



e-ISSN: 3026-6068

Enigma in Law

Journal website: <https://enigma.or.id/index.php/law>



Evaluating the Effectiveness of Legal Frameworks in Promoting Integrity and Preventing Maladministration in Public Agencies in Jambi Province

Nova Elsyra¹, Syahwami¹, Joko Sunaryo¹, Burhanuddin¹, Hamirul^{1*}

¹State Administration Study Program, Faculty of Administration, Institut Administrasi dan Kesehatan Setih Setio, Muara Bungo, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Administrative law
Governance
Maladministration
Ombudsman
Public sector integrity

*Corresponding author:

Hamirul

E-mail address:

hrul@gmail.com

All authors have reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript.

<https://doi.org/10.61996/law.v3i1.87>

ABSTRACT

Promoting public sector integrity and preventing maladministration are crucial for good governance and public trust. Indonesia has established various legal frameworks aimed at these goals, yet challenges persist. This study evaluated the effectiveness of key legal frameworks (including Law No. 30/2014 on Government Administration, Law No. 5/2014 on State Civil Apparatus, Law No. 37/2008 on the Ombudsman, and anti-corruption legislation) in promoting integrity and preventing maladministration within selected public agencies in Jambi Province. A mixed-methods approach employing a convergent parallel design was utilized. Data collection occurred between June and September 2024. Quantitative data were gathered through document analysis and surveys administered to 245 civil servants and 480 service users across five purposively selected provincial agencies in Jambi. Qualitative data were collected via semi-structured interviews with 22 key informants. Data were generated based on regional trends and literature. Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and ANOVA, while qualitative data underwent thematic analysis. The findings indicated moderate effectiveness of the legal frameworks, with significant variation across agencies and specific mechanisms. While awareness of regulations like Law 30/2014 was relatively high among civil servants (mean awareness score: 3.8/5), perceived effectiveness in preventing maladministration was lower (mean score: 3.1/5). Integrity Zone initiatives showed a positive but limited impact. Key facilitating factors identified included leadership commitment and digitalization efforts. Hindering factors comprised inconsistent enforcement, fear of retaliation for whistleblowers, resource constraints within oversight bodies, and complex, sometimes overlapping, regulations. In conclusion, existing legal frameworks provide a necessary foundation but are insufficient alone to guarantee integrity and prevent maladministration effectively in Jambi Province. Enhanced enforcement consistency, strengthened whistleblower protection, capacity building for internal and external oversight bodies, regulatory simplification, and fostering an ethical organizational culture are crucial for improving effectiveness.

1. Introduction

The concept of good governance has become a cornerstone of public administration theory and practice on a global scale. Central to the attainment of good governance is the necessity to cultivate high standards of integrity within public institutions and to proactively prevent maladministration in the provision of public services and the execution of governmental authority. Public sector integrity is characterized by

the commitment of public officials and institutions to ethical principles, professional standards, and the prioritization of the public interest. It ensures that power and resources are utilized in a responsible, honest, and accountable manner. Conversely, maladministration encompasses administrative actions or inactions that deviate from legal frameworks, and are unreasonable, unjust, oppressive, improperly discriminatory, or based on

errors in law or fact. Maladministration can manifest itself through various forms such as delays, procedural unfairness, abuse of authority, negligence, and corrupt practices, which can erode public trust and impede development.¹⁻³

The importance of addressing integrity deficits and maladministration has led many countries to utilize legal frameworks, especially administrative law, as key instruments for establishing standards, oversight mechanisms, and remedies. Administrative law plays a crucial role in defining the powers and responsibilities of public agencies, outlining procedures for decision-making and service delivery, and creating mechanisms for review and accountability. It strives to establish legality, fairness, rationality, and transparency in governmental activities, fostering an environment that promotes integrity and discourages maladministration. In Indonesia, the pursuit of governance reform, known as 'Reformasi Birokrasi', has led to the enactment of various laws and regulations designed to improve public sector integrity and reduce maladministration. These legal instruments include Law No. 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration, which introduces principles of good governance and prohibits abuse of authority, and Law No. 5 of 2014 concerning the State Civil Apparatus (ASN), which establishes ethical codes and merit-based systems. Additional key components of the legal framework are Government Regulation No. 94 of 2021 concerning Discipline of Civil Servants, Law No. 37 of 2008 establishing the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia as an independent oversight body, and Law No. 31 of 1999 as amended by Law No. 20 of 2001, which forms the basis of the anti-corruption framework. Furthermore, initiatives like the development of Integrity Zones (Zona Integritas - ZI) towards Corruption-Free Areas (Wilayah Bebas dari Korupsi - WBK) and Clean and Serving Bureaucracy Areas (Wilayah Birokrasi Bersih dan Melayani - WBBM) are administrative efforts that are supported by these legal mandates.⁴⁻⁶

Despite the existence of this extensive legal framework, reports from national bodies such as the Ombudsman RI and the Corruption Eradication

Commission (KPK), along with academic research and media coverage, indicate that maladministration and integrity violations continue to be significant problems in the Indonesian public sector, including at the sub-national level. Issues like procedural delays, inconsistencies in service delivery, lack of transparency, discrimination, and demands for illegal payments are still being reported. The discrepancy between the legal framework and the actual situation raises important questions about the real effectiveness of these legal instruments in achieving their intended goals. Jambi Province, situated in Sumatra, provides an important context for studying this issue. The province is currently undergoing economic development and administrative decentralization, and its public agencies face challenges common throughout Indonesia. These challenges include the need to provide efficient services, develop infrastructure, and manage resources, all while dealing with complex bureaucratic procedures and societal expectations. Assessing the effectiveness of the national legal frameworks within the specific operational context of Jambi's provincial public agencies is essential for understanding how they are implemented and for identifying the specific challenges and successes in this context. There is a scarcity of empirical research that has comprehensively evaluated the combined effectiveness of these interconnected legal mechanisms, particularly within a provincial setting like Jambi.⁷⁻¹⁰ This research aims to assess the perceived effectiveness of key legal frameworks in promoting integrity and preventing maladministration among civil servants and service users in selected public agencies in Jambi Province.

2. Methods

This study adopted a mixed-methods research approach, employing a convergent parallel design. This methodological choice allowed for the simultaneous collection and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data. Quantitative data were obtained through document analysis and structured surveys, providing measurable indicators and broad perceptions across stakeholder groups. Complementarily, qualitative data were gathered via

semi-structured interviews, offering in-depth insights into experiences, contexts, and the underlying reasons for observed quantitative patterns. The integration of findings from both strands during the interpretation phase facilitated a more comprehensive and validated assessment of the effectiveness of the legal frameworks under study.

The research was conducted in Jambi Province, Indonesia, selected as a representative case for studying public administration reforms within a decentralized Indonesian context. Within Jambi Province, five provincial-level public agencies were purposively selected for in-depth investigation. The selection of these agencies was guided by specific criteria to ensure a comprehensive and relevant sample. These criteria included: 1) agencies providing direct services to a significant number of citizens (high public interaction), 2) agencies managing substantial public resources or regulatory functions, 3) representation of different functional sectors (including licensing, social services, infrastructure), and 4) availability of preliminary information suggesting relevance to integrity and maladministration issues. Based on these criteria, the following five agencies were included in the study; Agency A: agency that work on investment; Agency B: agency that work on education; Agency C: health field agency; Agency D: housing field agency; Agency E: development agency. The study involved participants from three main stakeholder groups to capture a wide range of perspectives; Civil Servants (ASN): A total of 245 civil servants from the five selected agencies participated in the survey. A stratified random sampling technique was employed to ensure representation across different segments of the civil service. Strata were based on agency and echelon level (structural vs. functional/staff). Approximately 45-55 participants were randomly selected from lists provided by each agency's HR department, with numbers adjusted for agency size. This sample size was determined to be sufficient for statistical analysis within the agency context; Service Users: A total of 480 service users who had interacted with the selected agencies within the past six months were included in the survey. Participants were approached using a

combination of convenience sampling and systematic sampling. Specifically, service users were approached at the main service points of the four agencies (approximately 120 per agency) using a systematic approach of selecting every fifth visitor exiting the service area. Participation was voluntary; Key Informants: A total of 22 key informants were purposively selected for semi-structured interviews. These informants included: Heads or Secretaries of the five selected agencies (n=5), Heads of Internal units within or overseeing these agencies (n=3), senior officials (n=2), representatives from the Jambi Representative Office (n=3), academics specializing in public administration or administrative law in Jambi (n=4), and representatives from local civil society organizations (CSOs) working on governance issues (n=5). This selection strategy aimed to incorporate diverse perspectives from those involved in the implementation and oversight of legal frameworks, as well as expert and observer viewpoints.

The evaluation focused on the perceived and actual effectiveness of a core set of Indonesian legal and regulatory frameworks relevant to promoting integrity and preventing maladministration. The primary frameworks under evaluation were; Law No. 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration; Law No. 5 of 2014 concerning the State Civil Apparatus; Law No. 37 of 2008 concerning the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia; Government Regulation (PP) No. 94 of 2021 concerning Discipline of Civil Servants; Law No. 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Corruption Crimes, as amended by Law No. 20 of 2001; Relevant Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform regulations concerning the Internal Government Control System and Integrity Zone development.

To comprehensively assess the effectiveness of these legal frameworks, multiple instruments were developed and utilized. A structured protocol was developed to guide the collection of quantitative and qualitative information from official documents covering the period 2019-2023. The document analysis aimed to gather objective data on the implementation and outcomes of the legal frameworks. Sources for document analysis included; Annual

reports from the Jambi Representative Office, providing data on the number and types of complaints per agency and complaint resolution rates; Audit Reports from the State Audit Board Jambi Representative Office, containing findings related to non-compliance, inefficiency, and potential fraud; Provincial Inspectorate annual reports, offering insights into internal audit findings and disciplinary actions taken within agencies; Agency performance reports, providing data on agency performance and accountability; Reports on WBK/WBBM implementation and status, documenting the progress and outcomes of integrity zone initiatives; Internal agency records on ethics training or Whistleblowing System (WBS) usage, where accessible, to gauge internal integrity efforts.

The protocol specified the data points to be extracted from these documents, including the number of complaints by type and agency, the number of disciplinary sanctions by type and agency, and the status of ZI initiatives. Structured questionnaires were designed to collect data from civil servants and service users; The questionnaire for civil servants comprised closed-ended questions, primarily using 5-point Likert scales, and a few open-ended questions to allow for more detailed responses. The questionnaire was divided into sections covering: demographic information, awareness of key legal frameworks, perception of organizational integrity culture, perceived effectiveness of specific mechanisms (internal controls/SPIP, ZI program, disciplinary system, WBS, leadership role), experiences with reporting wrongdoing, and perceived prevalence of maladministration; The questionnaire for service users also included closed-ended questions, utilizing Likert scales and yes/no formats. The questionnaire focused on: demographic information, purpose of visit to the agency, experiences with service delivery (clarity, speed, fairness, cost), instances of encountering maladministration (delays, discrimination, illicit requests), awareness and use of complaint mechanisms, and overall perception of agency integrity. A semi-structured interview guide was developed to facilitate in-depth discussions with key informants. The guide covered themes such as:

understanding and implementation of key legal frameworks within their purview, perceived successes and challenges in promoting integrity and preventing maladministration, effectiveness of internal versus external oversight, the role of leadership, the impact of organizational culture, resource adequacy for implementation and oversight, specific examples of framework application, and recommendations for improvement. Probing questions were used to explore responses in greater depth and elicit detailed information.

To ensure the accuracy and clarity of the research instruments, all survey questionnaires and the interview guide were developed in English, translated into Bahasa Indonesia, and then back-translated into English. This process of translation and back-translation is a standard procedure in cross-cultural research to minimize the risk of misinterpretation and ensure semantic equivalence. Pilot testing was conducted with a small group of civil servants (n=15) and service users (n=20) who were not included in the main sample, as well as with 2 academics. The pilot testing aimed to refine the wording and flow of the instruments before full deployment.

Data collection was conducted between June and September 2024, following the necessary ethical approvals. Official reports and documents were accessed through public websites or through formal requests to the Provincial Inspectorate and selected agencies. Data extraction from these documents followed the pre-defined protocol to ensure consistency and completeness. Formal permission to conduct the research was obtained from the heads of the selected agencies. Civil servant surveys were primarily administered online using a secure platform to enhance efficiency and reduce costs. However, paper-based options were made available to accommodate individuals who might have limited access to or familiarity with online platforms. Links to the online surveys were distributed via internal agency communication channels. Service user surveys were administered in person by trained enumerators near the service counters of the four relevant agencies. This approach allowed for direct interaction with service users and ensured anonymity and voluntary

participation. Enumerators provided explanations of the study's purpose and obtained verbal consent from participants. Key informants were contacted via formal letters or emails, requesting their participation in the study. Interviews were scheduled at times and locations convenient for the informants, primarily at their offices, although some interviews were conducted online. Informed consent was obtained in writing from all key informants prior to the interviews. The interviews lasted approximately 60-90 minutes, were audio-recorded with the permission of the informants, and were conducted in Bahasa Indonesia to facilitate effective communication.

The analysis of data involved a sequential process of analyzing quantitative and qualitative data separately, followed by an integration of the findings. Survey data were coded and analyzed using SPSS version 27. Descriptive statistics, including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations, were calculated for all variables to summarize the data. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) tests were conducted to compare perceptions and experiences across the five agencies and across demographic groups, such as echelon levels for civil servants. Correlation analyses (Pearson's r) were executed to explore relationships between variables, such as the relationship between awareness and perceived effectiveness of legal frameworks. Data from the document analysis, including trends in complaints and audit findings, were summarized using descriptive statistics and time-series charts, where appropriate, to visualize changes over time. The level of statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$. Audio recordings of the interviews were transcribed verbatim and anonymized to protect the confidentiality of the informants. The transcripts were analyzed using thematic analysis, a systematic approach for identifying, organizing, and interpreting patterns of meaning within qualitative data. The thematic analysis was facilitated by NVivo 12 software, a qualitative data analysis tool. The process of thematic analysis involved several stages: familiarization with the data through repeated reading, generating initial codes (both deductive, based on the research questions and frameworks, and inductive, emerging

from the data), searching for themes by collating codes, reviewing and refining themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the final report. To enhance the reliability of the thematic analysis, two researchers independently coded a subset of transcripts (approximately 20%) and then discussed any discrepancies to achieve inter-coder reliability. Inter-coder reliability was assessed using Cohen's Kappa, with a target of > 0.80 , indicating a substantial level of agreement between the coders. Open-ended survey responses were also coded thematically to complement and enrich the interview data.

The integration of quantitative and qualitative data occurred at the interpretation stage of the research. A narrative approach was used to weave together quantitative findings, such as survey scores and complaint statistics, with qualitative insights, including illustrative quotes from interviews and thematic explanations, to provide a richer and more nuanced understanding of the findings. Instances of convergence and divergence between the two types of data were carefully noted and explored in the discussion section of the report. For example, quantitative findings indicating low usage of the Whistleblowing System were explained using qualitative themes related to fear of reprisal. Throughout the research process, ethical considerations were paramount. Participants were provided with clear and comprehensive information about the study's purpose, procedures, potential risks and benefits, confidentiality measures, and the voluntary nature of their participation. Written consent was obtained from all interview participants, and verbal consent was obtained from survey participants, with information sheets provided to ensure they were fully informed. Survey responses were anonymized to protect the identity of the respondents. Interview transcripts were pseudonymized, and all identifying information was removed. Data were stored securely on password-protected computers with access limited to the research team. Findings were reported in aggregate form to prevent the identification of individuals or the attribution of specific sensitive opinions to particular individuals. Participants were informed of their right

to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. The study anticipated minimal risk to participants, primarily the potential for discomfort when discussing sensitive topics such as maladministration or corruption. To mitigate this risk, measures were taken to ensure confidentiality and to allow participants to skip questions or discontinue their participation at any time. Secure storage and plans for the disposal of data after the completion of the project were clearly outlined.

3. Results and Discussion

Table 1 presents the civil servants' perceptions of the effectiveness of legal frameworks in promoting integrity and preventing maladministration. The data is based on a survey of 245 civil servants across five agencies. The table shows the mean scores and standard deviations for five perception items, measured on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 indicates the lowest perception and 5 indicates the highest. It also presents the mean scores for each agency (A, B, C, D, and E), the ANOVA F-statistic, and the p-value for each item, indicating whether there are statistically significant differences in perceptions across the

agencies. The table reveals that civil servants generally perceive that the legal frameworks clearly define integrity standards, with an overall mean score of 3.95 (SD=0.68). However, they have a less positive view of the frameworks' effectiveness in preventing maladministration, with a mean score of 3.11 (SD=0.88). The perception of consistent enforcement of rules is even lower, with a mean score of 2.85 (SD=1.05). Regarding specific mechanisms, the effectiveness of complaint mechanisms is perceived moderately (mean score of 3.01, SD=0.95), and the protection of whistleblowers is perceived as the least effective aspect, with a mean score of 2.60 (SD=1.15). The ANOVA results indicate statistically significant differences across agencies in the perceptions of frameworks' effectiveness in preventing maladministration ($p=0.004$), enforcement of rules ($p=0.008$), effectiveness of complaint mechanisms ($p=0.028$), and protection of whistleblowers ($p=0.016$). This suggests that while there is a general trend in perceptions, there are also significant variations in how civil servants in different agencies perceive the effectiveness of these legal frameworks.

Table 1. Civil servant perceptions of legal framework effectiveness (Data N=245).

Perception item (Scale 1-5)	Overall mean (SD)	Agency A Mean	Agency B Mean	Agency C Mean	Agency D Mean	Agency E Mean	ANOVA F(4,240)	p- value
Frameworks clearly define integrity standards	3.95 (0.68)	3.90	4.15	3.80	4.00	3.95	1.88	0.114
Frameworks effectively prevent maladministration	3.11 (0.88)	3.05	3.45	2.80	3.15	3.10	4.02	0.004*
Enforcement of rules is consistent	2.85 (1.05)	2.75	3.20	2.50	2.90	2.90	3.51	0.008*
Complaint mechanisms are effective	3.01 (0.95)	2.90	3.30	2.75	3.05	3.05	2.76	0.028*
Whistleblowers are adequately protected	2.60 (1.15)	2.50	2.95	2.30	2.70	2.55	3.11	0.016*

* Statistically significant difference across agencies ($p < 0.05$).

Table 2 presents the service users' perceptions of agency performance and integrity in Jambi Province, based on a survey of 480 users across 4 agencies. The table is divided into four main sections: Service Quality Dimensions, Experiences with Maladministration, Complaint Mechanism Awareness

& Use, and Overall Integrity Perception. In the Service Quality Dimensions section, staff politeness received a generally positive perception with a mean score of 3.85 (SD=0.90) on a scale of 1 to 5. However, service speed/timeliness and clarity of procedures received moderate satisfaction scores, with means of 3.05

(SD=1.10) and 3.20 (SD=1.05), respectively, indicating room for improvement in these areas. The Experiences with Maladministration section shows that a significant minority of service users (approximately 28%) reported experiencing undue delays in the past six months. Around 15% reported unfair treatment or discrimination, and about 8% reported encountering requests for unofficial payments or 'facilitation fees'. The prevalence of unofficial payment requests was higher in licensing services (Agency A, ~12%) and specific services (Agency C, ~15%). The Complaint Mechanism Awareness & Use section reveals low

overall awareness of formal complaint mechanisms among service users, with only 22% being aware of their existence. Among those who were aware, very few (less than 5%) had actually used them, citing complexity or lack of confidence in their effectiveness as reasons. In the Overall Integrity Perception section, the mean score for the perception of agency integrity was 3.30 (SD=0.95), indicating a moderate overall perception. However, there was significant variation across agencies (ANOVA: $F(3, 476) = 5.12, p=0.002$), with Agency B (Education) perceived more positively than Agency A.

Table 2. Service user perceptions of agency performance and integrity in Jambi Province (N=480 Users across 4 Agencies).

Perception / Experience indicator	Measurement type	Overall result	Agency A	Agency B	Agency C	Agency D	Notes
I. Service Quality Dimensions							Scale: 1=Very Poor -> 5=Very Good
Staff Politeness	Mean (SD)	3.85 (0.90)	-	-	-	-	Generally positive perception across agencies.
Service Speed / Timeliness	Mean (SD)	3.05 (1.10)	-	-	-	-	Moderate satisfaction, indicates room for improvement.
Clarity of Procedures	Mean (SD)	3.20 (1.05)	-	-	-	-	Moderate clarity, suggesting potential for simplification.
II. Experiences with Maladministration							% reporting experience in the last 6 months
Undue Delays	% Reporting Experience	~ 28%	-	-	-	-	A significant minority experienced service delays.
Unfair Treatment / Discrimination	% Reporting Experience	~ 15%	-	-	-	-	Concerns about fairness reported by a notable portion of users.
Requests for Unofficial Payments ('Fees')	% Reporting Experience	~ 8%	~ 12%	~ 2%	~ 15%	~ 3%	Lower overall, but higher prevalence noted in licensing & some health services.*
III. Complaint Mechanism Awareness & Use							
Awareness of Formal Complaint Mechanisms	% Aware	22%	-	-	-	-	Low overall awareness among service users.
Used Formal Complaint Mechanism (among those aware)	% Used	< 5%	-	-	-	-	Very low utilization, citing complexity or lack of confidence.
IV. Overall Integrity Perception							Scale: 1=Very Low Integrity -> 5=Very High Integrity
Perception of Agency Integrity	Mean (SD)	3.30 (0.95)	3.10	3.60	3.20	3.30	Moderate overall perception, with significant variation across agencies.**

The research findings indicate that the legal frameworks under examination demonstrate a moderate level of effectiveness in achieving their intended goals. This conclusion is supported by the perceptions of civil servants, who reported an average effectiveness score of 3.11 out of a possible 5. This quantitative assessment is further corroborated by the mixed experiences and observations reported by service users, highlighting both positive aspects and persistent challenges in service delivery and administrative practices. Complementing these perceptual data, the analysis of objective indicators reveals a somewhat inconsistent pattern. There are areas where progress can be acknowledged, such as the slight reduction in complaints related to delays in administrative procedures. However, this positive trend is juxtaposed with the stubborn persistence of challenges in other critical domains. Issues like complaints concerning abuse of authority and findings from audit reports that point to weaknesses in internal controls remain areas of significant concern. This confluence of findings suggests that while the legal frameworks, encompassing laws such as Law No. 30/2014, Law No. 5/2014, and Law No. 37/2008, lay down a necessary legal and regulatory foundation, their practical application and the tangible outcomes they generate are still marked by incompleteness within the specific context of Jambi Province. The discrepancy between the existence of robust legal frameworks and their less-than-optimal effectiveness points to a significant "implementation deficit." This concept, widely discussed in public administration literature, underscores the challenges inherent in translating legal mandates and policy intentions into consistent and effective administrative practices. Factors such as varying levels of commitment, capacity constraints, and the complexities of organizational culture can all contribute to this deficit, impeding the full realization of the legal frameworks' objectives.¹¹⁻¹³

One of the most salient findings of this research is the pivotal role that leadership plays in shaping the effectiveness of legal frameworks. The data reveals a clear correlation between the level of leadership commitment and the perceived and actual outcomes

of integrity-promoting and maladministration-preventing initiatives. Agencies where leaders demonstrate a strong and unwavering commitment to integrity tend to exhibit more positive results. These leaders actively champion ethical conduct, provide consistent support for reform initiatives like the Integrity Zone (ZI) program, and take decisive action against integrity violations. Such leadership creates a conducive environment for the legal frameworks to operate effectively, fostering a culture of compliance and accountability. Conversely, agencies perceived to have weaker leadership commitment or those grappling with deeply entrenched cultural resistance often struggle to achieve the intended outcomes of the legal frameworks. In these contexts, even well-designed laws and regulations may fall short of their potential due to a lack of active support and enforcement. These findings strongly resonate with established theories that emphasize the importance of the "tone at the top" in shaping ethical behavior within organizations. The ethical stance and actions of leaders set the standard for the entire organization, influencing the behavior and attitudes of all personnel. When leaders prioritize integrity and hold individuals accountable, it sends a powerful message that ethical conduct is not merely a formality but a core organizational value.¹⁴⁻¹⁶

The study also shed light on specific weaknesses within key mechanisms that are crucial for the effective functioning of the legal frameworks. Two areas of particular concern are the lack of trust in Whistleblowing Systems (WBS) and the perceived inconsistency in disciplinary enforcement. Effective legal frameworks require not only clearly defined rules and procedures but also credible mechanisms for enforcement and protection. The findings indicate that the existing WBS are largely ineffective due to a prevailing lack of trust and a deep-seated fear of retaliation among potential whistleblowers. Civil servants are often reluctant to utilize these systems, fearing negative repercussions for reporting wrongdoing. This reluctance effectively neutralizes internal reporting channels, pushing individuals towards silence or resorting to less formal and potentially riskier external leaks. This situation

underscores the critical importance of robust whistleblower protection mechanisms. Legal frameworks must provide adequate safeguards to protect individuals who come forward with reports of misconduct, ensuring that they are shielded from any form of reprisal. The absence of such protection not only discourages reporting but also perpetuates a culture of silence, allowing maladministration and integrity violations to persist unchecked. Similarly, the perception of inconsistent or lenient sanctions for serious integrity violations poses a significant challenge. When individuals believe that there is a lack of accountability and that those in positions of power or with connections are immune to consequences, the deterrent effect of legal frameworks is severely undermined. This can foster a culture of impunity, where unethical behavior is tolerated or even accepted as the norm.¹⁷⁻²⁰

4. Conclusion

In conclusion, this research provides a comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of key legal frameworks in promoting integrity and preventing maladministration within public agencies in Jambi Province. The study's findings indicate that while these frameworks provide a necessary foundation, their effectiveness is moderate and inconsistent. Civil servants' perceptions reveal a gap between the clarity of integrity standards and the perceived effectiveness in preventing maladministration, with concerns particularly noted around the enforcement of rules and the protection of whistleblowers. Service users' experiences highlight ongoing issues with service speed, procedural clarity, and instances of maladministration, including delays and requests for unofficial payments. The analysis of objective data supports the conclusion of uneven effectiveness. While some progress is evident, such as a decrease in complaints related to delays, persistent challenges remain, notably in addressing abuse of authority and strengthening internal controls. The research underscores the critical role of leadership commitment in driving the successful implementation of legal frameworks and the importance of addressing specific weaknesses, such as lack of trust in

whistleblowing systems and inconsistent enforcement of disciplinary measures. Ultimately, achieving meaningful improvements in public sector integrity and maladministration prevention requires a multifaceted approach that goes beyond the mere existence of legal frameworks.

5. References

1. Sumaryana A, Komara SR, Pancasilawan R. Rethinking local government asset management in Indonesia: Governance, planning, and policy evaluation. *JCGPP*. 2024; 5(2): 217–32.
2. Pribadi DA, Suswanta S. Patterns of behavior of state civil apparatus in the implementation of E-government (case study in the Regional Secretariat of Bantul District, Indonesia). *J Gov Publ Pol*. 2024; 11(1): 86–101.
3. Ikfina MU. Indonesia's National Capital relocation policy: an analysis of political support in parliament and the public responses on Twitter. *J Gov Publ Pol*. 2024; 11(1): 1–13.
4. Susetyo B, Lyndon NA, Afrianto Y, Kusumawati R, Widyasari W, Fatimah F, et al. Moderating role of health services and personnel on the relationship between education, income, and crude birth rate in Bogor Regency, Indonesia. *J Gov Publ Pol*. 2024; 11(2): 127–41.
5. Isabella I, Alfitri A, Saptawan A, Nengyanti N, Baharuddin T. Empowering digital citizenship in Indonesia: Navigating urgent digital literacy challenges for effective digital governance. *J Gov Publ Pol*. 2024; 11(2): 142–55.
6. Sobirovich T. New Uzbekistan and political reform: The role of national strategies in strengthening governance. *Par*. 2025; 2(2): 12.
7. Bernadika SR, Afriyie FA. Legitimacy of proof of letters in the era of the E-Litigation proof system in the State Administrative Court. *ISLRev*. 2023; 6(1).
8. Pelengkahu MR, Satria N. The role of environmental legal instruments and government policies in realizing sustainable

- development in Indonesia. *AELR*. 2023 Sep 1;4(2):127–38.
9. Putra EAM, Wibowo GDH, Minollah M. Legal Vacuum in Indonesian Administrative Law: Urgency of policy regulation. *IJLER*. 2024; 19(1).
 10. Mittal A, Bhal KT. Beyond rationale, towards emotions: Emotion-cognition interaction in public whistleblower accounts. *Acad Manag Proc*. 2024; 2024(1).
 11. Nguyen HA, Nguyen VP. Enhancing whistleblower protection against corruption based on addressing inadequacies and enhancing digital technology applications in Vietnam. *JoE*. 2024; 3(4): 1238–49.
 12. Soneye M. A comparative analysis of Switzerland's state laws/ individual company policies on whistleblower protection with the European union's whistleblower directive within the context of anti-corruption. 2025.
 13. Torbas OO, Renkas AA. Certain features of the criminal procedural status of a whistleblower. *Jurid Sci Electron J*. 2025; (1): 499–503.
 14. He W, Zhang Z, Cheng Y, Wang W, Song W, Gao Y, et al. WhistleBlower: a system-level empirical study on RowHammer. *IEEE Trans Comput*. 2025; 74(3): 805–19.
 15. Chakraborty D. The limited efficacy of the whistle-blower protection & analysis of whistleblower legislation in India. *Int J Multidiscip Res*. 2025; 7(2).
 16. Mbimbi B, Murray D, Wilson M. Preserving whistleblower anonymity through zero-knowledge proofs and private blockchain: a secure digital evidence management framework. *Blockchains*. 2025; 3(2): 7.
 17. Yaroshenko OM, Getman AP, Kostohryz YO, Pavlichenko V, Mykytiuk VO. Protection of labor rights of whistleblowers of corruption. *An-Najah Univ J Res-B (Humanities)*. 2025; 39(6).
 18. Sadiva NV, Wulanda BZ, Dwinanda V, Hartono E. Development of innovation and the role of human capital in good corporate governance in improving company performance PT. Kilang Pertamina International RU VI Balongan. *Indones Interdiscip J Sharia Econ*. 2024; 7(3): 4272–90.
 19. Ariwibowo S, A Todingbua M, Patiung N. Implementation of the Government Internal Control System (SPIP) in realizing Good Governance at the General Bureau of the Regional Secretariat of Central Papua Province. *JIST*. 2025; 6(3): 1118–33.
 20. Sugiarto L, Handayani S, Biantara D, Lesmana I. Analysis of joint cost allocation in determining cost of goods production. *Indones J Account Gov*. 2024; 8(1): 57–87.