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Abstract

The complexities of corruption and abuse of power cases involve multiple stakeholders ranging from the government and corporations. This research aims to understand the corruption and abuse of power in state administration that are very interesting to be studied due at the ontological level and sociological level based on sociology of law perspective. Analysis on research problems was conducted using a mixed method study. Data were collected through interview, observation, documentation, and survey questionnaire. Data analyzed using qualitative data analysis were data reduction, data display, and data verification, triangulation, and a quantitative data analysis were conducted using smart PLS application. The results indicated that it was necessary to do mitigation on the corruption and abuse of power in state administration in Indonesia to provide stakeholders with information and state agencies as public officials and practitioners with input in making better regulation and policies.
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INTRODUCTION

Corruption is a common problem in societies around the world, with significant implications for socio-economic, political, and administrative systems. In essence, corruption entails the abuse of entrusted power for personal gain or to obtain illegitimate advantages. This multidimensional phenomenon has been observed throughout history and continues to be a widespread problem in contemporary society. It is important to eradicate corruption thoroughly and responsibly because its impact is detrimental to the interests of the public and the state. In addition, corruption can be seen as a symptom of abuse and mismanagement of power, in which individuals exploit their authority and position to enrich themselves at the expense of the society and the state. Furthermore, corruption reflects the dysfunctional relationship between the state and its citizens, resulting in a decline in trust towards the government’s ability to act in the best interests of its citizens. Source: Corruption is a multidimensional phenomenon with broad and varied impacts that can have complex socio-economic, political, and public administration consequences in any society. Corruption, as defined by various sources, refers to the abuse of entrusted power for personal or illicit gain (Jonathan, Olusola, Bernadin, & Inoussa, 2021).

Corruption and abuse of power in state administration are critical issues that have broad sociology of law implications. These problems undermine the principles of justice, equity, and democratic governance, erode public trust and hinder socio-economic development. It involves the abuse of entrusted power for personal gain. This can include bribery, embezzlement, and nepotism. This refers to the abuse of power by public officials for improper purposes, such as violating rights, manipulating processes, or suppressing dissent. Corruption and abuse of power erode public trust in institutions and the rule of law, leading to social unrest and the erosion of community cohesion. These practices perpetuate inequality by diverting resources away from public services and welfare programs, thereby benefiting only a select few individuals or groups. Abuse of power can result in the violation of human rights, as officials may suppress freedom of expression, freedom of assembly, and due process. Corruption and abuse of power discourage foreign investment, impede economic growth, and hinder poverty alleviation efforts. When those in power carry out these practices with impunity, it undermines the rule of law, fostering a culture of impunity and lawlessness. The government enacts laws and regulations to prevent and penalize corruption and abuse of power. This includes anti-corruption laws, whistleblower protection measures, and codes of conduct for public officials (Suramin, 2021).

The human resource and its implication provides inputs for making better policies (Toruan, Gusti, & Riyadi, 2021).
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Implementation of performance accountability system for government institution provides inputs for making better regulation on the implementation of performance accountability system for public officials and practitioners (Priyambodo, Wijaya, Wike, Sujarwoto, & Riyadi, 2023a). The Performance Accountability System For Government Agency provides inputs for making better regulation on the performance accountability system for government institution policies (Priyambodo, Wijaya, Wike, Sujarwoto, & Riyadi, 2023b). Transformational Leadership, Technology Adoption, and Public Service provide a significant positive effect on the Job Competency (Purbiyantari, Zauhar, Suryadi, Hermawan, & Riyadi, 2023b). The leadership and service are useful for improving policies and practices and providing information to stakeholders (Purbiyantari, Zauhar, Suryadi, Hermawan, & Riyadi, 2023a). The user satisfaction provides a positive and significant effect on the organizational performance (Sinulingga et al., 2023). The Public Private Partnership policy and practice provide information to related stakeholders (Syahruddin, Wijaya, Suryono, & Riyadi, 2023). The role of Workplace Spirituality mediates effect of Information Technology on Innovative Work Behavior and mediates effect of Transformational Leadership on Innovative Work Behavior (Susilo, Astuti, Arifin, Mawardi, & Riyadi, 2023). The collaboration must involve the related institutions and should be conducted to improve regulation on disaster management (Tjahjono, Suryono, Riyanto, Amin, & Riyadi, 2023).

Effective conflict management strategies and their implementation are essential in providing stakeholders with valuable information for improving policy and regulations (Toruan, Riyadi, & Gusti, 2023). Improvements in policies are necessary to provide information and produce a clear input for public officials to make better regulations (Rozikin, Wijaya, & Riyadi, 2023). The community empowerment positively affects production capacity and social capital (Nuraini, Saleh, Wike, & Riyadi, 2023). The Collaborative Governance in Digital Infrastructure Development and its implementation are needed for providing information to stakeholders (Rozikin, Sulistyo, Saleh, Hermawan, & Riyadi, 2023). It is necessary to formulate and implement a policy as inputs for making a better regulation in managing the implementation of policies (Sipayung, Sumartono, Saleh, Rozikin, & Riyadi, 2023a). The Content of Policy and Context of Implementation are positively affected by the Program. The Collaborative Governance positively affects the Program (Sipayung, Sumartono, Saleh, Rozikin, & Riyadi, 2023b). The social leadership and social capital positively affect community empowerment and social capital fully mediates the relationship between social leaderships on the community empowerment (Rozikin, Nalikan, Sumartono, Suryadi, & Riyadi, 2023). It is essential to implement community empowerment to provide stakeholders with information and inputs for making better regulations and policies (Nalikan, Rozikin, Sumartono, Suryadi, & Riyadi, 2023; Noordiatmoko & Riyadi, 2023b, 2023a; Sukma, Sumartono, Saleh, Amin, & Riyadi, 2023).

Examination of abuse of authority is an essential factor in determining corruption crimes and resulting in financial losses to the state. The corruption crimes referred to in this case is related to Public Officials or State Administrators, especially in terms of the use of state finances. The enactment of Law no. 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration has brought fundamental changes in the exercise of authority by government officials. Any policies implemented by public officials suspected of abusing their authority and causing harm to state finances do not necessarily have to be considered criminal acts of corruption and brought to court. Instead, these policies must first be scrutinized for signs of abuse of authority and financial loss to the state (Yasser, 2019).

Since ancient times, society has been aware of the issue of corruption. It is neither a new nor an old phenomenon in terms of social reality. History has demonstrated to us over a period of nearly seven centuries that humanity has effectively fought against this wickedness. At the beginning of the third millennium, we humans have yet been able to completely eradicate corruption in its truest form. Corruption is a persistent phenomenon that affects people’s daily lives and transcends all national and geographic boundaries. While government employees are a part of to society, corruption remains a looming aspect of their operations (Yusubboevich, 2022).

Previous studies on corruption and abuse of power in public administration still lack clarity. Therefore, it is possible to identify the problems related and provide the justification. The research question is: how is corruption and abuse of power in state administration in Indonesia? The researcher conducted a mixed method
approach to obtain a better finding.

LITERATURE REVIEW

A Sociology of Law

Abuse of power from a sociology of law impacts deviant acts beyond the depression of power and moral behavior of public officials. Many public officials engage in corrupt conduct and may be subject to punitive laws, yet the effects of these actions on the perpetrators’ corrupt behavior remain unclear. When public officials do not have a proper view of national and state life, they need to return to the basic order of national and state life, namely carrying out the principles of practicing and appreciating the truth (Riyadi, 2020). White collar crime involves people in high positions abusing the power they have. White collar crime does not refer to the social position of the perpetrator, but rather the context or method used in committing the crime. White collar crimes are illegal actions committed for personal gain using a position of power, influence, or trust in an economic or political order. White collar crime is characterized by deception, concealment, or breach of trust. The motivation behind these crimes is financial matters. The perpetrators seek to obtain money, property, services or to gain personal advantages. Indonesia is a country governed by the rule of law, ensuring the proper functioning of the judiciary and upholding law and justice based on the state constitution and applicable laws and regulations. Prosecution that is overly lenient can lead to the misuse of power and result in the commission of criminal acts. Discretion that is excessively free presents a risk of using power to engage in corruption, therefore limiting power within state institutions and protecting it through external institutions is essential to ensure performance accountability and establish checks and balances (Hermanto & Riyadi, 2020).

The corruption among politicians in parliament and state officials persists. Corruption is considered a serious issue. This crime can even be called organized crime in a corrupt government. This crime aims to advance the interests of individuals, groups, or political parties while maintaining power. The inability to sufficiently resolve cases involving state officials implicated in corruption, collusion, and nepotism with expeditious court decisions, as evidenced by numerous instances of delayed prosecutions and even dismissal of charges, suggests inadequate handling and resolution of corruption cases. Weak law enforcement against white collar criminals occurs due to serious conflicts of interest, so the resolution is political bargaining and abuse of power (Riyadi, Wibowo, & Susanti, 2020).

Corruption and abuse of power involve political elites and state officials in cases of mining contract extensions. The research findings reveal that corruption is in the political crime agreement scenario in the case of extending concentrate export permits and diversion of issues and political lobbying. Responses to social situations and relationships with criminals influence individual and group criminal behavior. Social behavior drives behavior in society so the State needs to create laws to protect it. Criminals commit criminal acts to save their interests. Corruption is synonymous with organized crime or crimes against democracy (Riyadi & Mustofa, 2020).

Corruption in State Administration

Corruption in the state administration can result in the destruction of the economic and social structure. This can hinder or limit the country's development path, reduce public services, and hinder the growth of trade and investment. Furthermore, corruption undermines the realization of democracy and erodes people’s trust towards government and the governance system. The result is waste valuable economic resources, a failure by governments to meet their targets, and a negative impact on GDP growth. In addition, corruption in state governance also has a negative impact on foreign investment. Foreign investors are wary of investing in countries with high levels of corruption, as this increases the risks associated with doing business. In addition, corruption in state administration has a negative impact on state finances (Tsitouras, Koulikoti, Makris, & Papapanagos, 2017).

Corruption in state administration is a very broad problem and has serious implications for the functioning of government and people's welfare. Widespread corruption is not only a sign of ethical failure but also of poor governance. When corruption creeps into public administration, it undermines the principles of accountability, transparency and fairness that are the cornerstones of effective governance. In addition, corruption in state administration hinders economic development, erodes public trust towards government institutions, and
creates uneven economic and social conditions. From a sociological point of view, corruption can be seen as a
symptom of a dysfunctional relationship between the state and its citizens. Bribery, misappropriation of funds,
and favoritism to family and friends are just some of the ways this dysfunction manifests itself. These practices
not only undermine the integrity of state administration but also perpetuate a culture of impunity, where those
in power can act with impunity without fear of the consequences. In addition, corruption in state administration
has a negative impact on investment and economic growth. This is because corruption creates uncertainty and
weakens the rule of law, making it less attractive for the business world to invest in a country. Corruption leads
to administrative inefficiencies, unequal enforcement of property rights, and a lack of justice. In addition to the
economic impact of corruption, administrative corruption also has a negative impact on the welfare of society
as a whole (Bezenjani, Tavakoli, & Nikpour, 2020).

Corruption in state administration has a broad negative impact on the economic and social order of a country. Corruption impedes economic growth by discouraging investment and distorting the allocation of resources. Furthermore, corruption undermines the principles of justice and equality. Corruption in state governance has a negative impact on investment and economic growth. Corruption creates administrative inefficiencies and unequal enforcement of property rights, thereby hindering the smooth functioning of the economy. This leads to a mis-allocation of resources and hinders domestic and foreign investment. In addition, corruption in state administration also has an impact on state finances. Corruption in state governance has a negative impact on investment and economic growth (Refakar & Cárdenas, 2023).

Corruption in state governance has a negative impact on political stability and social welfare. Political stability
is very important to attract investment and encourage economic growth. Distortions in the allocation of
resources and the misallocation of public funds caused by corruption can lead to economic downturns and
hinder the country's ability to provide essential public services such as health and education services. Moreover,
corruption creates an atmosphere of mistrust and erodes public trust in government. In addition to its economic
and social impacts, corruption also has an impact on the crime rates and on the informal economy. Research
has shown that high levels of corruption are associated with increased crime rates and underground economic
growth. In addition, corruption in the state administration also has a negative impact on the distribution of
wealth within a country. Research shows that corruption exacerbates income inequality because resources and
opportunities are disproportionately allocated to those who engage in corrupt practices. In addition, corruption
in state administration can distort markets and hinder fair competition. Corruption undermines the principles
of transparency and fairness, creating an environment in which bribery, favoritism, and nepotism thrive.
Corruption in public administration increases the cost of doing business, discouraging private investment.
Various sources consistently show that corruption in the state administration has a negative impact on the
economy, political stability, social welfare, and distribution of wealth. In conclusion, corruption in the state
administration has a broad and detrimental impact on various aspects of people's lives. Specifically, corruption
hinders the country's growth, development, and people's welfare (Haryadi, Rossieta, & Utama, 2017).

**Abuse of Power in State Administration**

Abuse of power in public administration is a common problem that has a significant impact on the functioning
of the government and the well-being of its citizens. Abuse of power in public administration refers to the abuse or
excessive exercise of authority by individuals or institutions that influence in government. This can take many forms,
including but not limited to corruption, nepotism, favoritism, and the suppression of dissent. Abuse of power in the
state administration is a global phenomenon that transcends national borders. Abuse of power in the state
administration occurs in many countries. One of the main causes of abuse of power in the state administration is the
absence of an independent legal system. Abuse of power by state-owned companies and fraudulent activities affecting
legal transparency are common. This is because the legal system is not independent and is heavily influenced by
administrative intervention. Abuse of power in public administration is a chronic problem worldwide (Bezenjani et
al., 2020).

Abuse of power by state-owned companies and the lack of transparency in laws undermine the principles of
fairness and justice. They perpetuate a system in which those in authority can act with impunity, often at the
expense of the general public. This abuse of power not only hampers the development and progress of a nation,
but also erodes public trust towards the government and its institutions. Abuse of power in the state administration has serious implications for the economic and social structure. This can lead to the breakdown of these structures, hindering a country's path of development and impeding or limiting trade and investment growth opportunities. In addition, abuse of power in the state administration can undermine democracy by impeding the realization of democratic principles and eroding public trust towards the government and the government system. The consequences of abuse of power in the state administration are not only limited to the political field. This also has a significant economic impact. The negative impacts of abuse of power in the state administration on the economy include wasting valuable economic resources and hindering the achievement of government goals, such as GDP growth and foreign investment. In addition, abuse of power in the state administration exacerbates income inequality and poverty. This is particularly true for the most vulnerable groups in society, those most affected by corruption and abuse of power. In addition, abuse of power in the state administration also perpetuates injustice in society. This creates a system where those in power can exploit their position for personal gain, while marginalized groups pay the price. The negative impact of abuse of power in the state administration on the most vulnerable groups in society, coupled with the loss of trust towards institutions, has fueled social instability (Minh, Yen, Thuy, Hung, & Vu, 2020).

Therefore, it is important for countries to address abuse of power in the state administration and work towards establishing an independent legal system. This includes implementing comprehensive measures to promote transparency, accountability, and integrity in the government. It is also important for politicians and officials to face up the reality of corruption and actively fight it. By doing this, they are not only able to mitigate the negative impact of abuse of power in the state administration but also improve social stability, economic growth, and the welfare of all citizens. Abuse of power in the state administration can have a severe and broad impact on a country. The chronic and widespread nature of administrative corruption emphasizes the need for urgent action to address the abuse of power in public administration. Abuse of power in the state administration is a complex problem that has various consequences. However, it is clear that the negative impact of abuse of power does not only affect politics but also economic (Jam et al., 2016). According to this source, abuse of power in the state administration can have a negative impact on the economy. This can lead to the breakdown of economic and social structures, hindering a country's development, and impeding trade and investment growth. Furthermore, abuse of power in the state administration can lead to reduced public services to the community. This reduction in public services not only impacts the well-being of society as a whole, but also hinders the government's ability to achieve its objectives. In addition to these economic impacts, abuse of power in the state administration also has major social and societal impacts. Abuse of power in public administration erodes trust and delegitimizes institutions, giving rise to widespread distrust of both the state and the private sector. This loss of trust exacerbates social instability, because it undermines public trust towards the government's ability to address social problems and meet the needs of its citizens. In addition, abuse of power in the state administration can perpetuate income inequality and poverty. This is particularly apparent in the fact that it is the poorest and most marginalized groups in society that are most affected by corruption. They are the group least able to access essential public services and resources, because corrupt officials often prioritize personal gain over the needs of the most vulnerable. Abuse of power in the state administration not only has a negative impact on the economy and society, but also damages the moral fabric of society (Bekesiene, Petrukasaitė, & Kazlauskaitė, 2021).

METHOD

This research used a mixed method approach. The qualitative descriptive approach was adopted to obtain themes and meanings from the research. The quantitative approach aimed to test research hypotheses. The qualitative approach was selected in accordance with the overall research objectives, which were to describe and understand the phenomena, events, social activities, attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions of people. Qualitative research is suitable for examining research problems in greater depth than theory or concept can capture. This approach generates descriptive data in the form of words or written records and observed behaviors of the study subjects and objects (Creswell, 2013).

Qualitative Approach

Data collection in this qualitative approach were observation and documentation. Related documentation was
obtained from many sources, such as internet media and library documents. There were three steps of data analysis, including data reduction, data display and data verification referring to the interactive model. Data reduction was to sort out the main data, data display was to present the data, and data verification was to conclude the main themes of the results (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Validity and reliability of the qualitative approach are achieved through the use of triangulation via observation and documentation analysis to obtain valid and reliable data coping credibility, transferability, auditability, and confirmability. Credibility is determined through triangulation of results to verify their accuracy. Transferability shows the applicability of research to other studies, thereby enabling readers to comprehensively understand the results of qualitative research. The report is made in a detailed, concise, and systematic manner. Auditability means that the research process can be thoroughly tested, as the fair design of case studies, identification of data sources, data collection, data analysis, conclusions drawn, and the exhibited processes and results can be traced. Conformability pertains to the objectivity research results being agreed upon and accepted (Creswell, 2009).

**Quantitative Approach**

The quantitative predictive tested a research model integrating 3 variables and predicted the relationship between variables. There were 3 latent variables studied, such as Corruption in State Administration (Corruption), Abuse of Power in State Administration (Abuse), and Poverty (Poverty). The hypothesized relationship between variables is as follows: Corruption in State Administration positively affects Poverty (H1) and Abuse of Power in State Administration positively affects Poverty (H2). The conceptual model can be drawn as figure 1.

![Figure 1. Conceptual Model](image_url)

All variables were measured through indicators. Corruption in state administration had 5 reflective indicators, Abuse of Power in State Administration had 4 reflective indicators, and Poverty had 4 reflective indicators. Based on the development of hypotheses and the measurement of all variables measured through indicators, a research model was created as illustrated in Figure 2 below.
Data were collected using a simple questionnaire developed based on established measures for all variables. A five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) was utilized, and then the questionnaire was submitted electronically to 500 academicians in Indonesia, who conduct a lecture in sociology of law. And 100 usable responses were obtained resulting in a response rate 20% as expected for this research.

Data were analyzed using the Partial Least Square (PLS) and smartPLS version 3.0. Descriptive Statistics was conducted to explain characteristics of respondents and variables. Inductive Statistics was performed by using Variance-Based Structural Equation Modelling. Path analysis employed Partial Least Square consisting of 3 relationships, such as: outer-model specifying the relationship between latent variable and its indicator (measurement model), inner-model specifying relationship between latent variables (structural model), and weight relation in assessing latent variables to be estimated (Ringle, Wende, & Will, 2015).

Validity refers to the extent to a measuring instrument can accurately and precisely measure a construct. Construct validity calculations are assessed by convergent validity and discriminant validity. Reliability refers to internal consistency of indicators of a construct, showing the degree to which, each indicator indicates a common latent factor. Reliability calculations are assessed by Cronbach’s Alpha and Composite Reliability (Ringle et al., 2015).

If all indicators have been declared valid and variables have been declared reliable and model has a Goodness of Fit that meets the predictive relevance, then hypotheses test can be carried out. For hypothesis testing with a probability or alpha value of 5% and the t-statistic value is 1.96, then the criteria for accepting the hypothesis are when the t-statistic is > 1.96 and the p-value is <0.05. To determine the role of mediator variables (i.e. intervening variables) through a mediation test, the direct effect is compared to the indirect effect. The effect with the greater role is then established.

RESULT

Qualitative Result

Based on the qualitative results of documentation from news sources, three cases can be identified.

First is the case of corruption and abuse of power of the minister of communications and information. When the Minister of Communication and Information was arrested, the Attorney General's Office revealed that the reason for naming the suspect because it was related to his authority as a budget user and his position as minister. On the previous occasion, the Financial and Development Supervisory Agency revealed that state losses related to this case were estimated at IDR 8.32 trillion. As a consequence of the suspect's actions, he was charged with violating Article 2 Paragraph (1) and Article 3 in conjunction with Article 18 of Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 20 of 2001 concerning Amendments to Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 31 of 1999 concerning Eradication of Corruption Crimes in conjunction with Article 55 Paragraph (1) to -1 Criminal Code (www.kompas.com).
Second is the case of corruption and abuse of power of the Minister of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries as a suspect in accepting gifts related to licensing at the Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries. After conducting a series of examinations as specified in the Criminal Procedure Code and providing a case title, the Corruption Eradication Commission determined that there was a suspected act of corruption consisting of the acceptance of gifts or promises by State Officials related to fish farming permits, fisheries business, and/or the management of other similar aquatic commodities in 2020. This case began when the Minister of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries issued a Decree regarding the Due Diligence Team for Lobster Cultivation Fishery Business Licensing. One of the tasks of the Team is to check the completeness of the administrative documents submitted by prospective fry exporters (www.bbc.com/indonesia).

Third is the case of corruption and abuse of power of the Minister of Trade. The corruption and abuse of power case involving the Minister of Trade in Indonesia seemed to revolve around accusation regarding export permits for cooking oil. The Director General of the Ministry of Trade was a suspect in this case. The involvement of the Minister of Trade was not specifically mentioned in the available search results. This case mainly focused on the Director General of the Ministry of Trade who was a suspect in a corruption case related to cooking oil permits. This case revolved around alleged corruption in the issuance of cooking oil export permits. This corruption scandal raised concerns and led to investigations by law enforcement agencies. The case remains under investigation by the relevant authorities, and further details may emerge as the legal process progresses (www.cnbcindonesia.com).

Based on related cases described above, the analysis was performed in 3 steps consisting of data reduction, data display, and data verification, to obtain theme.

The first theme was corruption is a social phenomenon that often becomes an endless poison for people in various parts of the world. With the evolution of technology and culture, corrupt methods and practices have also advanced. Today, corruption is not only perpetrated by central level officials, but also by almost everyone, be it central officials, regional officials, as well as businessmen and bureaucrats. Acts of corruption are not only carried out by individuals, but also carried out in groups. For example, Systemic corruption has been identified as a pervasive issue that has permeated throughout various aspects of society. Corruption has resulted in the distortion of individual behavior, as well as institutional bureaucracy and socio-economic interactions at all levels of society. Moreover, honesty has become a seemingly impractical and illogical action to take. Corruption, a deeply ingrained behavior, requires comprehensive study to prevent its proliferation.

The second theme was corruption as an activity of using authority for personal gain. Corruption is an illegal pursuit of profit, which includes receiving financial or material resources by involved party. Corruption is related to various actions of bureaucrats who have the ability to invest all forms of power originating from the power entrusted to them, with the aim to enrich themselves or some of the people involved. Furthermore, corruption is also defined as activities that deviate from official matters in the bureaucracy for material and status gains. Power has two conceptual meanings, the first is power to, which refers to what the recipient of the power can do with the power he has and the second is power over, which can mean that the recipient of the power has power over the person giving the power of attorney to make the recipient of the power do something.

Based on the cases above, researchers offer the following opinions regarding corruption and abuse of power as follows. Law Number 28 of 1999 concerning Clean State Administration and Free of Corruption, Collusion and Nepotism, amended by Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Clean State Administration and Free of Corruption, Collusion and Nepotism, defines corruption, collusion, and nepotism. Article 1 (3) Law no. 28 of 1999 defines corruption as an unlawful agreement or collaboration among State Administrators or between State Administrators and other parties that harms other people, society and/or the state. The definition of corruption is broader and includes aspects of corrupt human behavior. The definition of corruption places more emphasis on disgraceful acts. The act of doing something with the intention of obtaining benefits that are not in accordance with the official duties and rights of other people; using of an official's office to obtain benefits either personally or for another person, contrary to the rights of another person. Some of the definitions above show that white collar crimes are crimes committed by individuals who hold high social status or position, often related to their job. The perpetrator usually does not employ threats or violence to achieve
personal gain through the abuse of power, position, influence, and trust given. White collar crime can occur both within a country.

**Quantitative Result**

Based on the quantitative results obtained from survey data analysis, the hypotheses were tested using the smartPLS application and described as follows.

**Respondent Profile**

The population in this research was academicians in Indonesia that conduct a lecture related to A Sociology of law. Samples consisted of 100 academicians who were purposefully selected to give lectures on A Sociology of laws. Table 1 shows Respondents Profile in this research. The data indicates that 60% of the participants were men and the remaining 40% were women. Moreover, 50% of the respondents were aged between 31-40 and the remaining 50% were 41-50 years. Additionally, 50% of the respondents have been working as academicians for 5 years, and the other 50% have been working for years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academicians</td>
<td>Men = 60%</td>
<td>Women = 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>31-40 = 50%</td>
<td>41-50 = 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Work</td>
<td>5 Years = 50%</td>
<td>10 Years = 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outer Model Evaluation**

Based on Figure 3, the Convergent Validity can be assessed by examining the outer loading of all indicators that were deemed valid with a coefficient greater than 0.70, as well as the Average Variance Extracted (AVE), which should be at least 0.5. (Ringle et al., 2015).

![Figure 3. PLS Algorithm](image-url)
Based on Figure 3, the R-squared value for Poverty was 0.454, indicating that 45.4% of the variance could be explained by the related dependent variables under study, namely corruption and abuse of power, while the remaining 54.6% was accounted by other variables outside the research model.

Based on Table 2, it is possible to evaluate the reliability of all variables that were deemed reliable, using Cronbach’s Alpha and Composite Reliability. Each variable with a Cronbach’s Alpha > 0.70 and Composite Reliability > 0.80 can be considered reliable (Ringle et al., 2015).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>Average Variance Extracted (AVE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abuse of Power</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>0.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>0.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td>0.718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inner Model Evaluation**

Q-square is performed to generate a predictive relevance (Goodness of Fit) by using a Stone-Geisser test to find out relative influence of structural model on observation measurement for endogenous latent variables. Q-square = 1 – (1–R-square). Since the value of Q-square is positive and > 0.35, it indicates that the observed value has been well reconstructed and model has a strong predictive relevance (Ringle et al., 2015). Then it was followed by testing all hypotheses through PLS Bootstrapping from the smartPLS as shown in Figure 4 below:

**Figure 4. PLS Bootstrapping**

It can also be evaluated using a significance level of 5%, with an acceptance range for the Ho of +/− 1.96. If the value of the T statistic exceeds +/− 1.96, then the Ho is rejected, or the alternative hypothesis is accepted, as shown in Table 3. Based on the calculations, it is supported that corruption positively affects poverty (H1), and abuse of power positively affects poverty (H2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Correlation (r)</th>
<th>T Statistics</th>
<th>P Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corruption -&gt; Poverty</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>5.948</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse of Power -&gt; Poverty</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>4.377</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION

Regarding the legal consequences of public officials abusing their power to the detriment of state finances, this is known as using authority to manipulate people's action. Authority must have legitimacy and conformity with the law, containing interpretations of authority standards, namely general standards and specific standards. Abuse of power, which is a corrupt behavior, may develop when the perpetrator holds significant authority. Article 3 of Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning Eradication of Corruption as amended by Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Eradication of Corruption in conjunction with Article 5 and Article 6 of Law Number 46 of 2009 concerning Criminal Justice. Corruption is one of the elements due to abuse of power. In constitutional law, the Corruption Eradication Commission is a constitutional state institution tasked with handling and eradicating corruption problems. The criminal act of abuse of authority in corruption is regulated in Article 3 of Law Number 31 of 1999 in conjunction with Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning the Eradication of Corruption Crimes. The criminal act of corruption is defined as a state administrator or public official who meets specific criteria. This includes being appointed by an authorized official, holding concurrent positions, and performing state duties. It is important to note that the term "abuse of power and authority" applies specifically to public officials, not individuals in private positions, even if they hold influential roles.

The authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission to prosecute criminal acts of corruption is re-regulated in Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission. If we look at the formulation of the Criminal Procedure Code, the prosecutor who has the authority to carry out prosecutions is the one who serves as a public prosecutor and the Attorney General's Office and the Corruption Eradication Commission, who both act as prosecutors for criminal acts of corruption. Overlapping authority in terms of who has the authority to prosecute criminal acts of corruption emerged after the publication of Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Corruption Crimes. Article 26 of this law states that investigations, prosecutions, and trials in court regarding criminal acts of corruption are carried out based on the applicable criminal procedural law, unless otherwise provided in this law. This is also consistent with the formulation of Article 39 of Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission. The article states that the investigation and prosecution of criminal acts of corruption are carried out based on the applicable criminal procedural law and based on the Law Number 31 of 1999 which has been amended into Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning the Eradication of Corruption Crimes.

Constitutional law regarding the testing for abuse of power or the assessment of elements of abuse of power can state that the actions of public officials do not contain elements of abuse of power and authority if a criminal act is committed at the time or while using their authority. This holds them accountable for both job responsibilities and accountability. In this case, it is necessary to first establish whether a criminal act was committed through the abuse of power and authority. Objective proof of this wrongdoing must be demonstrated. Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration and Supreme Court Regulation Number 4 of 2015 concerning Guidelines for Conducting Assessments of Elements of Abuse of Power and Authority. Examining abuse of power through the State Administrative Court is crucial in determining the absence of any abuse of power. This examination can be a defense for state administrative officials who are suspected of committing criminal acts of corruption in carrying out their authority. Despite the occurrence of real state losses, matters of a technical nature or inadequate studies in that field could be the real cause.

Based on the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, known as the Constitutional Law, there are judicial, legislative and executive levels of government, each of which has its own powers. With regard to the independent functioning of the judiciary in administering justice and other duties as well as in order to protect law and justice based on the state constitution and applicable regulations, Indonesia guarantees the supremacy of law. According to Article 24 of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, the institution carries out the duties of judicial power as regulated by law. The Attorney General's Office has the authority to adjudicate and has quite large powers. Prosecutors actually have the ability to resolve legal disputes, both those involving state administration and civil matters, in addition to their role as public prosecutors in the judicial process. Public prosecutors and special prosecutors wield significant power on behalf of the state, as the Prosecutor's Office, a government institution uses its authority to prosecute cases on behalf of the state, which
Microenterprises’ Ability to Repay Debt. Do Saving Literacy

holds complete discretion in trying criminal cases involving offenses.

The management of state finances as an instrument for realizing people's welfare by means of attribution given by public officials, in this case is based on Article 6 paragraph (1) of Law Number 17 of 2013 concerning State Finances. State financial governance carried out by the government in the execution of it functions, including regulation, service provision, development, empowerment and protection functions must adhere to the principle of legality, general principles of good government and good governance. These principles are codified in various regulations, such as. Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration.

According to Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration, it is stated that the Government Administration Law guarantees basic rights and provides protection to citizens and guarantees the implementation of state duties. Based on this provision, citizens are not objects, but subjects who are actively involved in administering government. Government Administration Regulations in Law Number 30 of 2014 guarantee that decisions and/or actions of government agencies and/or officials towards citizens cannot be carried out arbitrarily. With Law Number 30 of 2014, citizens will not easily become objects of state power. Apart from that, this Law is a transformation of the General Principles of Good Governance, which have been practiced for decades in government administration, and has been concreted into binding legal norms. The government administration must adhere to the principle of legality, the principle of protecting human rights, and the General Principles of Good Government, specifically the principle of avoiding the abuse power as outlined in Law Number 30 of 2014, specifically in Article 10 paragraph (1) letter e and its explanation. These principles mandate that government officials refrain from using their authority for personal or other interests that do not align with the purpose of granting that authority. They should not exceed or abuse their authority, nor should they mix personal interests with official responsibilities.

Abuse of power by public officials in making public policies is viewed as a procedural and administrative error. However, if done with the intention of benefiting themselves or others which results in financial losses to the state, it constitutes a social deviant behavior and white-collar criminal behavior, as regulated in Law Number 31 of 1999 as amended by Law Number 20 of 2001. The administration of public officials should be based on the principle of legality, the principle of protecting human rights, and the General Principles of Good Government, specifically the principle of avoiding the abuse power as outlined regulated in Article 10 paragraph (1) letter e of Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning State Administration. This principle mandates that no government agency or official may utilize their authority for personal or other interests that are not aligned with the intended purpose of that authority. They must not surpass, exploit, or conflate their authority. It is also supported by the provisions of Article 17, that government agencies and/or officials are prohibited from abusing their authority. These prohibitions include a prohibition on exceeding authority, mixing authority, and/or a acting arbitrarily. Abuse of power and authority by government officials is not subject to criminal proceedings under Law Number 30 of 2014. Without criminal elements, abuse of authority falls under administrative resolution by the official’s superior. Officials found guilty of abuse of authority may face revocation of authority, reprimand, or dismissal as sanctions. Regarding the legal ramifications of public officials abusing their power in a way that harms state finances, this is referred to as authority.

Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration, specifically Articles 17 to Article 21 regulate the prohibition of abuse of power and authority by Government Agencies and/or Officials as well as granting authority to the Government Internal Supervisory Apparatus and the State Administrative Court to carry out supervision and examination regarding whether there are elements of abuse of power and authority carried out by Government Officials. Meanwhile, there were provisions in Article 3 of Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Corruption Crimes as amended by Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning the Eradication of Corruption in conjunction with Article 5 and Article 6 of Law Number 46 of 2009 concerning Corruption Courts. One element of this regulation concerns Corruption due to abuse of power, and the Corruption Court holds absolute authority to examine the matter.

Abuse of power can have an impact on corruption, collusion and nepotism. Currently, there is a positive legal dispute regarding Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration, specifically Article 17 to Article 21, which prohibits power holders from abusing their authority. Government agencies and officials, as
well as the Government Internal Audit Apparatus and the State Administrative Court, are authorized to conduct supervision and testing to determine if government officials have engaged in abuse of authority. With Article 3 of Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning Eradication of Corruption as amended by Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Eradication of Corruption Crimes in conjunction with Article 5 and Article 6 of Law Number 46 of 2009 concerning Corruption Courts, the Corruption Court has been granted exclusive jurisdiction to investigate cases involving corruption arising from the abuse of power. The dispute between the Corruption Court and the State Administrative Court regarding the abuse of authority by public officials in Corruption Crimes arises from differences in regulations regarding power and authority in Indonesian law.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis and discussion of the research result above, it can be concluded that Corruption and Abuse of Power positively affect Poverty. The results are expected to solve the problems of corruption and abuse of power through significant adjustments that align with sociology of law reality and policy.
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