

Effectiveness of Law Enforcement Against Criminal Acts of Corruption in Public Services Based on Law Number 25 of 2009 Concerning Public Services

Sulaiman Amiruddin¹, Riswadi²

Universitas Borobudur, Indonesia

Email: suleamir95@gmail.com, riswadi@borobudur.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
Keywords: Corruption, Public Service, Criminal Acts, Law Enforcement, Good Governance	<i>This research examines the effectiveness of law enforcement against corruption in public services under Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services in Indonesia. Corruption in public services, such as bribery, extortion, and abuse of authority, undermines good governance and public trust. The study aims to analyze the role of the Public Service Law as a legal framework for combating corruption and evaluate the challenges in law enforcement. Using a normative juridical method, the research analyzes legal norms, regulations, and literature, including the Public Service Law and the Criminal Code. Findings reveal that while the Public Service Law provides a robust administrative and ethical foundation for public services, violations often escalate into criminal corruption. Key challenges include weak internal supervision, low public reporting due to fear, and complex bureaucratic procedures. The study highlights the need for stronger coordination between institutions like the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), the Ombudsman, and law enforcement agencies. Implications suggest systemic reforms, such as digitalizing public services to reduce corruption opportunities, enhancing whistleblower protections, and improving law enforcement capacity. These measures are crucial for fostering transparency, accountability, and public trust in government services.</i>

This work is licensed under CC BY-SA 4.0 

INTRODUCTION

Public service is defined as a series of activities to meet the service needs of every citizen for goods and services or administrative services provided by public service providers based on laws and regulations (Suryantoro & Kusdyana, 2020). In a democratic system within a *state of law*, public service is not only an obligation of the state but also a basic right of every citizen (Widanti, 2022). Therefore, improving the quality of public services is an important indicator to evaluate how much the state works for the welfare of its people.

The quality of public services is reflected in how the government system is managed, also known as *good governance* (Sumantri, 2022). A professional and accountable bureaucratic system is characterized by the government's ability to create public services that are efficient, fast, transparent, and free from all violations of the law (Widanti, *The concept of good governance in the perspective of public services: A literature review*, 2022). On the other hand, poor public service reflects weak government management and opens up loopholes for abuse of authority,

including criminal acts of corruption that can cause losses to the wider community. Thus, efforts to improve the public service system are essential to bureaucratic reform.

The urgency of professionalism and integrity in the implementation of public services is necessary. Service providers are required to possess administrative competence and uphold service ethics, moral responsibility, and compliance with the law (Resmadiktia, 2023). Professionalism and integrity are the main safeguards to prevent abuse of authority and to maintain public trust in the government (Sutanto, 2024). Law enforcement is a crucial step, especially in dealing with corrupt practices of authority to realize clean, transparent, and accountable public services. The increasingly uncontrolled corruption in the public service sector is a serious problem that hinders the achievement of *good governance* (Pratama, 2024). The Corruption Eradication Commission (hereinafter *KPK*) reports that there are many cases of corruption in public services, especially in licensing, population administration, education, and the health sector. The most common forms of corruption include bribery in the licensing process, extortion by certain officials, and the manipulation of documents or administrative data for personal or partisan interests (Surbakti, 2024). Corruption not only reduces the quality of public services but also undermines public trust in the government and weakens the effectiveness of the bureaucracy as a whole (Ramadana, 2025). The perception of being "charged more" than the regulated fees makes citizens reluctant to use official services, thereby eroding the legitimacy of the state in providing fair and equal services to all its citizens.

Public service is the spearhead of government bureaucracy that operates at the forefront and is in direct contact with the community. There are various forms of public services such as population administration, business licensing, healthcare, education, and others. Through these services, the public can directly assess the performance and integrity of state administrators (Akil, 2024). Therefore, clean public services are a benchmark for how well the government carries out its functions fairly, effectively, and in the public interest (Maranjaya, 2022). With increasing public legal awareness and rights, it is expected that services can be delivered quickly, transparently, free from extortion, and in a non-discriminatory manner.

Public services that are free from criminal violations such as corruption not only enhance public trust in the government but also serve as a fundamental pillar in realizing the principle of *good governance* (Firmansyah, 2021). A clean and accountable government is reflected in an efficient service system that prioritizes public satisfaction over the interests of individuals or groups (Ristiani, 2020). Firmness and consistency are key to preventing and taking action against all forms of misconduct, including criminal acts of corruption. Strong law enforcement against every form of violation in public services, including corruption, will strengthen the legitimacy of the government and ensure social justice in access to basic services, which should be the right of every citizen (Resmadiktia, 2023).

Challenges in law enforcement against corruption in the public service sector can hinder effectiveness (Hariwangsa, 2024). The main challenge lies in the weak internal supervisory systems of the bureaucracy, which are often not independent and susceptible to conflicts of interest (Aiman, 2024). Community participation in reporting corruption is suboptimal due to low legal

literacy, fear of retaliation, and distrust in whistleblower protection mechanisms. The prosecution process is often hampered by complex bureaucratic structures, long and overlapping procedures, and loopholes that enable perpetrators to evade justice. As a result, many corruption cases in the public service sector remain unexposed or inadequately addressed, reducing the deterrent effect and perpetuating a culture of impunity.

Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services (hereinafter referred to as the *Public Service Law*) is a fundamental regulation that outlines the principles, systems, and mechanisms of public service delivery in Indonesia (Syahrudin, 2020). The *Public Service Law* serves as the legal basis that guarantees certainty in the relationship between the public as recipients of services and the government as providers (Dirkareshza, 2021). Article 2 of the *Public Service Law* emphasizes legal certainty in public service interactions, ultimately expected to strengthen state apparatus accountability. Article 3 explicitly states that the objective of establishing the *Public Service Law* is to ensure public service fulfillment in accordance with *good governance* principles and compliance with prevailing laws and regulations.

The norms set out in the *Public Service Law* serve as a foundation for the conduct of officials or institutions in delivering services to the public (Asyikin, 2020). When violations occur, such as corruption, bribery, or other infractions, service providers may be subjected to administrative sanctions or criminal penalties (Susanto, 2024). Hence, the norms in the *Public Service Law* are not only preventive but also repressive, as violations of service standards may be construed as abuses of authority.

The relationship between the *Public Service Law* and efforts to prevent and prosecute corruption in public services is significant (Situmeang, 2023). This law functions as a normative framework for building a transparent, participatory, and accountable public service system. If corruption is indicated in public services, this law strengthens the authority of law enforcement officials to take action by referring to the obligations violated by the service providers. The *Public Service Law* is intrinsically linked to the criminal justice system in protecting citizens' rights and preventing abuse of power that leads to corruption (Tairas, 2023).

This study focuses on the effectiveness of law enforcement against corruption in public services and analyzes the extent to which the *Public Service Law* can be used as a legal reference in prosecuting violations in this sector. The issue arises from the persistent practice of corruption in various forms of public services, ranging from bribery and extortion to abuse of authority, which degrades service quality and erodes public trust. Therefore, it is crucial to assess the performance of law enforcement in tackling this issue, with the *Public Service Law* serving as legal legitimacy for enforcing and preventing corruption in public services.

METHOD

The method used in this study is *normative juridical*, which is conducted by tracing and analyzing relevant laws, regulations, and legal literature. The approach employed in this study is the *statute approach* and *conceptual approach*, which examine in depth the legal norms contained in Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services and the concepts of law enforcement

against corruption in the public service sector. Data collection techniques are carried out through literature studies involving primary and secondary legal materials, such as laws, court decisions, scientific journals, and other legal documents. All of the data are then analyzed using *qualitative descriptive* methods to illustrate the extent of the effectiveness of law enforcement and the role of regulations as a legal foundation for taking action against corrupt practices in public services.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. Position of Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services as a Basis for Legal Action against Violations in the Public Service Sector

The Public Service Law as a legal instrument that plays an important role in the Indonesian national legal regulation system. This law was formed from the constitutional mandate of Article 28D paragraph (1) and Article 34 of the 1945 Constitution which emphasizes the state's obligation to guarantee legal certainty and fulfill the basic rights of citizens to good public services. Based on the hierarchy, the Public Service Law has binding legal force and is the legal basis for the government as the organizer of public services both at the central and regional levels in order to build a service system that meets standards, is accountable, and transparent.

Substantively, the Public Service Law is a *lex generalis* in the field of public services that regulates the basic principles, rights and obligations of users and service providers, governance, and public service monitoring mechanisms. The scope of this regulation includes all types of public services organized by government agencies, state/regional-owned enterprises, and private institutions mandated to organize services. With this function, the Public Service Law not only forms a normative framework, but also becomes an instrument of renewal in a bureaucratic culture that is responsive to the community demands.

The principles of public services regulated in Article 4 of the Public Service Law demonstrate the spirit of good governance that emphasizes transparency, accountability, efficiency, and justice. Principles such as openness, accountability, legal certainty, equal rights, and speed and ease of service are the minimum benchmarks that must be followed by service providers. With these principles as a reference, the public services implementation is expected to run according to the principles of good governance, while minimizing the possibility of abuse of authority and corrupt actions in service practices.

The normative content in the Public Service Law is very relevant as an administrative and ethical basis when acting against actions suspected of violations in the public service sector. Articles 2 and 3, which are fundamental provisions, guarantee legal certainty in the relationship between the community and service providers. It is emphasized that the purpose of public services is not only to provide services technically but also to ensure the realization of clear legal relations regarding the rights, obligations, and authorities of all parties, as well as building a service system that is by the principles of good governance.

Articles 17 to 22 strictly regulate the rights and obligations of the organizers and the community. The prohibitions on the implementation of Article 17 are important because they can be the basis for evaluating the actions of service implementers who abuse their authority, such as

making cooperation without permission, leaving their duties, or violating the principles of public service. Articles 18 and 19 of the Public Services Law guarantee the public's right to monitor, complain about, and even request improvements to services that do not meet standards, which reflects a participatory model in public control of government services.

Public Service Law Articles 34 to 38 explain the complaint mechanism and administrative sanctions for violations in the provision of services. Articles 54 to 57 specifically discuss that the public is given a medium to submit complaints to their direct superiors, organizers, and the Ombudsman. The role of the Ombudsman is very important as an external supervisory institution that has the authority to receive, follow up on, and recommend resolution of service deviations.

The Public Service Law is closely related to special criminal law, especially in enforcing corruption. Although the Public Service Law focuses more on administrative and ethical regulations in providing public services, violations of the principles contained in this law are often early indicators or initial facts that lead to corruption. For example, if there is a deviation from the established service standards or the practice of extortion, then this is not only an administrative violation, but can also be included in the criminal realm if there is an element of bribery or gratification.

Provisions in the Public Service Law such as Article 17 which prohibits service implementers from creating cooperation without permission or abusing authority, as well as Articles 18 and 35 concerning supervision and public complaints, can be the initial basis for further investigation by law enforcement officers. When indications of abuse of office or the provision of rewards related to the management of public services are found, the provisions in Article 605 and Article 606 of Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code (hereinafter referred to as the Criminal Code) can be enforced because they regulate bribery, making promises, or gratification to public officials.

Coordination between law enforcement agencies such as the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), the Police, and the Prosecutor's Office, with public services supervisory agencies such as the Inspectorate, Ombudsman, and internal supervisors of agencies, is very important. The Ombudsman, which has the authority to follow up on public reports of maladministration, can be a gateway for law enforcement officers to uncover alleged corrupt practices. The findings of the Ombudsman or Inspectorate can be used as preliminary evidence in a more in-depth investigation process.

2. Effectiveness of Law Enforcement Against Corruption in Public Services

Public services are a form of real state obligation in fulfilling the basic rights of citizens. Public services that are free from corruption are an absolute requirement for the realization of social justice and increasing public trust in the state. Corruption in public services not only hinders public access to basic services such as education, health, population administration, and business licensing but also damages the principles of good governance. Law enforcement efforts against corrupt practices are very much needed in the sector as a form of protection for public rights.

Corruption practices in the public service sector are still rampant based on reports from the Corruption Eradication Committee (KPK) and the Indonesian Ombudsman regarding extortion,

gratuities, and bribery in public services still dominate complaints every year. For example, in the processing of population documents, business licensing, to the distribution of social assistance, procedural deviations and requests for fees outside the provisions are often found. It is feared that this condition will create inequality of access, and discrimination in services, and distance the public from the right to fair and transparent public services.

Law enforcement plays an important role as a tool to correct and control abuse of power by public service providers. By implementing it in law enforcement agencies such as the Corruption Eradication Committee (KPK), the Police, and the Prosecutor's Office, it can ensnare perpetrators of corruption that harm the public interest. Not only does it provide a deterrent effect for perpetrators, but law enforcement also becomes an instrument of prevention through increasing accountability and integrity in the bureaucratic environment. Thus, effective law enforcement will strengthen public trust and accelerate the creation of public services with integrity.

The legal basis for enforcing the law against corruption in the public service sector is based on several laws and regulations that are in synergy with each other. The Public Service Law is a normative foundation that establishes principles, standards, and ethical obligations for public service providers. This law emphasizes the importance of transparency, accountability, and professionalism in providing services to the public. When these principles are violated, for example through extortion, gratification, or bribery, this administrative violation can be an entry point for criminal investigations into corruption, because it indicates abuse of authority. Positive criminal law regulations in the new Criminal Code provide relevant rules related to the crime of bribery and abuse of office. Article 605 of the Criminal Code regulates sanctions for parties who give or promise something to state administrators so that they act defiantly from their obligations, as well as for civil servants who receive such gifts or promises. The criminal threat consists of imprisonment of between 1 and 6 years and a fine ranging from category III of IDR 50,000,000 to category V of IDR 500,000,000. Likewise, Article 606 of the Criminal Code expands the scope of criminal law by ensnaring the giving of gifts or promises based on the perception of power or position, with a criminal penalty of up to 4 years. This provision strengthens the prosecution of corrupt practices that are intertwined in relations between positions and services.

Other implementing regulations such as the Presidential Regulation (Perpres), the Regulation of the Minister of PAN-RB, and the SOP for public services also help form a more technical normative framework to ensure the quality and integrity of services. Violations of these operational standards can be used as initial evidence to trace the possibility of broader corruption. Procedural inconsistencies are not only a matter of maladministration but are an indication of a crime that must be followed up legally. The synergy between administrative regulations and criminal provisions is an important instrument for creating clean and accountable public services.

Corruption in the public service sector is often carried out through various modes that harm the community, and the state, and damage the clean governance system. Bribery and gratification modes are the most common forms, especially in the licensing process or administrative services such as processing ID cards, business permits, and land certificates. The perpetrators who are civil servants or state administrators receive compensation from service applicants in return for

speeding up, simplifying, or ignoring procedural requirements. This action not only violates service ethics but also falls into the criminal category as regulated in the new Criminal Code.

Extortion is also a very disturbing corruption practice. Extortion is usually carried out by service implementers in the field such as administrative service officers, schools, hospitals, and police services. The public often feels forced to pay additional money outside the official provisions to be served faster or to avoid deliberate difficulties. This practice violates the principles of transparency and justice in public services and shows weak internal supervision of service implementers.

Another mode is procedural deviations by manipulating data which is carried out by changing or removing important information in the service system. This can occur in the form of changes to social assistance recipient data, falsification of licensing documents, or removal of important files that hinder the service process. Procurement of goods/services or distribution of social assistance also often occurs when service providers work together with officials to win tenders illegally or arrange the distribution of social assistance in a discriminatory manner for personal or political interests.

Deliberate service delays as a form of extortion are becoming a form of covert corruption that is increasingly rampant. Service officers deliberately slow down the service process, creating bureaucratic obstacles so that the public feels frustrated and ultimately chooses to give bribes. This practice is a form of extortion that is very detrimental to citizens and damages public trust in state institutions. Therefore, identification and action against these various modes must be the main focus of the strategy to eradicate corruption in the public service sector.

The effectiveness of law enforcement against corruption in public services depends on the synergy between law enforcement agencies such as the Corruption Eradication Committee (KPK), the Police, and the Prosecutor's Office. The KPK is still the most active institution in handling corruption in the public service sector, especially in cases of bribery for permits, extortion, and gratification of regional officials. The Police and the Prosecutor's Office, despite having broad authority, often face challenges in investigating corruption cases involving internal bureaucracy or local elites. Internal supervision through the Inspectorate tends to be administrative in nature and is not yet effective enough as an early detection tool, while the Ombudsman and the role of the community as external supervisors are still constrained by low public participation and lack of access to information.

The main obstacle in law enforcement against public service corruption is the lack of reporting from the public due to a culture of fear of the authorities, as well as the perception that reporting will not produce results. Weak multi-layered supervision and less than-optimal bureaucratic reform have created gaps in the service system that are easily exploited for corrupt practices. Public complaints about extortion and non-transparent services are still high, but not all cases are followed up criminally. The trend in enforcement also shows that corruption in the public service sector is more often found at the regional level, reflecting weak control over service implementers in the field. Increasing the effectiveness of law enforcement requires a more

integrated approach to strengthening the reporting system, protection of whistleblowers, and structural reforms in public service management.

The synergy between institutions in law enforcement against criminal acts of corruption in the public service sector is highly dependent on the effectiveness of the coordination mechanism between the KPK, the Prosecutor's Office, the Police, and internal supervisors of government agencies such as the Inspectorate General. All three need to share information and resources in handling allegations of corruption quickly and measurably. The Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia as an independent institution that handles maladministration, has an important role in following up on public reports. The Ombudsman's findings, especially related to extortion practices, service discrimination, or procedural deviations, can be early indicators that encourage criminal investigations by law enforcement officers. Collaboration with other anti-corruption institutions such as the Ministry of PAN-RB, the role of civil society, and the media are key to encouraging transparency, increasing participatory supervision, and strengthening public pressure on fair and firm law enforcement.

Strengthening law enforcement against corruption in public services needs to start with systemic reform through optimizing public reporting mechanisms, such as a reliable, easily accessible whistleblowing system that guarantees protection of the reporter's identity. Many corruption cases are not revealed because the public is afraid to report due to intimidation or distrust of the reporting mechanism. Regulations that support the security and courage of reporters are important. Public services digitalization is an effective strategy to reduce direct interaction between officers and the public so that opportunities for bribery, gratification, and extortion can be significantly reduced.

Increasing the capacity of law enforcement officers and internal supervisors through technical training, ethics, and using modern technology must also be prioritized. The consistent implementation of a reward and punishment system for state civil servants will create a culture of integrity and accountability in the bureaucracy. The synergy between repressive law enforcement by law enforcement officers and administrative prevention efforts by supervisory agencies and leaders of public service agencies is crucial to creating a deterrent effect while closing gaps for corruption to occur early on. This approach will make law enforcement not only a response to crime but also a comprehensive and sustainable prevention system.

CONCLUSION

The *Public Service Law* is a legal instrument based on the constitutional mandate of Article 28D paragraph (1) and Article 34 of the 1945 Constitution, which emphasizes the state's obligation to guarantee legal certainty and the fulfillment of citizens' basic rights to quality public services. As a *lex generalis* in the service sector, this law regulates the fundamental principles, rights and obligations of users and service providers, governance, and oversight mechanisms that reflect the spirit of *good governance*. With principles such as openness, accountability, and legal certainty, this law functions not only as a normative framework but also as a tool for responsive and anti-corruption bureaucratic reform.

The provisions in Articles 17–22 and Articles 34–38 strengthen complaint and oversight mechanisms, including the important role of the *Ombudsman* in monitoring maladministration practices. Although administrative in nature, violations of this law often become the entry point for uncovering criminal acts of corruption as regulated in the new *Criminal Code*. Therefore, coordination between the *Ombudsman*, *Inspectorate*, and law enforcement officers is crucial in enforcing the law and combating corruption in the public service sector.

Strengthening law enforcement against corruption in public services must be carried out comprehensively by prioritizing systemic reform, starting with the optimization of public reporting mechanisms through a *whistleblowing system* that is safe, easily accessible, and guarantees protection for whistleblowers.

The digitalization of public services is a crucial strategy to minimize direct interaction between officials and the public, thereby reducing opportunities for corrupt practices. Enhancing the capacity of law enforcement officers and internal supervisors through training and the use of modern technology is essential. This must be supported by consistent implementation of *rewards and punishments* to foster a culture of bureaucratic integrity.

The synergy between repressive law enforcement and administrative preventive measures is a key foundation for creating a clean, transparent, and accountable public service system, thereby strengthening public trust in the state in a sustainable manner.

REFERENCE

- Aiman, R. (2024). *Hukum dan korupsi: Tantangan dan solusi dalam pemberantasan korupsi di Indonesia*. *Peradaban Journal of Law and Society*, 16–30.
- Akil, A. (2024). Transformasi layanan publik melalui standar pelayanan di Kantor Kelurahan Pa’baeng-Baeng. *ADMIT: Jurnal Administrasi Terapan*, 332–344.
- Asyikin, N. (2020). Pengawasan publik terhadap pejabat publik yang melakukan tindakan korupsi: Perspektif hukum administrasi. *Jurnal Wawasan Yuridika*, 80–102.
- Dirkareshza, R. (2021). Penafsiran hukum (legal interpretations) terhadap Undang-Undang Nomor 25 Tahun 2009 tentang pelayanan publik demi masyarakat yang sejahtera, adil, dan makmur (welfare state)(standpoint usul perubahan terhadap UU pelayanan publik). *Legal Interpretations Ag. Reformasi Hukum*, 127–146.
- Firmansyah, V. Z. (2021). Penguatan hukum administrasi negara pencegah praktik korupsi dalam diri pemerintahan Indonesia. *Integritas: Jurnal Antikorupsi*, 325–344.
- Hariwangsa, T. (2024). Upaya penguatan regulasi untuk mencegah tindak pidana korupsi. *Disiplin: Majalah Civitas Akademika Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Hukum Sumpah Pemuda*, 121–130.
- Maranjaya, A. K. (2022). Good governance sebagai tolak ukur untuk mengukur kinerja pemerintahan. *Journal of Social & Technology/Jurnal Sosial dan Teknologi (SOSTECH)*.
- Pratama, W. A. (2024). Penegakan hukum terhadap korupsi di era modernisasi digital. *SEIKAT: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial, Politik dan Hukum*, 91–104.
- Ramadana, Z. (2025). Sulitnya pembuktian kerugian perekonomian negara pada perkara korupsi. *Jurnal Dinamika Hukum dan Kebijakan Publik*.

- Resmadiktia, N. M. (2023). Pertanggungjawaban pemerintah dalam mewujudkan good governance sesuai hukum administrasi negara. *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan*, 685–697. **(Catatan: Duplikasi. Hanya satu yang dicantumkan.)**
- Ristiani, I. Y. (2020). Manajemen pelayanan publik pada mall pelayanan publik di Kabupaten Sumedang Provinsi Jawa Barat. *Coopetition*, 325691.
- Situmeang, T. A. (2023). Kebijakan hukum pidana terhadap tindak pidana korupsi pada sektor pelayanan publik. *Perkara: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum dan Politik*, 264–269.
- Sumantri, I. (2022). Reorientasi reformasi birokrasi dan good governance dalam penyelenggaraan sektor publik di Indonesia. *PAPATUNG: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Publik, Pemerintahan dan Politik*, 63–72.
- Surbakti, D. S. (2024). Membangun sistem e-government sebagai terobosan melawan korupsi di Indonesia. *Ilmu Hukum Prima (IHP)*, 72–83.
- Suryantoro, B. (2020). Analisis kualitas pelayanan publik pada Politeknik Pelayaran Surabaya. *Jurnal Baruna Horizon*, 223–229.
- Susanto, E. A. (2024). Penegakan hukum terhadap pelaku tindak pidana korupsi dalam pengadaan barang pemerintah. *Jurnal Penelitian Ilmiah Multidisiplin*.
- Sutanto, A. L. (2024). Pertanggungjawaban pidana pelaku tindak pidana penyuapan terhadap anggota Kepolisian Republik Indonesia. *ARMADA: Jurnal Penelitian Multidisiplin*, 648–659.
- Syahrudin, N. I. (2020). Penerapan Kypso dalam pelayanan publik sebagai perwujudan new public service paradigm. *Jurnal Legislatif*, 322–346.
- Tairas, O. (2023). Pertanggungjawaban pidana terhadap pelaku pungutan liar di sektor pelayanan publik menurut Undang-Undang Nomor 20 Tahun 2001 tentang pemberantasan tindak pidana korupsi. *LEX PRIVATUM*.
- Widanti, N. P. (2022). Konsep good governance dalam perspektif pelayanan publik: Sebuah tinjauan literatur. *Jurnal Abdimas Peradaban: Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat*.