesia-lt5e6247a037c3a/>
- Ayuningtyas, AD (2025). KPK Returns Rp55 Billion in Auction Proceeds from Confiscated Corruption Items. Retrieved December 8, 2025, from <https://goodstats.id/article/kpk-balikkan-rp55-miliar-hasil-lelang-barang-rampasan-korupsi-Gdks2>
- Azzahra, SN, Saragih, YM, Yusuf, M., & Pasaribu, UR (2025). Legal Analysis of the Criminal Act of Bribery Corruption Based on the Theory of Legal Certainty. *Multi-Disciplinary Journal of Dehasen (MUDE)* , 4 (3), 593–598. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.37676/mude.v4i3.8533>
- Bagaskoro, MR, & Khumaeroh, IN (2024). Determinants of Corruption Crimes of Abuse of Authority Committed by Public Officials. *COLLEGIUM STUDIOSUM JOURNAL* , 7 (1), 299–306. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.56301/csj.v7i1.1459>
- Edy, S., Permadi, D., & Rahadi, AE (2024). News Framing Literacy in Mass Media (News Framing of the Revision of the ITE Law in Kompas.Id). *INNOVATIVE: Journal of Social Science Research* , 4 (3), 10874–10885. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31004/innovative.v4i3.11569>
- Fathni, I., Priyana, Y., & Primadhany, E.F. (2023). Empirical Analysis of the Relationship between Corruption, Law Enforcement, Economic Growth, and Foreign Direct Investment in Indonesia. *West Science Law and Human Rights* , 1 (02), 61–70. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.58812/wslhr.v1i02.61>
- Hidayatullah, Triono, A., & Sumarja, FX (2023). Public Accountants: Authority to Calculate State Financial Losses from Corruption. *AL-MANHAIJ: Journal of Islamic Law and Social Institutions* , 5 (1), 23–34. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.37680/almanhaj.v5i1.2074>
- ISACA. (2019). Why Auditors Rarely Find Fraud. Retrieved December 8, 2025, from <https://www.isaca.org/resources/news-and-trends/newsletters/atisaca/2019/volume-24/why-auditors-rarely-find-fraud>
- Ministry of Finance. (2024). Through the State Budget, the Government Accelerates Spending for Fiscal Resilience. Retrieved December 8, 2025, from <https://www.kemenkeu.go.id/informasi-publik/publikasi/berita-utama/Belanja-untuk-Ketahanan-Fiskal>

- KPK. (2024). 2020-2024 Performance: KPK Returns Rp2.5 Trillion in State Losses. Retrieved December 8, 2025, from <https://kpk.go.id/id/ruang-informasi/berita/kinerja-2020-2024-kpk-balikkan-kerugian-negara-senilai-rp25-triliun>
- Kurniati, P., Nursyamsiah, S., Barokah, A., & Saryono. (2025). The Strategic Role of Mass Media in Revealing Extortion Cases: Transparency, Accountability, and Anti-Corruption Education in Governance. *Journal of Citizenship Virtues*, 5 (1), 62–69. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.37640/jcv.v5i1.2289>
- Kusnandar, AR (2025). The 'Indonesian Corruption League' is Crowded, Here's the Ranking! Retrieved December 8, 2025, from https://umj.ac.id/just_info/klasemen-liga-korupsi-indonesia-ramai-berikut-urutannya
- Munafri, A. (2023). Criminal Liability for State Financial Losses in Corruption Crimes in Indonesia. *Jurnal Media Hukum*, 11 (1), 36–51. <https://doi.org/10.59414/jmh.v11i1.449>
- Muttawakil, HR (2025). Corruption Is Not Just a Game of Officials, But Has Become a Community Custom. Retrieved December 8, 2025, from <https://retizen.republika.co.id/posts/690921/korupsi-bukan-hanya-permainan-pejabat-namun-telah-menjadi-adat-masyarakat>
- Priyadi, BP (2021). Elite Corruption in Indonesia's Bureaucracy, Case Study of Kudus District Regent. *EAI*. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.4108/eai.9-10-2020.2304803>
- Puspitasari, D. (2024). ICW Records 791 Cases and 1,695 Corruption Suspects in 2023: There's a Massive Surge. Retrieved December 8, 2025, from <https://news.detik.com/berita/d-7347964/icw-catat-791-kasus-1-695-tersangka-korupsi-di-2023-ada-lonjakan-masif/amp>
- Rahmiati, Saputra, T., Nurhafni, & Sobih, M. (2024). Comparison of Anti-Corruption Institutions in Indonesia, Singapore, and Hong Kong. *JUPISI Journal*. Retrieved from <https://www.scribd.com/document/650386765/PERBANDINGAN-LEMBAGA-ANTI-KORUPSI-DI-INDONESIA-SINGAPURA-DAN-HONGKONG>
- Rusliandy. (2024). The Impact of Transparency Policy on the Integrity of Public Officials in Regional Government. *El-Riyasah Journal*, 15 (2), 89–105. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24014/jel.v15i2.33995>
- Sahara, W. (2021). The Beginning of the Covid-19 Social Assistance Corruption Case that Entangled Juliari and Sentenced Him to 12 Years in Prison. Retrieved December 8, 2025, from <https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2021/08/23/18010551/awal-mula-kasus-korupsi-bansos-covid-19-yang-menjerat-juliari-hingga-divonis>
- Sari, NW, Yanto, O., Suhendar, Soewita, S., & Nuraeny, H. (2025). Criminal Responsibility of Corporations in Criminal Acts of Corruption. *IJOLARES: Indonesian Journal of Law Research*, 3 (1), 25–33. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.60153/ijolares.v3i1.122>
- Sedgo, H., & Omgba, L.D. (2021). Corruption and distortion of public expenditures : Evidence from Africa. *EconomiX-CNRS, Paris Nanterre Universityb BETA-CNRS, Lorraine University*. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s10797-021-09718-6>

- Sopiyan, Firmansyah, Frimaruwah, E., Periansya, Sari, RI, Septiawati, A., & Islamiati, D. (2021). The Influence of Fraud Prevention Effectiveness in Goods/Services Procurement in Regional Government Organizations in Palembang City. *Journal of Applied Accounting Research* , 5 (1), 63–73. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4818483>
- Syaifulallah, DH, Fahham, AM, Khoiriyani, F., & Dani, FZDP (2022). Correlation between Perceptions of Service Quality and Perceptions of Small-Scale Corruption at the Semarang Religious Training Center. *Journal of Social Issues* , 13 (1), 19–36. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.46807/aspirasi.v13i1.2989>
- Tetuko, WH, & Adam, RC (2022). Application of the Business Judgment Rule Doctrine to the Directors of State-Owned Enterprise Subsidiaries (Case Study: Supreme Court Decision Number 121 K/Pid. Sus/2020). *Adigama Law Journal* , 5 (2), 777–800. <https://doi.org/10.32697/integritas.v7i2.817>.
- Tolan, WY, & Yusuf, H. (2024). The Impact of Special Economic Crimes on Foreign Investment: Analysis of Corporate Crime Cases in the Industrial Sector. *JOURNAL OF INTELEK INSAN CENDIKIA* , 1 (9), 5095–5111. Retrieved from <https://jicnusanantara.com/index.php/jiic/article/view/1421>
- Ulfa, FS, Masnila, N., & Aryani, YA (2024). Analysis of Factors Influencing Weaknesses in the Internal Control System of Provincial Governments in Sumatra in 2017–2021. *Journal of Accounting Control* , 2 (2), 134–155. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.59581/jka-widyakarya.v2i2.2802>
- Yuanasari, A. (2024). TII: The Practice of Sharing Positions in State-Owned Enterprises Increases the Risk of Corruption. Retrieved December 8, 2025, from <https://kbr.id/articles/indeks/tii-praktik-bagi-bagi-jabatan-di-bumn-perbesar-risiko-korupsi>
- Yuningsih, H., & Ramadani, RM (2024). Criminological Analysis of the Causal Factors of Corruption in the Public Sector. *DISPLIN Journal of Legal Studies* , 30 (4), 131–142. Retrieved from <https://www.scribd.com/document/863138655/131-Article-Text-472-1-10-20241212>
- Yustiarini, D., & Soemardi, BW (2020). A review of corruption in public procurement in Indonesia. *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering* , 1–13. <https://doi.org/https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1757-899X/849/1/012013>