

The Effectiveness of Integrity Pact Signing in Corruption Eradication Efforts in the Supreme Court

Nathasa Farucha

Faculty of Sharia and Law, UIN Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia.

**Corresponding author's e-mail: faruchanathasa@gmail.com*

Article	Abstract
<p>Keywords: Criminal Acts of Corruption; Integrity Pact; Supreme Court</p> <p>Artikel History Received: Sept 15, 2023; Reviewed: Oct 11, 2023; Accepted: Oct 22, 2023; Published: Oct 27, 2023.</p> <p>DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.20961/jolsic.v1i2.78840</p>	<p>The corruption case that occurred in the Supreme Court was a major blow to the world of justice in Indonesia. The Supreme Court as the country's highest court and the spearhead of justice still has loopholes to commit criminal acts of corruption. Moreover, this case involves the elite ranks of the Supreme Court such as Supreme Court Judges. The Supreme Court is supposed to be an independent, authoritative, accountable judicial institution, and by law has been given independence and autonomy in fulfilling its judicial aspects. However, this has not been able to create a clean bureaucracy and judicial apparatus. Therefore, as a follow-up to this, the leadership of the Supreme Court issued an instruction to sign an integrity pact as contained in the Circular Letter of the Secretary of the Supreme Court Number 4 of 2022 concerning the Signing of Integrity Pacts. This instruction is addressed to all judicial officers within the Supreme Court and all judicial bodies under it in the context of bureaucratic reform and corruption eradication. This integrity pact document will later become a commitment of all judicial apparatus to carry out all duties, functions, responsibilities, authorities, and roles in accordance with the provisions of applicable laws and regulations and the ability not to commit corruption. In addition, this integrity pact has fulfilled the aspects of attachment and legality that have been legally regulated in the legislation. This paper will discuss the integrity pact as a guarantee of a clean and accountable bureaucracy and measure its effectiveness in preventing and eradicating corruption in the Supreme Court. This paper uses normative-qualitative research methods and literature study methods through literature related to the theme of discussion.</p>

INTRODUCTION

Corruption is still a hot issue among government agencies. The number of corruption cases continues to increase and traps those who hold strategic positions in the government bureaucracy from the central to regional levels. The Supreme Court is no exception as one of the holders of judicial power and the highest state court. Recently, the Corruption Eradication Commission conducted a sting operation in the Supreme Court, arresting a Supreme Court Judge and a number of registrar staff in connection with alleged bribery for case management in the Supreme Court. This shows that the law enforcement environment's practices, bureaucracy, and actors are not entirely free from corrupt behavior. Judges and their staff are supposed to be agents of law enforcement and providers of justice for the people who are independent and have integrity and accountability.

Following up on the case, the Supreme Court leadership then issued a circular letter regarding the signing of an integrity pact as a first step in improving the bureaucracy. The signing of the integrity pact is a continuation of the Supreme Court leadership's instruction in the context of bureaucratic reform and the eradication of corruption, collusion, and nepotism in the Supreme Court. This is in line with the mandate of Law Number 14 of 2008 on Public Information Disclosure and Regulation of the Minister of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform Number 49 of 2011 on General Guidelines for Integrity Pacts within Ministries/Agencies and Local Governments, which states that every judge and apparatus is obliged to make a statement or promise to themselves about the commitment to carry out all duties, functions, responsibilities, authorities, and roles in accordance with laws and regulations and the ability not to commit corruption, collusion, and nepotism.

The signing of the integrity pact is a form of oral and written agreement between the personal apparatus related to themselves, the community, the agency, the state, and God Almighty. This pact is binding both legally, namely the legal consequences that will be received if violations are committed, and morally, namely the social sanctions that the community will impose on it. The signing of the integrity pact was actually done at the time of inauguration as a State Civil Apparatus, but due to the disintegration cases that occurred, the Supreme Court repeated the signing of the integrity pact accompanied by oral pronouncement in public. This is one of the efforts made by the Supreme Court to increase the burden of moral responsibility that will be carried by all judicial apparatus so that it is expected to be a reminder not to commit deviant acts and violate the law.

Integrity pact as a prevention of corruption does not necessarily provide absolute results. Although its validity and legality as an official document have been recognized by the state and has a clear legal basis, the document does not necessarily guarantee the implementation of a clean judicial bureaucracy. Therefore, through this paper the author will discuss the extent to which the effectiveness of the integrity pact on efforts to prevent corruption in the Supreme Court and what efforts need to be made by the Supreme Court to be able to eradicate criminal acts of corruption. Because basically the integrity pact is only the first step and other efforts need to be made, such as increasing supervision by the Supreme Court and all judicial bodies under it as regulated in the

Regulation of the Minister of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform, and other efforts that can support the effectiveness of this integrity pact.

RESEARCH METHODS

This paper is included in the type of qualitative normative legal research, which is a type of legal research that uses an interpretative paradigm of social phenomena to find the meaning behind the phenomena that are happening, (Murdiyanto, 2020: 6), which is carried out by examining library materials or secondary data. (Soekanto, 2013: 13). Through this method, the author will discuss the extent to which the effectiveness of the policy issued by the Supreme Court regarding the signing of an integrity pact in an effort to eradicate corruption, following up on the case of a sting operation by the Corruption Eradication Commission that ensnared a Supreme Court judge and several registrar staff at the Supreme Court.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Integrity Pact as a Guarantee of Clean and Accountable Judicial Bureaucracy

Semantically, a pact is a form of agreement in the form of a written or oral agreement made by two or more parties who mutually agree to obey what is written in the pact. Meanwhile, integrity is the quality, nature, or condition that shows complete unity so that it has competence and ability that radiates authority and honesty. Integrity is generally associated with virtue or good character. From these two definitions, an integrity pact can be interpreted as an agreement, either written or oral, made by two or more people who mutually agree to show the quality, nature, or condition that has competence and ability that radiates authority, honesty, and shows virtue or good character. Meanwhile, based on the Regulation of the Minister of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform, an integrity pact is a statement or promise to themselves about the commitment to carry out all duties, functions, responsibilities, authorities, and roles in accordance with laws and regulations and the ability not to commit corruption, collusion, and nepotism.

According to Endro (2017: 136), Integrity is essentially an ability to make decisions and take actions morally. Moral decisions and actions are those that are able to express the self-identity that has been built. There are two aspects of integrity for individuals with integrity. First, individuals who are able to build and maintain their identity by being able to control personal internal attitudes. This will greatly affect the decision-making process. Second, individuals who always do moral things. Moral behavior that is carried out continuously will form a habit and form a strong conscience and idealism so that the will to commit deviant acts will recede along with the strengthening of the habit of moral behavior.

The government presents an integrity pact as a document containing agreements and commitments of all government employees and apparatus, both those in ministries, state institutions, and local governments. This integrity pact is signed at the time of inauguration as an employee, which then becomes a written promise and commitment to oneself not to do things outside their authority, especially those related to criminal acts of corruption, collusion, and nepotism that are still widespread in the government environment. Corruption is still a problem for the government. In fact, corruption is becoming more widespread as time goes by.

The implementation of corruption that is carried out neatly and systemically threatens public trust in the government. (Basuki, 2010: 38). This is in accordance with what Firmansyah (2021:

331) said that corruption causes enormous losses to the state and has an impact on various aspects of nationhood and statehood because it is related to finance. Corruption has a destructive effect on various sides of the life of the nation and state, especially in the economic sector, which is the main driver of public welfare. (Rachmawati, 2021: 15). After the reformation, access to the government became wide open for all circles. This also became the gate to open the path of corruption from upstream to downstream. Therefore, efforts to eradicate corruption continue and become the government's top priority.

The eradication of corruption based on Law Number 19 of 2019 is a series of activities to prevent and eradicate corruption through coordination, supervision, monitoring, investigation, prosecution, and examination in court, with the participation of the community in accordance with statutory provisions. Corruption eradication is part of the government's top priorities because it is directly related to state administration and has a major impact on people's welfare. Various kinds of efforts to eradicate corruption have been made starting from the issuance of regulations through laws and regulations under it, to the establishment of a corruption eradication institution commonly referred to as the Corruption Eradication Commission.

Efforts to eradicate corruption are part of the bureaucratic reforms that are currently being carried out by the government. As stated in the reform demands, the eradication of corruption, collusion, and nepotism is one of the main points or headlines echoed. Bureaucratic reform is a change in the mindset and work culture of the state apparatus and is an effort to carry out fundamental reforms and changes to the administration of the government system, especially concerning institutional and governance aspects and the resources of the bureaucratic reform apparatus which is a public service provider that aims to provide various types of services needed by the community and fulfillment of civil rights and basic needs of the community. In addition, the implementation of public services is also as optimal as possible to realize good governance.

In more detail, the Ministry of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform explained that bureaucratic reform is a major change in the paradigm and governance of Indonesia and a big gamble for the Indonesian nation in facing the challenges of the 21st century. In addition, bureaucratic reform is also related to simplifying the bureaucracy, which until now still has a lot of overlap with a large budget absorption, as well as reorganizing the bureaucratic process from the highest to the lowest level by making many new breakthroughs that are gradual, concrete, realistic, and other new innovations that are initiated by using the renewal paradigm. With bureaucratic reform, it is expected to be able to form a government bureaucracy that is professional, has character, integrity, high performance, clean from corruption, able to serve the public, neutral, prosperous, dedicated, and upholds the basic values and code of ethics of government officials.

The ultimate goal of bureaucratic reform is the creation of good governance. There are 5 (five) indicators to measure bureaucratic performance, namely, productivity, service quality, responsiveness, responsibility, and accountability. All five can be fulfilled by improving the moral, intellectual, and motivational qualities of human resources, which are still lacking. This also needs to be supported by the commitment of the leadership of the institution or organization. If the synergy between human resources and institutional commitment has been obtained, an established organizational culture will be formed and able to push for changes toward achieving the vision and mission of the bureaucracy, as explained by Wardana (2017: 333-334). This includes the action

taken by the Supreme Court to sign an integrity pact after the disclosure of the alleged bribery case.

The signing of the integrity pact was done simultaneously by all judicial apparatus without exception followed by oral reading in public. This shows the seriousness of the Supreme Court regarding the pledge and commitment of the judicial apparatus. Legally, the integrity pact document is valid before the law because it has a clear legal basis, namely the Ministerial Regulation on Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform Number 49 of 2011 concerning General Guidelines for Integrity Pacts within Ministries/Institutions and Local Governments. Morally, each individual apparatus carries a greater moral burden not to do things arbitrarily because they have been legally bound by the integrity pact and are ready for all the consequences if they violate it.

The integrity pact has the same meaning as an agreement, which in general is an act in which one or more people commit themselves to one or more other people to carry out or not carry out a matter and will accept the consequences for its violation. A legally made agreement then applies as a law for both parties and cannot be withdrawn except by agreement of both parties. (Bustomi, 2017: 377). Although treaty law adheres to the principle of freedom of contract, this integrity pact applies mandatory law because it is a mandate from legal regulations to be carried out.

The Effectiveness of Integrity Pact Signing in Corruption Eradication Efforts in the Supreme Court

Following up on the Regulation of the Minister of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform No. 49 of 2011 on General Guidelines for Integrity Pacts within Ministries/Agencies and Local Governments, the Supreme Court signed an integrity pact for all State Civil Apparatus under it which was carried out at the time of employee inauguration, transfer, and promotion. This makes the integrity pact similar to an agreement and commitment that must be held and borne by the judicial apparatus in line with the mandate it carries. Therefore, the integrity pact is not only signed once but also always updated according to the placement and position held.

Broadly speaking, the points emphasized in the integrity pact are as follows: (1) Play a proactive role in efforts to prevent and eradicate corruption, collusion, and nepotism and not involve themselves in despicable acts; (2) Not request or accept gifts directly or indirectly in the form of bribes, gifts. (3) Being transparent, honest, objective, and accountable in carrying out my duties; (4) Avoiding conflicts of interest in carrying out my duties; (5) Setting an example in compliance with laws and regulations in carrying out my duties, especially to employees in my work environment consistently; (6) Will convey information on integrity irregularities in the work unit and help maintain the confidentiality of witnesses to violations of the regulations they report; (7) If I violate the above, I am ready to face the consequences. As for the realization, there are some differences in the substance of the integrity pact that are adjusted to the type of position.

Based on the Regulation of the Minister of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform Number 49 of 2011 concerning General Guidelines for Integrity Pacts within Ministries/Agencies and Local Governments, an integrity pact is a statement or promise to oneself about the commitment to carry out all duties, functions, responsibilities, authorities, and roles in accordance with laws and regulations and the ability not to commit corruption, collusion, and nepotism. The signing of the integrity pact is mandatory for leaders of Ministries/Institutions and Local

Governments, officials, and all civil servants within the Ministries/Institutions and Local Governments. The signing of the integrity pact is carried out in front of the superior and signed in accordance with the type of position. The signing of the integrity pact by the heads of ministries and ministerial-level institutions is witnessed/known by the President as their direct superior, and the signing of the integrity pact by the heads of non-ministerial government institutions and non-structural institutions coordinated by the ministry is witnessed/known by the coordinating minister, the signing of the integrity pact by the governor is witnessed/knowledgeable by the Minister of Home Affairs, the signing of the integrity pact by the regent/mayor is witnessed/knowledgeable by the governor as the representative of the central government in the provincial area, and the signing of integrity pacts by civil servants within the Ministries/institutions and Regional Governments witnessed/known by their immediate superiors.

The purpose of signing the integrity pact is to strengthen mutual commitment in the prevention and eradication of corruption, foster openness and honesty, and facilitate the implementation of quality, effective, efficient and accountable tasks, and realize an advanced, independent, responsible and dignified Indonesian government and society based on the noble values of national culture, the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, and Pancasila.

In 2022, the Supreme Court received a hard blow when there was a sting operation by the Corruption Eradication Commission involving Supreme Court Justices and several registrar staff related to bribery in case management at the Supreme Court. This incident has harmed the image and integrity of the Supreme Court as the country's highest judiciary that spearheads justice. The emergence of this case shows that the Supreme Court has not been completely cleared of corruption networks. In addition, it also shows that the Supreme Court has not been able to prove its commitment to eradicating corruption in the bureaucracy and government and has not been a good example for other government institutions.

For this reason, in order to reduce public sentiment and as an effort to restore the image of the institution, the Supreme Court issued a policy on renewing the signing of integrity pacts contained in Circular Letter of the Secretary of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia Number 4 of 2022 concerning the Signing of Integrity Pacts. This circular letter is an instruction from the leadership of the Supreme Court in the context of bureaucratic reform and the eradication of corruption, collusion and nepotism within the Supreme Court and the judicial bodies under it. After the issuance of this circular letter, all judicial officers within the Supreme Court renewed the integrity pact and simultaneously published it on all social media. This is one of the efforts and quick steps taken by the Supreme Court to maintain the image of its institution amidst the pressure and news that is heating up. And as an initial step to save the image of the institution, it seems that the integrity pact has a good impact because it is able to slightly reduce the chaotic atmosphere and slowly begin to reduce public sentiment.

Basically, there are several objectives that the Supreme Court wants to achieve in relation to the renewal of the integrity pact in the midst of the alleged bribery case in the Supreme Court. These objectives are:

First, as an effort to save the image of the organization. The Supreme Court with its tagline of "realizing a great judiciary" is in fact still prone to corruption. This is similar to when the Directorate General of Taxes was affected by the Gayus Tambunan case. At that time, the Directorate General of Taxes focused on the performance of the public relations department in

making efforts to save its image by using mass media (Putra, 2018: 37). It is not much different from the current Supreme Court. In the implementation of the integrity pact signing, documentation and massive news dissemination were also carried out on the social media of the Supreme Court and all judicial bodies under it. This activity was made the headline on the homepage of all judicial institutions. The main objective was to inform the public that the Supreme Court and all judicial institutions under it were quick in responding to ongoing cases and there were concrete actions taken by institutions and their apparatus through the signing of integrity pacts as a renewal of promises and commitments to the law, justice, society and the state.

Second, as a warning and realization for all judges and judicial apparatus that the Supreme Court is serious about eradicating corruption, collusion, and nepotism. For judicial officers who are already civil servants, the signing of the integrity pact has already been done at the time of inauguration. The re-signing accompanied by public pronouncement can be interpreted as a renewal of promise and also a reminder that there is a commitment that must be inspired and always remembered not to commit any form of fraud. In addition, the integrity pact was also signed by honorary staff. This is to maximize efforts to prevent fraud and break the chain of corrupt behavior in the judicial environment. As part of the staff and employees in the judiciary, honorary staff must also sign the integrity pact because they have great potential as the main entry point for corruption and as potential recipients of bribes and other forms of fraud. With the integrity pact document, honorary staff will have the same consequences as civil servants if they are found to have committed fraud. This is expected to be able to minimize the possibility of corruption in the judicial environment and be able to realize a clean judiciary.

Third, as a reminder that the Supreme Court is constantly monitoring all behaviors and actions of all judicial apparatus. Through the signing of the integrity pact, supervision of corrupt behavior in the judiciary is not only imposed on the supervisory body but also on all judicial apparatus. Point one of the integrity pact states that the party concerned will play a proactive role in efforts to prevent and eradicate corruption, collusion, and nepotism. This reaffirms that everyone has the right to report suspected corruption and report known misconduct.

Corruption cases that still occur in the Supreme Court are a reality that makes us realize that the integrity pact has not been able to bind the commitment of the judicial apparatus in eradicating corruption. Thus, it can be said that the policy of signing integrity pacts has not been able to work effectively in efforts to reform the bureaucracy and eradicate corruption in the Supreme Court.

An effective policy is a policy that is able to run in harmony between policy objectives and the final results or outputs of the policy. (Priansa, 2013: 11). According to Rosalina (2012: 3), a policy can be said to be effective if the policy has been able to achieve its policy objectives. Effectiveness is an important element in achieving the objectives of a policy because it is a measure of policy success. Effectiveness is also an important indicator in the policy evaluation process. This is one of the determinants of the success of the policy whether it can be continued or not. (Mayasoni, 2022: 171).

The effectiveness of a policy can be measured through several indicators, including policy accuracy, implementation, targets, environment, and process. (Nugroho, 2012: 107). The description of these indicators is: (1) The policy accuracy indicator is a measure of the extent to which the policy is in accordance with the needs of solving and solving problems. (2) Implementation indicators, namely who is authorized to run and implement the policy. (3) Target

indicators, namely that the policy target is ready and in accordance with what is planned and does not overlap with other policies. (4) Environmental indicators, which include the policy environment consisting of policy formulators and implementers, as well as the external environment of the policy, namely public perception (public opinion) of the policy. (5) Process indicators, namely that the policy has gone through appropriate processes, namely acceptance of policy formation, adaptation to policies, and readiness to be part of the implementers of policy implementation.

Based on the indicators above, the policy of signing integrity pacts is basically in accordance with the needs of problem-solving and resolution because integrity pacts target the morals of the apparatus with the hope of being able to reduce and eliminate corrupt behavior. Moreover, Article 9 of the Regulation of the Minister of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform Number 49 of 2011 concerning General Guidelines for Integrity Pacts within Ministries/Agencies and Local Governments also explains that the signing of the integrity pact is accompanied by supervision of the implementation of the integrity pact which is carried out through monitoring and evaluation. The monitoring process is carried out by an Independent Monitoring Forum initiated by the Ministry/Institution and Local Government concerned, which in the judicial environment is known as the Supervisory Body. Furthermore, the Independent Monitoring Forum is obliged to compile a code of ethics which is the basis for the task of supervising the implementation of the Integrity Pact which is carried out jointly with the Ministries/Institutions and Local Governments.

The substance of the code of ethics of the Independent Monitoring Forum at least includes: (a) determined to help the successful implementation of the Integrity Pact; (b) oriented towards solutions and prevention of corruption; (c) maintaining personal integrity in carrying out their duties; (d) not receiving money or other illegal assets from the monitored agency; (e) not involving themselves in despicable acts.

The rules regarding monitoring and supervision of integrity pacts as described above show that the effectiveness indicators regarding implementation have also been fulfilled as well as the target indicators to be achieved which have been clearly stated, namely as an effort to reform the bureaucracy and eradicate corruption. However, the policy of signing the integrity pact still has many gaps in the points of environmental indicators and process indicators where the environment of policy makers and recipients does not fully understand the purpose of the integrity pact and is not ready for its implementation, so that in its realization, this integrity pact is only a ceremonial event which is a requirement for inauguration. This perception then has an impact on the attitude of the officials who are not serious in guiding the contents of the integrity pact into a commitment to the state, society, and institution. This then becomes one of the reasons for the existence of irregularities. Moreover, the process of monitoring and supervision of the implementation of the integrity pact is still not maximized and not consistent. For example, it can be seen from the response of the Supreme Court and the Judicial Commission, which seemed unprepared for the discovery of corruption cases in the Supreme Court. Even though events like this can actually be anticipated by the two institutions.

Basically, the integrity pact cannot stand alone in eradicating corruption in the Supreme Court. As mentioned earlier that the integrity pact is a promise to oneself, the community, the state, and God, but the promise contained in the pact only provides moral consequences so that it cannot be

said to be sufficient to become a policy that can effectively eradicate corruption. The moral quality of individual judicial officers is one aspect that greatly influences the occurrence of corruption and other acts of abuse of authority. Therefore, in addition to the signing of integrity pacts, other efforts are needed in the form of concrete actions that can improve the moral quality of judicial apparatus, such as increasing monitoring and supervision efforts, updating policies and codes of ethics, as well as disciplinary actions that contain penalties that can threaten and create a deterrent effect.

Corruption that has become a culture within the bureaucracy is not enough to be eradicated with promises but there must be strict sanctions that deter the perpetrators of corruption. In addition, in the implementation process there is still confusion where this policy is made by and for all judicial apparatus, so the policy is not binding enough. It was proven that shortly after the issuance of this circular, the Corruption Eradication Commission named the Secretary of the Supreme Court as a suspect in a case of alleged bribery for case management. This shows that a culture of corruption is still rife in the judiciary, starting from the leadership to the lower ranks. This also proves that with or without an integrity pact, a corrupt culture still exists. Although reforms are always carried out, if this entrenched and structured culture is not uprooted completely, corruption will still continue to exist.

Based on data from Indonesia Corruption Watch (2023), 579 corruption cases have been prosecuted and 1,396 people have been named as corruption suspects throughout 2022. This number has increased by 8.63% for corruption cases and 19.01% for the number of suspects in corruption cases compared to 2021. In addition, at the beginning of 2023 the corruption perception index experienced a decrease in score from 38 to 34 which placed Indonesia in 110th place out of 180 countries and below Singapore, Malaysia, Timor Leste, Vietnam, and Thailand. This data is an overall picture of corruption cases that occurred in Indonesia in 2022. As an institution that prosecutes corruption through corruption courts, the Supreme Court should be able to set an example of a bureaucracy that is clean from corruption. However, the Supreme Court has actually added to the long list of corruption cases in Indonesia.

The power and authority obtained by the judicial apparatus is a form of trust given by the state and society to be done well. (Setiawan, 2022: 42). However, this trust is actually abused by taking advantage for their own personal gain. This further emphasizes that the government's efforts to eradicate corruption must be even harder, especially in the Supreme Court as the spearhead of justice and the country's highest court. Various types of socialization and reminders, both in the form of emphasis on the code of ethics and the signing of integrity pacts are still intensively carried out and repeated as a prevention effort. Basically, corrupt behavior and culture are rooted and this is closely related to morality so efforts to touch morality through advice are expected to erode corrupt behavior and increase moral awareness not to commit irregularities that can harm themselves and others.

CONCLUSION

The integrity pact is a statement or promise to oneself about the commitment to carry out all duties, functions, responsibilities, authorities, and roles in accordance with laws and regulations and the ability not to commit corruption, collusion, and nepotism. The policy of signing an integrity pact is a government initiative in the context of bureaucratic reform and eradication of

corruption, collusion and nepotism. The Supreme Court as a state institution also implements this integrity pact policy and has been implementing it for a long time. This is a manifestation of the agency's commitment to corruption eradication efforts.

The corruption case that occurred in the Supreme Court that ensnared a Supreme Court Justice and several registrar staff has tarnished the image and integrity of the Supreme Court. Responding to this, the leadership of the Supreme Court issued an instruction to renew the signing of integrity pacts for all judicial apparatus through Circular Letter of the Secretary of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia Number 4 of 2022 concerning the Signing of Integrity Pacts. The renewal of the integrity pact aims to reduce public sentiment and save the institution's image. This incident shows that the integrity pact has not been effective enough in eradicating corruption within the Supreme Court, because even though the integrity pact has been implemented, corruption still occurs. As a short-term effort, the integrity pact still has a fairly good effect on reducing corruption, as the Circular Letter of the Secretary of the Supreme Court regarding the renewal of the integrity pact signing was quite successful in reducing the situation. However, as a long-term corruption eradication effort, the implementation of integrity pacts still cannot work effectively and optimally. The Supreme Court still needs many other efforts to eradicate corruption to establish a clean judicial environment.

REFERENCES

- Basuki, A. (2010). Pakta Integritas Di Tengah Suramnya Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi Di Indonesia. *Perspektif*, 15(1), 37-49.
- Bayu, D. (2023). ICW: Penindakan Kasus Korupsi Meningkat pada 2022. Dipetik September 14, 2023, dari DataIndonesia.id: <https://dataindonesia.id/varia/detail/icw-penindakan-kasus-korupsi-meningkat-pada-2022>.
- Bustomi, A. (2017). Kekuatan Mengikat Isi dari perjanjian Baku (Standard Contract) Bagi Para Pihak yang Membuatnya. *SOLUSI*, 15(3), 376-381.
- Donni Juni Priansa, A. G. (2013). *Manajemen Perkantoran: Efektif, Efisien, dan Profesional*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Endro, G. (2017). Menyelisik Makna Integritas dan Pertentangannya dengan Korupsi. *Integritas: Jurnal Antikorupsi*, 3(1), 131-152.
- Firmansyah, V. Z., & Syam, F. (2021). Penguatan Hukum Administrasi Negara Pencegah Praktik Korupsi dalam Diri Pemerintahan Indonesia. *Integritas: Jurnal Antikorupsi*, 7(2), 325-344.
- Griffin, R. W. (2004). *Manajemen*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Indonesia, B. P. (2019). Database Peraturan. Dipetik September 13, 2023, dari Dtabase Peraturan: <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/122028/uu-no-19-tahun-2019>.
- Indonesia, M. A. (2022). Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia. Dipetik September 13, 2023, dari Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia: <https://www.mahkamahagung.go.id/id/pengumuman/5438/penandatanganan-pakta-integritas>.
- Mayasoni, L. (2022). Metode Mengukur Efektivitas Kebijakan Publik. *Jurnal Sosial Politik Integratif*, 2(3), 169-173.
- Murdiyanto, E. (2020). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif (Teori dan Aplikasi Disertai Proposalnya)*. Yogyakarta: UPN "Veteran" Press.
- Nugroho, R. (2012). *Public Policy*. Jakarta: Kompas Gramedia.

- Rachmawati, A. F. (2022). Dampak korupsi dalam perkembangan ekonomi dan penegakan hukum di Indonesia. *Eksaminasi: Jurnal Hukum*, 1(1), 12-19.
- Rosalina, I. (2012). Efektivitas Program Nasional Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Mandiri Perkotaan Pada Kelompok Pinjaman Bergulir di Desa Mantren Kec Karangrejo Kabupaten Madetaan. *Jurnal Efektivitas Pemberdayaan Masyarakat*, 2(2), 1-9.
- Salimah, S. (2013). Upaya Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi dalam Menangani Kasus Korupsi Gayus Halomoan P Tambunan. *Jurnal Cita Hukum*, 1(2), 312-334.
- Setiawan, I., & Jesaja, C. P. (2022). Analisis Perilaku Korupsi Aparatur Pemerintah Di Indonesia (Studi pada Pengelolaan Bantuan Sosial Di Era Pandemi Covid-19). *Jurnal Media Birokrasi*, 4(2), 33-50.
- Soerjono Soekanto, S. M. (2013). *Penelitian Hukum Normatif: Suatu Tinjauan Singkat*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo.
- Suharyo. (2020). *Peranan Mahkamah Agung Sebagai Benteng Terakhir Dalam Penegakan Hukum Pada Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi*. Jakarta: BALITBANGKUMHAM Press.
- Wardana, D., Meiwanda, G. (2017). Reformasi Birokrasi Menuju Indonesia Baru, Bersih dan Bermartabat. *WEDANA: Jurnal Kajian Pemerintahan, Politik dan Birokrasi*, 3(1), 331-336.
- Watch, I. C. (2023). *Indonesia Corruption Watch*. Dipetik September 14, 2023, dari Indonesia Corruption Watch: <https://antikorupsi.org/id/laporan-akhir-tahun-icw-2022>.