

Cognitive Dialectical Development of Anti-Bribery Attitude: A Model of Legal Culture in Lampung

Slamet Haryadi^a, Didiek R. Mawardi^b, Nurlaili Husna^c, ^aLaw and Social Science Faculty of Universitas Muhammadiyah Kotabumi, ^cLaw and Social Science Faculty of Lampung University, Email: slamet.haryadi@umko.ac.id, didiekm85@gmail.com, nurlailiharyadi@gmail.com

The Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia and the judicial body underneath is trying to change the image and perception of the people who already do not trust the court by building a zone of integrity (ZI), the court as a Corruption-Free Zone (WBK) and Clean and Serving Bureaucracy Zone (WBBM). The question is, how does the High Court, as an extension of the Supreme Court, develop a corruption-free attitude that supports the establishment of the court as a Clean and Serving Bureaucracy Zone. Substantial and structural reforms have been carried out by the Supreme Court and the judiciary under it, but the improvement and renewal of the culture of bureaucratic law centred on judges has lagged behind. Therefore, the Supreme Court has reaffirmed the importance of applying the principles of *clean government* and *good governance* which is believed to be the principle needed to provide excellent service to the community. Bribery as a legal matter is important to be reflected back. During this time the judge reflected on bribery as a matter of veiled habits. Placing the legal mindset on bribery allows judges to prevent and reduce or even stop bribery that has become an internal habit. If a judge does an act that is good and in accordance with his legal actions, is consistent, honest and trustworthy, sooner or later his actions will get a positive response from the community. Judges' cognition requires legal knowledge and integrity to be able to control their thinking, and more than that, so that the judge does not get lost in the way of thinking and get lost by the results of his thoughts. The judges' legal actions will appear as a valuable product of thought, if the results of the thought are in the form of legal decisions that result in decisions which reflect the legal considerations that are true and fair. The cognitive dialectical model of bribery prevention can be



interpreted as a legal cultural concept of a judge that places the mindset in the cognitive structure of the judge as a subject of change. Starting from the mental activity of the judge to direct, return and control the mind for all positive and open things to do and leave things that are negative and not commendable.

Key words: *Cognitive Dialectical Development, Anti-Bribery Attitude, Legal Culture*

INTRODUCTION

Background

The efforts to restore public trust to the judiciary from judicial corruption or judicial bribery continue to be carried out by the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia (MARI) and the judiciary underneath it by trying to change the image and perception of the people who have attached "sharp downward but blunt upward laws" that is, the law only targets the small people and does not touch elites, politicians, businessmen or officials. (Lubis, 2017, p. 81) The law is used by some judges as a tool to enrich or gather economic resources. So that at the same time, it is hard for little people. (Kick Andi, 2015, p.14)

The Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) survey on 2018 Integrity Assessment Survey (SPI), announced on October 1, 2019, the Supreme Court with the lowest integrity index (61.11), while the highest index was obtained by the Central Java Regional Government (78.26). (KPK, 2018) The survey results illustrate the Supreme Court and the judiciary below it was not independent by bribery. Bribery is one of the most damaging forms of judicial corruption; large cases can be purchased without requiring personal or professional relations between bribes and judges. (Pahis, 2019, p. 1905)

The efforts to prevent corruption in the courts of the Republic of Indonesia (MARI) has ordered all courts in the general, religious, military, and administrative courts of the State to establish a Zone of Integrity (ZI), (The Court Integrity Zone, 2019) at all levels of the court as Corruption-Free Zone (WBK) and Clean and Serving Bureaucracy Zone (WBBM). Several supporting legal policies have been implemented including Regulation of the Supreme Court (Perma) Judge Work Discipline Enforcement. 5 (five) working days or 37.5 hours of work time may not be used for other activities outside the service. (Republic of Indonesia Supreme Court Regulation, 2016) The Chair of the Court in accordance with his hierarchy is obliged to examine the implementation of duties so that they run in accordance with the established work discipline. (Republic of Indonesia Supreme Court Regulation, 2016)



In addition, the Supreme Court has also involved the community's role in supervising judges and court officials who make bribes through the Perma regarding the Whistle Blowing System. People who see and / or are aware of bribery in court can report to the Supervisory Board or to the High Court. (Republic of Indonesia Supreme Court Regulation, 2016)

Judges are important human resources in order to realise the main principles of the implementation of free and independent justice, especially in preventing bribery. The Code of Ethics and the Code of Conduct for Judges (KEPPH) are clearly stated:

“...the authority and duties possessed by judges must be carried out in order to uphold the law, truth and justice indiscriminately by not discriminating against people as stipulated in a judge's oath, in which everyone is equal before the law and the judge.” (Joint Decree, 2009)

Even though the Court has declared the implementation of the Construction of Zone of Integrity (ZI), the court as Corruption-Free Zone (WBK), and Clean and Serving Bureaucracy Zone (WBBM), the practice of bribery continues, because it is not easy to stop it. There is no internal mechanism that can detect bribes, so many cases of judicial corruption are left untouched. (Pahis, 2009, p.1904)

Since 2012 until now, 20 Judges have been found guilty of bribery. (Kompas, 2019) Some of the judges view bribery as a cognitive concept, (KPK) that is, bribery as an act which is usually done even though it is secret and veiled.

Problem

The Tanjungkarang High Court has declared a zone of integrity of a corruption free and a clean and serving bureaucracy. (Regulation, as in Minister of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform, 2019) The Integrity Pact has been signed, judges, leaders and all court officials state that corruption is destructive and must be overcome.

The question is, how to develop anti-bribery attitudes in the court in realising the legal culture of judges who support the development of the integrity zone of the corruption free zone and clean and serving bureaucracy in Tanjungkarang High Court Area?

Theoretical Assumptions

The practice of corruption (bribery) within the judiciary must be recognised as being part of the attitudes and views of some judges and even institutions. The practice of bribery has become a

sub-culture in the life environment of judges. The reasons underlying these assumptions are, (1) The practice of bribery results in regularity of behaviour. (2) The existence of culture and sub-culture which is active within the institution. (3) The existence of cultural intervention into the structure. (Friedman, 1975, p. 16)(4) There is a system of meaning (symbols) to hide or cover up so that it runs smoothly without anyone knowing. (Kompas, 2016) It can be understood by judges who come and go in court due to mutation of duties, some of whom carry the habit of bribery, although some also carry an anti-bribery attitude. In other words, in court institutions, there is an understanding that corruption has been institutionalised.

Under such circumstances bribery is institutionalised in court; there are three pillars that contribute to the institutionalisation of corruption (bribery) in an organisation according to Blake E. Ashforth and Vikas Anand: (Ashford and Anand, 2003, p. 1-52)

(1) institutionalisation, the process by which corrupt practices are treated as routine problems, often unknowingly thinking of their politeness; (2) rationalisation, the process by which individuals involved in acts of corruption use socially created accounts to legitimise acting in their own eyes; and (3) socialisation, the process by which newcomers are taught to commit and accept corrupt practices. The three pillars are mutually reinforcing and interdependent; once established in an organisation, the pillar creates a situation where corruption is practiced collectively by employees and can last indefinitely.

For some judges who are tasked and profit-oriented, bribes are better understood not as a juridical concept (as a prohibited and illegal act), but rather as a cognitive concept (Hamid, 2007) (knowledge received and trusted and carried out though, in a manner that is covered up and takes place in law enforcement activities). Bargaining for the suspension of detention, bidding for the verdict, continues (Winarta, 2012, p.77) though, the more careful and more sophisticated the techniques and methods.

Thus, the legal culture occupies an important position for review because in this study law is understood as a mental construction for the judge. (Indarti, 2010, p.30-31) This is important to encourage the operation of the law by judges to be more honest and fairer. Lawrence M. Friedman explicitly distinguishes the legal culture of the legal profession from the legal culture of society. As stated as follows, (Friedman, 1975, p. 23):

“We can distinguish between an external and internal legal culture. The external legal culture is the legal culture of the general population; the internal legal culture of those members of society who perform specialised legal perform. Every society has legal culture, but only societies with legal specialist have an internal legal culture”.



Internal legal culture by Lawrence M. Friedman is considered a very important type of group legal culture. The legal culture of legal professionals (police, prosecutors, judges, advocates) has values, ideologies, and principles that work within the "magic" circle of the legal system. (Friedman, 1975, p. 194) The behaviour and attitudes of professionals have a big influence on the pattern of demands that are submitted to the system.

From this aspect, it can be stated that the concept of the legal culture of judges greatly determines the operation of the legal / criminal / civil justice system. The justice system is not only seen as a means or a mere mechanism; in it there is a judge's behaviour. In other words, the judge as the main figure of the court represents the law with the practice of bribery or not; basically it has lasted a long time and dialectically influences in the institutional environment.

Simply put, the legal culture in the concept here is the experimental efforts of individuals and groups of judges to continuously improve the quality of themselves and the environment and their communities intellectually based on integrity and legal knowledge to bring the values of truth, justice and humanity into mind and the attitude of noble actions and behaviour in resolving problems in concreto in law enforcement.

Improvements in the laws and institutions have been carried out by the Supreme Court and the lower judicial body, but the improvement of the legal culture centred on human beings (Judges) has been left behind. Therefore, the Supreme Court has reaffirmed the importance of applying the principles of clean government and good governance that are universally believed to be the principles needed to provide excellent service to the community.

In this regard, the main program carried out by the government is to develop the state apparatus through the application of bureaucratic reform through the Integrity Zone of the Corruption-Free Bureaucracy Region and the Clean and Serving Bureaucracy Region. (Decree of the Chairperson of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia, 2019)

The legal culture aspect is the focus of court reform. The Supreme Court and subordinate judiciary bodies such as the Tanjungkarang High Court have sought to develop it through a system of administrative structuring for the implementation of tasks and authorities for handling cases that have been improved and complemented with Judicial Service Standards as Decree of the Chairperson of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia Number 26/KMA/SK/II/2012 dated February 9, 2012 and a quality assurance system which is elaborated in the form of Job Descriptions and Standard Operating Procedures (SOP).



The static nature of statutory regulations and institutional structures, requires the existence of a legal culture that encourages the optimisation of the values, attitudes, and rational principles of judges in implementing the authority to enforce the law. (Arief, 2011, p.5) The obligation to implement law fairly and responsibly based on values, (Tim Pengembang Ilmu Pendidikan, 2007, p.45) attitudes and principles that should be the integrity of judges in upholding truth and justice. The values and attitudes of judges that reflect the legal culture are the places where the soul, spirit, ideas and independence of judges reside.

Approach Model

To get an empirical explanation, Jean Piaget's theory of cognitive development, (JR, 2014, p.9) according to the researchers it is suitable to understand and answer the main problems in developing anti-bribery attitudes in the court environment in an effort to realise the court as a Corruption-Free Zone (WBK) and Clean and Serving Bureaucracy Zone (WBBM) courts.

Cognitive development theory emphasises matters that deal with knowledge and thought processes in the human brain involving processes that are mentally invisible. In other words cognitive theory pays more attention to the way humans accept, process, store and issue thoughts or ideas. Cognitive is all mental processes associated with gaining and producing knowledge' and using and carrying out mental processes. Information received is adjusted, compared and classified with information that is in short-term and long-term memory. New information that is more meaningful and relevant might be integrated with existing information.

Cognitive itself has the meaning of thinking. Cognitive related to thinking, knowledge, interpretation, understanding and individual ideas. Cognitive processes are also related to perceptions, memories and information that is processed and so on are used by individuals to obtain information, design and solve problems. (Hamid, 2007, p.3)

This theory is used to explore the knowledge of bribery experienced in court as a habit, separating important ideas from less important ones, linking ideas to each other, but also adjusting the way of thinking to include new ideas, because additional information makes deeper understanding. Piaget believes that humans adapt to two ways, namely assimilation and accommodation. (Santrock, 2003, p.105) Assimilation occurs when a person combines new information into the knowledge he already has. Accommodation occurs when someone adjusts to new information. According to Gisela Labouvivief there was a new integration in the new adult human way of thinking. (Santrock, 2003, p.114)

Therefore, the cognitive approach focuses more on expressions, chatter and the way judges discuss with their thoughts, knowledge, interpretations, understandings and ideas related to perceptions, memories and information processed and so on, and are used by individuals to obtain information, design and solve problems. (Hamid, 2007, p.3)

DISCUSSIONS

Bribery as an act prohibited by criminal law is included in one type of corruption according to Law number 31 of 1999 in conjunction with Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Amendment to Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning Eradication of Corruption.

Many terms are used to give the meaning of bribery which in English is called bribery, Arabic is called Rashwah or rasya. are as follows:

- 1) A bribe is something (money or property) given to someone, provided that the person given can help the person who gives.
- 2) Bribery is something that is given to someone, so that the person given is giving punishment in a vanity way or giving a position or to commit dzolim.
- 3) Bribery is something given by a person to a judge or another so that the person can obtain legal certainty or obtain his wish. (Ibid)

From some of the above meanings, bribery as corruption is defined as - giving something to a judge who will, or is handling a case so that in the case to be handled or being examined in court, the actions of the defendant by the judge can be made or arranged in a legal judgment as if not a criminal offense but civil, or even if guilty of small and minor mistakes.

Indonesia is a country that ratified the United Nations Convention Against Corruption, 2003 (The United Nations Convention Against Corruption / UNCAC 2003). Indonesia has participated actively in the efforts of the international community to prevent and eradicate corruption by signing United Nations Convention Against Corruption, 2003 (United Nations Convention) (Anti-Corruption Nations, 2003). (concerning Ratification of the United Nations Anti-Corruption Convention, as in Law of the Republic of Indonesia, 2006) Bribery has been formulated as a form of corruption in accordance with Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning Eradication of Corruption.

As stated in UNCAC 2003, the definition of bribery from a legal point of view basically implies an act of corruption namely:

- 1) Acts of corruption are illegal (illegitimate), in the sense that there is a violation of the values prevailing in a democratic society, thus constituting the basis for sanctions;

- 2) The act of power, namely the abuse of power in support of certain interests in the exchange of gifts, promises or abuse of public functions;
- 3) All that meant is action and negligence;
- 4) Involves a conflict of interest. Corruption violates the public or private sector interests and implies benefits (economy, status, honour, awards, gifts or favours) for yourself or others (family, friends, groups or organisations);
- 5) Implies violations of basic principles, values and rights in a democratic society, such as the principles of legality, good faith, transparency, accountability and human rights. The types of sanctions range from civil to criminal, including administrative and disciplinary rules, in various legal instruments. (European Commission, p.5)

Corruption-Free and Clean Serving Regional Courts Areas

Bureaucratic Reform is one of the levers to support the governance system of the Supreme Court and the Judiciary Board under it to realise good governance and clean government towards the civil apparatus of the Supreme Court and the Judiciary below it is clean and free of Collusion, Corruption, Nepotism, and is effective and efficient, so that it can serve the community quickly, precisely, and professionally, increasing service excellence as well as increasing capacity and performance accountability.

The implementation of bureaucratic reform in the court is constrained by human resource factors, namely the judge as the main actor in carrying out an independent and fair trial. The reality is that judges abuse their authority, commit corruption, by practicing bribery, discrimination and not being able to supervise themselves.

Zone of Integrity (ZI) development policy for the court as Corruption-Free Zone (WBK) and Clean and Serving Bureaucracy Zone (WBBM) courts, which covers 6 (six) areas of change in the field of Change Management, Management Arrangement, Management of HR Management System, Strengthening Oversight, Strengthening Performance Accountability and Strengthening Public Service Quality in order to cause changes in mindset and Work culture (culture set), which is an activity carried out in order to change the mindset of members towards a better direction and to create a work culture in their work units so as to create a work environment that is truly free of corruption and performs well, through efforts, a) the leadership of the court and hierarchical positions below must act as role models in the implementation of Zone of Integrity (ZI) Development towards Corruption-Free Zone (WBK) / Clean and Serving Bureaucracy Zone (WBBM), with: (1) the example shown by the leadership will be a role model for his/her



subordinates (2) the example has a big influence on the formation of a person; (3) the example will very quickly change the mindset of subordinates.

Reflecting on a corruption-free and clean and serving regional court requires judges who have legal knowledge and integrity as piles in their lives. Law must be used as a torch, an agent of justice in a life of law. With legal science the judge develops his culture and builds civilisation. It is not the cognition of bribery that is understood and practised in law. For this reason, the dialectical model of cognition needs to be developed to free and change the judge's cognition from the knowledge of bribery as an act that demeans oneself and the institution.

Rethink Bribery as a Legal Issue

Judges as individuals and bearers of the legal profession have dialectical and interrelated functions. Anwar Haryono said that, the law worked on the relations of individuals in the community so that their interests did not collide and could coexist peacefully. Integrity is important so that judges as individuals can live according to values that are considered good and stay away from anything that is considered not good. (Haryono, 1995, p.86) Both are interrelated in the common sense of human beings by presenting words and actions that are in line and integrated. Judgment with that important position, has advantages compared to individuals with other professions. Therefore, with the Supreme Court's policy of establishing a regional court free of corruption and clean serving, it becomes a strategic opportunity for judges to be entitled and obliged to change and correct the bad things that are still inherent in their cognition and reason. Get rid of bad habits such as still doing bribes and dirty services to justice seekers in the Court.

Starting with rethinking bribes is an important legal issue to help reflect wrong common sense in the judge's cognition so far. Compared to thinking about obtaining the economic benefits of bribery from the cases he handled but the best possibility is unknown but humiliated because of criticism and humiliation by the public, and the worst possibility of being caught by Hand Catch Operation (OTT).

Rethinking bribery as a legal issue is important to help reflect wrong common sense in the judge's cognition so far. Putting the legal mindset on bribery allows judges to prevent and reduce or even stop bribery behaviour which has become the judge's internal habits. If a judge does an act in good way and in accordance with his legal actions, is consistent (istikomah), honest, and can be trusted, sooner or later his actions will get a positive response from the community.



The positive impact obtained, namely the trust and sympathy of the community and changes in the legal culture of the judge, colleagues, and colleagues within the institution. Judges in their capacity as individuals in their institutional environment, if they have started to get used to leaving actions that are contrary to the ethics of their profession, will form positive personality values in their work environment.

The intention to stop getting wealth or profit from bribery or the intention to prevent the practice of bribery in handling cases is the main prerequisite because the intention does not depend on the command or prohibition even though the law. According to Poespoprodjo that, intention depends on the approval of the will that underlies the motive for the action. (Poespoprodjo, p. 156) If the motive for the action is to gain personal gain in carrying out the law, then the judge's conduct is not upholding the law but is committing bribes to impose the law. Conversely, if the motive for the mere act of enforcing the law, then the act of the judge elevates the glory of the legal profession and community justice.

Cognitive Dialectical Development of Anti-Bribery Attitudes

The efforts to avoid bribery by judges are not enough just to rethink critically by improving cognition by preventing bad intentions of bribery that resides in cognition and heart, requiring effective and sustainable action strategies through a process of knowledge (learning) that puts the science of law as a source of cognition. Judges with the knowledge of legal science can make a discrete choice, between benefits or mudorat, positive or negative, halal or haram. Against this choice, intellectually and morally can be justified. Likewise, the choice is between making a bribe and choosing not to bribe.

A taboo question is whether as a judge usually accepts bribes. Normatively, it will be answered never, even though the actual answers raised are just false words that are not in accordance with the actions carried out because the method is classified as acts that are considered contrary to the law. Therefore, his way of thinking will try to cover up his actions so as not to be known and lying is his choice.

In the perspective of cognitive psychology, the mind gives birth to actions with and through one's thinking to act in accordance with his mind. It is the mind that drives every action and its effects. The mind also determines the condition of the soul, body, personality, and confidence of each person. (Elfiky, 2015, p.4) Therefore, judges in their cognition need criminal law and integrity to be able to control thinking, and more than that, so that the judge does not get lost in the way of thinking and get lost by the results of his thoughts. This will have an impact on the quality of legal action. A legal action will appear as the result of a valuable thought product, if



the results of thought that are decided are in the form of legal decisions that produce decisions, which illustrate legal considerations that are true and fair. In other words, misguided thinking or not in deciding a legal action basically can be known and learned from his thoughts in providing legal considerations and in the legal actions carried out.

Judges are clearly stated in the Code of Ethics and the Code of Conduct. Judges are the main actors or central figures in the judicial process and are required to hone their conscience, maintain integrity, have moral intelligence and increase professionalism. The authority and duty to uphold the law, truth and justice indiscriminately by not discriminating against people demands high responsibility, horizontally to all humans, and vertically accountable to God Almighty. Therefore, with the cognition of legal science that becomes the control of his thinking, it is important to stimulate the workplace and collaborate with colleagues (members of the panel) or regional oversight team to arrange the working environment so that it leads to an atmosphere and thinking that is in line with cognition that frees the court from the area of corruption.

The normative construction of bribery prevention has so far been felt to have not touched the subject matter. Thus, it does not have implications for judges who have an indication of bribery behaviour. Many normative models of prevention were developed, but bribery was easily and continuously carried out clandestinely.

In the efforts to prevent the practice of bribery in the court environment so that it does not continue to develop, we need a cognitive dialectical model in a peer environment so that there is a change from the layer of bad habits to good habits. The mental activities of law enforcement officials can be broken down into the following matters.

Assimilation and Accommodation

Cognitive dialectical of bribery prevention can be interpreted as judicial legal cultural concepts that place the mindset in the cognitive structure of the apparatus as the subject of change. Starting from the mental activity of the judge to direct, return and control the mind for all positive and open things to do and leave things that are negative and not commendable.

Judges are torealise that they have an important position as the bearer of a noble profession. With the existence of a corruption-free and clean serving court policy, scientific and integrity aspects comes self-control. Judges are wise, brave and istikomah in promoting truth and honesty in their work environment. The process of mental activity like that becomes internal knowledge. The cognitive dialectics of bribery prevention is exemplified by the U.S. Supreme Court Secretary Pudjoharsoyo, that as each trial begins, the presiding judge of the Assembly before opening the hearing first submits the following appeal(MA Secretary of the Republic of Indonesia, 2019):



“Before my trial starts, I need to convey to the Plaintiff / Petitioner and Defendant / Respondent, Defendant, Public Prosecutor, Legal Counsel, families of the parties and visitors of the hearing. Please help us Citizens of the Court, to behave cleanly by not contacting the judge, Registrar, Substitute Registrar, Registrar or our Employees, asking, receiving tips, bribes, bribes, giving or promising in any form. If anyone on behalf of a Judge, Registrar, Substitute Registrar, Registrar or our Employees, requests, receives tips, bribes, bribes, gifts or promises in any form, to immediately report to the Corruption Eradication Commission Ph. 085 585 755 75, Bawas MARI, Ph. 021 255 783 00 PT Tanjungkarang Ph. 0721 489076. Chairman of PT. 0812 3294 980.”

Starting from the courtroom, the judges dialected an anti-bribery attitude, and continued beyond the trial; the judge consistently and continuously talked about the bad and dangerous practices of bribery to colleagues, clerks, substitute registrars, bailiffs and staff, and it could be interpreted that the assimilation process took place. Judges internalise between new perceptions or thought patterns, concepts or experiences into their cognitive structures.

Cognitive schemes or structures as mental devices that contain knowledge of law and integrity are important things to be honed and developed theoretically and practically to keep the mind from going back or to repeat bad habits that have been patterned in cognitive minds through dialectics that are interrelated about legal science criminal or civil law in concreto cases with colleagues both pro-bribery and those who are anti-bribery.

Cognitive dialectical of bribery prevention lead to the development of the principles of openness of the assembly in addressing or dispelling the existence of parties who are trying to practise bribery. Develop the principles of honesty, objectivity and independence. The dialectical method used is to determine the dynamics of the development of anti-bribery discourse as a change in scientific culture.

The nature of cognitive dialectical is a movement of thought from thesis to antithesis, and from antithesis to synthesis. (Sijders, p.70-71) Bad habits in the practice of bribery as a thesis produce public mistrust in the court, the second phase called antithesis is the injustice of the law in the community, controversial decisions, selective logging, has no deterrent effect and so on. In the third phase comes another scientific view, towards the thesis phase and antilithic phase in a better unity. In the thesis synthesis the truth of the thesis and the anti-thesis truth do not stop, but are abstracted at a higher and better level. Contradictions and differences are a process of transition to the latest and better unity of opinion that leads to the prevention of bribery or anti-bribery or anti-corruption, and fair and impartial decisions. The contradiction with its changes to



knowledge of bribery as a legal problem takes place in the scientific dialectical process. The synthesis formed into a thesis again thus cognitive dialectics continues to gradually shape the legal culture of judges that reflect human values, justice, non-discrimination and sets an example.

Acceptance of legal science knowledge and inherent integrity of judges who reject bribes is a new discourse in the cognitive structure. This is the cognitive dialectic of judges as intelligent and wise adult humans, starting from the spirit to do something right, fair, and good and continue to eliminate negative thoughts and prevent bribery. This assimilation stage is inherent in (new) internal knowledge and is included in the judge's cognitive scheme. Judges in bribery court are in a territory free of corruption and clean in serving. Accordingly, preventing bribery, leaving dirty service has the same meaning and purpose as new internal knowledge. The change process starts from the assimilation and the second continues with accommodation. (Suparno, 2010, p.50)

This process of assimilation of knowledge, in the environment of judges and their colleagues, can occur and be carried out on some judges who have a bribery cognitive structure as a habit with some judges who carry the structure of bribery cognition as a legal problem (anti-bribery), then judges who have bribery cognition as a habit, accepting bribery new knowledge as a legal problem, undergoing a dialectical process trying to incorporate new knowledge into its cognitive schemes while continuing to understand and carry out the assimilation process by advancing the science of law.

In the accommodation stage, judges (it can be said) are in a completely new knowledge and understanding scheme, with the concept of a corruption-free and clean court serves inherent cognition in the science of law and integrity to control its logic. At this stage the process of the judge's cognition system changes and develops, and tends to leave the old cognition (the habit of taking bribes), which is already incompatible with the Supreme Court's policy of establishing a court free of corruption and clean serving.

In this process the apparatus expands and modifies its mental representations in understanding reality with new experiences. One form of the process of accommodation of new knowledge is to develop jurisprudence and integrity into operational schemes by reviving and actualising religious teachings; its function is to strengthen faith and piety, and obedience in carrying out the law, and to behave well in social relations. Judges in essence need a balance (equilibration) when mental activity leads to moral practice in exercising authority and duties to uphold law and justice.



CONCLUSION

The discussion above can be concluded that the Construction of the WBK and WBBM ZI Courts in the Tanjungkarang High Court area requires a legal culture approach to change the mindset and work culture of judges, especially changes in bribery knowledge as a habit of getting material, to bribery as a legal matter.

Cognitive dialectical methods consistently through the stages of assimilation and accommodation in their development, affect the attitude of the judge to be a good example (role model) in the implementation of Zone of Integrity (ZI) Development towards the court as a Corruption-Free Zone (WBK) / a Clean and Serving Bureaucracy Zone (WBBM).

Cognition of jurisprudence and integrity as controllers of common sense become the light of justice in the life of the law. With jurisprudence the judge develops his culture and builds civilisation by: (1) the example shown by the leadership will be a role model for his subordinates. (2) the example has a big influence on the formation of a person; (3) the example will very quickly change the mindset of subordinates.



REFERENCES

- Arief, Barda Nawawi. (2011). *Reformasi Sistem Peradilan (Sistem Penegakan Hukum Di Indonesia)*. Semarang: BP Undip.
- Decree of the Chairman of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia Number: 58 / Kma / Sk / Iii / 2019. (2019). *Pedoman Pembangunan Zona Integritas Menuju Wilayah Bebas dari Korupsi (WBK) dan Wilayah Birokrasi Bersih dan Melayani (WBBM) Pada Mahkamah Agung dan Badan Peradilan Di Bawahnya*.
- Decree of the Chairman of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia Number: 58 / Kma / Sk / Iii / 2019. (2019). *Pedoman Pembangunan Zona Integritas Menuju Wilayah Bebas dari Korupsi (WBK) dan Wilayah Birokrasi Bersih dan Melayani (WBBM) Pada Mahkamah Agung dan Badan Peradilan Di Bawahnya*.
- Endaswara, Suwardi. (2011). *Metode, Teori, dan Teknik Penelitian Kebudayaan (Ideologi, Epistemologi, aplikasi)*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Wedyatama.
- Hakim Kembali Ditangkap KPK, MA Bantah Tak Serius Lakukan Pengawasan. (2019). Retrieved from <https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2019/05/05/12195021/hakim-kembali-ditangkap-kpk-ma-bantah-tak-serius-lakukan-pengawasan>.
- Hamid, Moh. Azhar Abdul. (2007). *Meningkatkan Daya Pikir*. Selangor: PTS Publishing.
- Haryadi, Slamet. (2018). *Ilmu Hukum Pidana Integratif, Telaah Budaya Hukum Pencegahan Suap di kalangan Penegak Hukum*. Yogyakarta: Genta Publishing.
- Haryono, Anwar. (1995). *Indonesia Kita: Pemikiran Berwawasan Iman dan Islam*. Jakarta: Gema Insani Press.
- Ibrahim Elfiky. (2015). *Terapi Berpikir Positif*, Terj. Khalifurrahman Fath and M. Taufik Damas. pp.4. Jakarta: Zaman.
- Joint Decree of the Chairperson of MARI and the Chairperson of KY RI 047 / KMA / SKB / IV / 2009 and Number KB / P.KY / IV / 2009. (2018). *Kode Etik Dan Pedoman Perilaku Hakim*.



- JR, SutarjoAdisusilo. (2014). *Pembelajaran Nilai-Nilai Karakter, Konstruktivisme dan VCT sebagaiInovasiPendekatanPembelajaranAfektif*. Jakarta: Raja GrafindoPersada.
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia. 2006. *Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 7 of 2006 concerning Ratification of the United Nations Convention Against Corruption, 2003 (United Nations Convention Against Corruption, 2003)*.
- Lawrence M. Friedman. (1975). *The Legal System: A Social Science Perspective*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- Lihat, ErlynIndarti. (2010).Diskresi dan ParadigmaSebuahTelaahFilsafat Hukum. In *Inauguration Speech for a Professor of Legal Philosophy at the Faculty of Law, Diponegoro University*. pp.30-31
- Lubis, HM.Ridwan. (2017). *Agama dan Perdamaian, Landasan, Tujuan dan RealitasKehidupanberagama di Indonesia*. (pp.81).Jakarta: Grameadia Pustaka Utama.
- Minister of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic. (2014). *Regulation of the Minister of Administrative Reform and Bureaucratic Reform Number 52 of 2014 concerning Guidelines for the Development of Integrity Zones Towards Corruption-Free Areas and Clean and Serving Bureaucratic Areas within Government Agencies*.
- Pejabat MA PakaiIstilah “Tape” UntukSamarkan Uang Suap. (2016). Retrieved from <https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2016/05/23/18202521/pejabat.ma.pakai.istilah.tape.untuk.samarkan.uang.suap>.
- Poespoprodjo.*Filsafat Moral, Op.Cit*. pp.156.
- Rohman, Syaifur. (2013). *Hermeneutik Panduan keArah Desain Penelitian dan Analisis*. Yogyakarta: GrahaIlmu.
- Salle. (2018). *UrgensiKemandirianKekuasaanKehakiman*. Makasar: SIGn.
- Sejak 2012, Ada 20 Hakim TersangkutKasusKorupsi. (2019). Retrieved from <https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2019/05/07/10483411/sejak-2012-ada-20-hakim-tersangkut-kasus-korupsi?page=all>.
- Shidarta, Sulistyowatidan. (2011).*MetodePenelitian Hukum Konstelasi dan Refleksi*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor.



Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia. (2016). *Regulation of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia Number 7 of 2016 concerning Enforcement of Judges' Work Discipline at the Supreme Court and judicial bodies under it.*

Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia. (2016). *Regulation of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia Number 8 of 2016 concerning Supervision and Development of Direct Superiors within the Supreme Court and its subordinate judiciary bodies.*

Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia. (2016). *Regulation of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia Number 9 of 2016 concerning Guidelines for Handling Complaints (Whistleblowing System) at the Supreme Court and judicial bodies under it.*

Susanto, Nur Agus. (2014). Dimensi Aksiologis Dari Putusan Kasus “ST” Kajian Putusan Peninjauan Kembali Nomor 97 PK/Pid.Sus/2012. *Jurnal Yudisial Vol. 7 No. 3 Desember 2014.*

Tim Kick Andi. (2015). *Semangat Totalitas Membangun Negeri*. Pp. 14. Yogyakarta: Bentang,

Tim Pengembang Ilmu Pendidikan. (2007). *Ilmu dan Aplikasi Pendidikan, bagian 3 Pendidikan Disiplin Ilmu*. Bandung: Imtima.

Winarta, Frans Hendra. (2012). *Membangun Profesionalitas Aparat Penegak Hukum*. In Ed. Dinal Fedrian, et al. *Dialektika Pembaruan Sistem Hukum Indonesia*. (pp.77). Jakarta: KYRI.