vol. 1, no. 1, 2026
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX (E)

Research Article │ Received: Feb 21, 2026; Revised: Mar 07, 2026; Accepted Mar 15, 2026; Published Nov 23, 2026
https://doi.org/XX.XXXXX/XXXX

The Accountability Gap in Prosecutorial Supervision: Legal and Institutional Challenges in Indonesia

Galih Setya Refangga[1]*, Abdul Haq[2], Restu Adi Putra[3]

[1,2] Department of Law, Universitas Wisnuwardhana, Malang, Indonesia
[2] Department of Law, Universitas Kadiri, Kediri, Indonesia
* Correspondence author(s); E-mail(s): ranggagalih20@gmail.com

Highlights:

- Examines accountability gaps in Indonesia's prosecutorial supervision system
- Analyzes ethical oversight within prosecutorial institutions in Indonesia
- Identifies structural weaknesses in prosecutorial accountability mechanisms
- Highlights transparency challenges in prosecutorial disciplinary enforcement
- Proposes institutional reforms for ethical prosecutorial governance

Abstract: This study examines the accountability gap in prosecutorial supervision within Indonesia's criminal justice system by analyzing the legal and institutional framework governing prosecutorial ethics, transparency, and accountability. Prosecutors occupy a strategic position in law enforcement because they possess broad discretionary authority in determining prosecutions, representing state interests, and enforcing criminal law. Consequently, effective supervisory mechanisms are essential to ensure that prosecutorial authority is exercised ethically, transparently, and consistently with the rule of law. This research aims to evaluate the effectiveness of existing prosecutorial supervisory mechanisms in ensuring institutional accountability and ethical governance in Indonesia. The study employs a normative legal research method combined with a qualitative analytical approach using statutory, conceptual, and doctrinal analyses. Primary legal materials include laws regulating the Prosecutor's Office, prosecutorial ethics, and supervisory institutions, while secondary materials consist of scholarly literature, institutional reports, and legal studies concerning prosecutorial accountability and governance. The findings reveal that Indonesia's prosecutorial supervisory system operates through a centralized and hierarchical institutional structure supported by both internal and external oversight mechanisms. However, the implementation of prosecutorial supervision remains constrained by structural and

Copyright©Year by the authors. Published by NOMOS ETHICA. This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium provided the original work is properly cited.

institutional weaknesses, including concentration of supervisory authority, limited independence of external oversight bodies, fragmented institutional coordination, inconsistent disciplinary enforcement, and insufficient transparency in handling ethical violations. Furthermore, broad prosecutorial discretion without adequate accountability mechanisms creates risks of abuse of power, selective prosecution, and ethical misconduct. The study identifies a significant accountability gap between normative legal provisions and practical implementation within prosecutorial supervision. Therefore, this research argues that strengthening prosecutorial accountability requires comprehensive legal and institutional reform aimed at enhancing supervisory independence, improving transparency, strengthening inter-institutional coordination, and ensuring consistent ethical enforcement. Such reforms are essential for reinforcing institutional integrity, public trust, democratic governance, and the rule of law within Indonesia's criminal justice system.

Keywords: Prosecutorial Supervision; Accountability Gap; Prosecutorial Ethics; Institutional Accountability; Transparency; Criminal Justice System; Legal Governance; Rule of Law; Ethical Oversight

1. Introduction

The principle of the rule of law constitutes one of the fundamental foundations of democratic governance and modern constitutional systems. In Indonesia, this principle is explicitly affirmed in Article 1 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which declares Indonesia as a state based on law (rechtstaat)[1]. Within this constitutional framework, law functions not only as an instrument for maintaining public order but also as a mechanism for ensuring justice, legal certainty, accountability, and protection of human rights[2]. The effective realization of these objectives depends significantly on the integrity and professionalism of law enforcement institutions, particularly prosecutorial institutions that occupy a strategic role within the criminal justice system[3].

Prosecutors possess extensive authority in conducting prosecutions, determining legal charges, exercising prosecutorial discretion, and representing state interests before the courts[4]. Because of this strategic authority, prosecutorial institutions play an essential role in shaping the credibility and legitimacy of criminal justice systems[5]. Prosecutorial decisions directly influence legal outcomes, individual rights, and public perceptions regarding fairness and justice. Consequently, prosecutorial authority must be exercised in accordance with ethical principles, transparency, accountability, and the rule of law[6].

[1] Peirone F, "Rule of Law and Institutional Trust: The Role of Prosecutorial Accountability," *European Law Journal* 31, no. 1 (2025): 66–84.
[2] Akbar R, "Reforming Prosecutorial Ethics in the Digital Era: Challenges and Opportunities," *International Journal of Law and Society* 9, no. 1 (2025): 33–48.
[3] Appleby G, "Transparency and Accountability in Disciplinary Enforcement," *Legal Ethics Review* 29, no. 1 (2025): 55–72.
[4] Utami R, "Public Complaints Mechanism and Prosecutorial Supervision in Indonesia," *Indonesian Journal of Judicial Studies* 7, no. 1 (2025): 1–15.
[5] Maheswari D, "Public Complaints and Prosecutorial Accountability in Indonesia," *Journal of Legal Reform* 11, no. 2 (2025): 98–115.
[6] Holland J and Gray C, "Prosecutorial Discipline and Accountability Mechanisms," *Law and Policy Quarterly* 22, no. 4 (2000): 389–407.

In contemporary legal governance discourse, prosecutorial accountability has become an increasingly important issue in both developed and developing legal systems[7]. Comparative studies indicate that prosecutorial institutions with broad discretionary authority require effective supervisory mechanisms to prevent abuse of power, corruption, selective prosecution, and unethical conduct[8]. Weak prosecutorial supervision may create significant risks for democratic governance because prosecutors possess substantial influence over criminal law enforcement and judicial processes[9]. Therefore, many countries have developed institutional accountability frameworks involving internal disciplinary mechanisms, external oversight institutions, transparency procedures, and ethical governance standards to ensure that prosecutorial discretion remains subject to legal and institutional control[10].

In Indonesia, prosecutorial supervision is regulated through various statutory provisions and institutional mechanisms[11]. The principal legal framework governing prosecutorial institutions is Law No. 16 of 2004 concerning the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia, as amended by Law No. 11 of 2021[12]. The Indonesian prosecutorial system adopts a centralized and hierarchical institutional structure under the authority of the Attorney General's Office[13]. Supervisory mechanisms consist of both internal oversights conducted through the Deputy Attorney General for Supervision (Jaksa Agung Muda Pengawasan or JAMWAS) and external supervision through the Prosecutorial Commission (Komisi Kejaksaan Republik Indonesia)[14]. Normatively, this dual supervisory structure aims to strengthen prosecutorial accountability, institutional integrity, transparency, and ethical professionalism[15].

Despite the existence of these legal and institutional frameworks, concerns regarding prosecutorial misconduct and weak accountability continue to emerge within Indonesia's criminal justice system[16]. Cases involving corruption, abuse of authority, procedural irregularities, selective prosecution, and unethical prosecutorial behavior frequently attract public attention and generate criticism toward the effectiveness of supervisory institutions[17]. These conditions indicate that the existence of formal supervisory mechanisms alone is insufficient to guarantee effective accountability and ethical enforcement within prosecutorial institutions.

[7] Huchhanavar R, "Independence in Disciplinary Systems: A Comparative Analysis," *Journal of Judicial Administration* 31, no. 2 (2022): 120–137.
[8] Khan M and Ahmed S, "Harmonization of Prosecutorial Standards and Procedural Fairness," *International Review of Law* 15, no. 2 (2025): 210–228.
[9] Salim A, Nugroho B, and Widodo T, "Legal Fragmentation and Enforcement Challenges in Developing Criminal Justice Systems," *Asian Legal Studies Review* 12, no. 3 (2025): 178–196.
[10] Ardono T and Hariyanti S, "Transparency in Prosecutorial Disciplinary Processes and Public Trust," *Indonesian Journal of Law and Policy* 6, no. 2 (2025): 101–118.
[11] Cravens M, "Public Disclosure and Institutional Discipline: Implications for Accountability," *Journal of Legal Studies* 52, no. 3 (2023): 412–430.
[12] Isjayanto I and Bakti R, "Institutional Fragmentation in Prosecutorial Oversight: Evidence from Indonesia," *Journal of Southeast Asian Law* 10, no. 1 (2025): 88–105.
[13] Kumar V and Rastogi R, "Inter-Agency Coordination in Governance Systems," *Public Administration Quarterly* 49, no. 1 (2025): 73–95.
[14] Sapira L, Wibowo A, and Santoso D, "Sanction Consistency and Deterrence in Institutional Disciplinary Systems," *Journal of Law Enforcement Studies* 5, no. 1 (2026): 67–85.
[15] Nazifah N, Rahman A, and Siregar M, "Organizational Culture and Ethical Compliance in Prosecutorial Institutions," *Journal of Legal Sociology* 9, no. 3 (2025): 201–220.
[16] Prado M, "Institutional Fragmentation and Governance Inefficiencies," *World Development Journal* 162 (2024): 106–120.
[17] Ali S and Rehman A, "Institutional Synergy and Governance Effectiveness in Criminal Justice Systems," *Global Governance Review* 14, no. 3 (2025): 201–218.

One of the major challenges concerns the concentration of supervisory authority within the Attorney General's Office itself [18]. Internal supervision, although necessary for maintaining institutional discipline, may create structural conflicts of interest because prosecutorial institutions simultaneously function as supervisors and supervised entities[19]. Such centralized supervisory structures may weaken objectivity, reduce transparency, and limit public confidence in disciplinary enforcement processes. In addition, external oversight institutions possess limited enforcement authority because their recommendations are largely non-binding and dependent upon institutional willingness within the prosecution service.

Another important issue involves institutional fragmentation within prosecutorial supervision. Multiple institutions involved in legal oversight frequently operate with overlapping authority, unclear procedural coordination, and inconsistent accountability standards. The existence of independent prosecutorial authority within the Corruption Eradication Commission (Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi or KPK) further contributes to dualism in prosecutorial supervision and institutional accountability. Although this arrangement aims to strengthen anti-corruption enforcement, it simultaneously creates inconsistencies in supervisory mechanisms and disciplinary standards.

The problem of prosecutorial accountability is also closely connected to transparency within disciplinary enforcement systems. Public access to information concerning prosecutorial misconduct investigations, disciplinary proceedings, and institutional sanctions remains relatively limited. Lack of transparency weakens public participation and external scrutiny while simultaneously reducing institutional legitimacy and public trust. In democratic legal systems, transparency constitutes an essential component of accountability because prosecutorial institutions exercise discretionary authority capable of directly affecting citizens' rights and public interests.

Existing literature concerning prosecutorial institutions in Indonesia has primarily focused on prosecutorial authority, corruption eradication, criminal procedure, and institutional independence. However, relatively limited scholarly attention has been directed toward examining prosecutorial supervision through a broader accountability and ethical governance perspective. Previous studies tend to analyze prosecutorial supervision from administrative or procedural viewpoints without comprehensively addressing the relationship between institutional design, ethical accountability, transparency, and supervisory effectiveness. Consequently, there remains a significant research gap concerning how prosecutorial supervision operates within Indonesia's legal system and to what extent existing mechanisms effectively ensure accountability and institutional integrity.

Based on these considerations, this study aims to examine the accountability gap within Indonesia's prosecutorial supervisory system by analyzing the legal and institutional framework governing prosecutorial ethics, transparency, and accountability. The study further evaluates the effectiveness of existing supervisory mechanisms in ensuring prosecutorial accountability and institutional integrity within Indonesia's criminal justice system. Using a normative legal research method combined with qualitative analysis, this research examines statutory regulations, institutional structures, ethical standards, and supervisory mechanisms related to prosecutorial oversight.

[18] Dar S, Khan M, and Ali F, "Big Data Analytics in Governance: Enhancing Institutional Monitoring Systems," *Journal of Digital Governance* 7, no. 1 (2025): 65–82.

[19] Liu Y, Zhang H, and Chen X, "Early Warning Systems in Governance: A Predictive Approach," *Governance and Policy Journal* 19, no. 2 (2025): 134–150.

The novelty of this study lies in its use of the accountability gap as an analytical framework for examining prosecutorial supervision in Indonesia. Unlike previous studies that focus primarily on prosecutorial authority or institutional independence, this research emphasizes the discrepancy between normative supervisory frameworks and practical implementation within prosecutorial accountability systems. This study therefore contributes theoretically to discussions concerning legal governance, prosecutorial ethics, and institutional accountability, while also providing practical recommendations for strengthening prosecutorial supervision through legal reform, institutional integration, transparency enhancement, and consistent ethical enforcement.

Ultimately, strengthening prosecutorial accountability is essential not only for improving institutional integrity but also for reinforcing democratic governance, public trust, legal certainty, and the effective realization of the rule of law within Indonesia's criminal justice system.

2. Methods

This study employs a normative juridical research method to examine the accountability gap in prosecutorial supervision within Indonesia's criminal justice system[20]. Normative juridical research is appropriate because the study focuses on analyzing legal norms, statutory regulations, institutional structures, and ethical accountability mechanisms governing prosecutorial institutions. The research aims to evaluate how prosecutorial supervision is regulated within the Indonesian legal system and to assess the effectiveness of supervisory mechanisms in ensuring transparency, accountability, and ethical governance[21].

The study applies several complementary research approaches, namely the statutory approach, conceptual approach, comparative approach, and case approach. The statutory approach is used to analyze laws and regulations governing prosecutorial institutions, prosecutorial ethics, disciplinary enforcement, and supervisory authority in Indonesia[22]. Primary legal materials examined in this study include the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, Law No. 16 of 2004 concerning the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia as amended by Law No. 11 of 2021, regulations concerning prosecutorial ethics and disciplinary mechanisms, and other relevant statutory provisions related to legal accountability and criminal justice governance[23].

The conceptual approach is utilized to examine theoretical concepts related to prosecutorial accountability, ethical governance, institutional supervision, prosecutorial discretion, transparency, and the rule of law. This study adopts the concept of the accountability gap as its principal analytical framework. The accountability gap refers to the discrepancy between formal legal provisions concerning prosecutorial supervision and the practical implementation of accountability mechanisms within prosecutorial institutions. Through this framework, the study evaluates how institutional design, supervisory authority, transparency, and disciplinary enforcement influence the effectiveness of prosecutorial oversight in Indonesia.

[20] Taufik M, Hidayat R, and Anwar S, "Moral Values and Prosecutorial Ethics: A Socio-Legal Perspective," *Journal of Law and Ethics* 13, no. 2 (2025): 140–158.
[21] Adhari M, "Strengthening Judicial and Prosecutorial Oversight Institutions in Contemporary Legal Systems," *Journal of Legal Governance* 12, no. 2 (2025): 145–162.
[22] Barroso LR and Campos Mello P, "Prosecutorial Independence and Institutional Accountability in Democratic Governance," *Comparative Constitutional Law Journal* 11, no. 2 (2025): 89–110.
[23] Ferrajoli L, *Principles of Criminal Law and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021.

In addition, a comparative approach is employed to compare prosecutorial supervisory systems and accountability mechanisms implemented in several legal systems outside Indonesia[24]. Comparative analysis is intended to identify best practices concerning prosecutorial transparency, independent supervision, ethical enforcement, and institutional accountability[25]. This approach also assists in evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of Indonesia's prosecutorial supervisory framework within a broader international legal governance context.

The case approach is applied through the examination of selected cases involving prosecutorial misconduct, abuse of authority, corruption, procedural irregularities, and ethical violations occurring during the period of 2023–2025[26]. These cases are analyzed to evaluate institutional responses, disciplinary enforcement consistency, supervisory effectiveness, and transparency within prosecutorial accountability mechanisms. The selected cases serve as empirical illustrations of the accountability gap existing between normative regulations and practical implementation[27].

This study primarily relies on secondary legal materials consisting of statutes, government regulations, institutional reports, academic journals, books, legal commentaries, and scholarly publications related to prosecutorial institutions and criminal justice governance. Primary legal materials include constitutional provisions, prosecutorial laws, prosecutorial codes of ethics, and supervisory regulations. Secondary legal materials comprise academic literature discussing prosecutorial accountability, institutional governance, legal ethics, criminal justice reform, and comparative prosecutorial supervision systems. Tertiary materials such as legal dictionaries, encyclopedias, and official government publications are also utilized to support legal interpretation and conceptual clarification.

Data collection is conducted through library research and document analysis. The collected legal materials are analyzed qualitatively using legal interpretation, systematic analysis, and descriptive-analytical methods. The analytical process involves identifying inconsistencies between normative legal frameworks and practical implementation, examining institutional coordination within supervisory mechanisms, evaluating transparency and disciplinary enforcement, and assessing the effectiveness of prosecutorial accountability structures.

Furthermore, the study synthesizes normative legal analysis and institutional evaluation to formulate recommendations for strengthening prosecutorial supervision in Indonesia. The proposed recommendations emphasize legal reform, enhancement of supervisory independence, institutional coordination, transparency improvement, ethical governance reinforcement, and the development of preventive accountability mechanisms. Through this methodological framework, the research seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of prosecutorial accountability challenges while contributing theoretically and practically to the development of democratic legal governance and institutional integrity in Indonesia.

3. Results

[24] Rawls J, *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.
[25] Fuller LL, *The Morality of Law*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969.
[26] Dworkin R, *Law's Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986.
[27] Habermas J, *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996.

3.1. The Structure of Prosecutorial Supervision in Indonesia

The findings of this study indicate that prosecutorial supervision in Indonesia is formally regulated through a centralized and hierarchical institutional structure designed to maintain prosecutorial discipline, ethical conduct, and accountability. The Indonesian prosecutorial system places supervisory authority primarily under the Attorney General's Office through internal oversight mechanisms coordinated by the Deputy Attorney General for Supervision (Jaksa Agung Muda Pengawasan or JAMWAS). In addition, external supervision is institutionally supported through the Prosecutorial Commission of the Republic of Indonesia (Komisi Kejaksaan Republik Indonesia), which functions as an advisory and monitoring body concerning prosecutorial conduct and institutional performance.

Normatively, this dual supervisory mechanism reflects an attempt to balance internal institutional discipline with external accountability. Internal supervision is intended to ensure administrative efficiency, prosecutorial professionalism, and institutional control, while external supervision aims to strengthen public accountability and transparency. However, the findings demonstrate that the practical implementation of prosecutorial supervision remains significantly influenced by institutional centralization and hierarchical authority structures.

The study reveals that the centralized nature of supervisory authority creates limitations in maintaining institutional independence and objective disciplinary enforcement. Internal supervisory bodies frequently operate within the same institutional structure as the prosecutors they supervise, potentially generating conflicts of interest and reducing impartiality in handling ethical violations. Consequently, disciplinary enforcement processes may be perceived as lacking transparency and institutional neutrality.

Furthermore, the findings indicate that external supervisory institutions possess relatively limited authority in influencing prosecutorial accountability. Although the Prosecutorial Commission may provide recommendations and conduct monitoring activities, its institutional authority remains largely advisory and dependent upon the willingness of prosecutorial institutions to implement recommendations. This limited enforcement capacity weakens the effectiveness of external accountability mechanisms and reduces public confidence in supervisory institutions.

The existence of multiple supervisory institutions also contributes to procedural overlap and institutional fragmentation. Different oversight bodies frequently apply varying standards and procedures concerning prosecutorial accountability, thereby creating inconsistencies in disciplinary enforcement and institutional coordination. This fragmented supervisory structure demonstrates that formal institutional arrangements alone are insufficient to ensure effective prosecutorial accountability without strong coordination, transparency, and enforcement mechanisms.

3.2. Accountability Gap in Prosecutorial Supervision

One of the principal findings of this study is the existence of a significant accountability gap within Indonesia's prosecutorial supervisory system. The accountability gap refers to the discrepancy between formal legal provisions regulating prosecutorial supervision and the practical implementation of accountability mechanisms within prosecutorial institutions.

Normatively, Indonesian law has established various legal instruments intended to regulate prosecutorial ethics, transparency, and disciplinary enforcement. Prosecutors are required to uphold integrity,

impartiality, professionalism, and accountability in exercising prosecutorial discretion. Ethical codes and disciplinary regulations formally provide standards governing prosecutorial behavior and mechanisms for addressing misconduct.

However, empirical analysis demonstrates that practical implementation frequently fails to achieve the intended accountability objectives. Several cases involving corruption, abuse of authority, selective prosecution, and procedural irregularities reveal weaknesses within prosecutorial oversight mechanisms. These cases indicate that disciplinary enforcement often operates inconsistently and reactively rather than preventively.

The study further finds that prosecutorial supervision is frequently initiated only after public complaints, media exposure, or political pressure emerge. Preventive supervisory mechanisms capable of detecting ethical risks at earlier stages remain relatively weak. As a result, institutional responses tend to focus on post-violation disciplinary actions rather than systematic prevention and institutional risk management.

Another factor contributing to the accountability gap involves limited transparency within prosecutorial disciplinary processes. Public access to information regarding ethical investigations, supervisory proceedings, and disciplinary sanctions remains relatively restricted. This lack of transparency weakens external accountability and creates public perceptions that prosecutorial institutions prioritize institutional protection over impartial disciplinary enforcement.

In addition, the broad discretionary authority possessed by prosecutors creates substantial accountability challenges. Prosecutorial discretion plays an essential role within criminal justice systems because prosecutors must determine prosecution strategies, evidentiary considerations, and legal charges. Nevertheless, excessive discretion without effective supervisory control may increase the risk of abuse of power, selective law enforcement, and politically motivated prosecutions. Therefore, effective accountability mechanisms are necessary to ensure that prosecutorial discretion remains consistent with legal principles and ethical standards.

The findings also demonstrate that institutional culture significantly influences the effectiveness of prosecutorial supervision. In some instances, institutional loyalty and hierarchical relationships appear to outweigh ethical accountability considerations. Such institutional culture may discourage transparency, limit internal criticism, and weaken disciplinary consistency. Consequently, prosecutorial accountability cannot be strengthened solely through regulatory reform without broader institutional and cultural transformation.

3.3. Transparency and Ethical Governance in Prosecutorial Institutions

Transparency constitutes one of the essential components of democratic legal governance and institutional accountability. The findings of this study indicate that transparency within Indonesia's prosecutorial supervisory system remains relatively limited, particularly concerning disciplinary enforcement and ethical accountability procedures.

Institutional transparency is necessary because prosecutorial institutions exercise broad authority directly affecting public rights, criminal prosecutions, and judicial outcomes. Transparent supervisory procedures may strengthen public trust, increase institutional legitimacy, and improve accountability effectiveness. Nevertheless, the findings reveal that disciplinary processes involving prosecutorial misconduct are often conducted internally with limited public disclosure regarding investigation procedures, disciplinary findings, or sanctions imposed.

Limited transparency creates several negative consequences for prosecutorial governance. First, it reduces opportunities for public scrutiny and external oversight concerning prosecutorial accountability. Second, lack of transparency contributes to perceptions of selective disciplinary enforcement and institutional bias. Third, restricted public access to accountability information weakens institutional legitimacy and public confidence in the criminal justice system.

The study further identifies that ethical governance within prosecutorial institutions remains predominantly compliance-oriented rather than integrity-oriented. Ethical supervision frequently emphasizes procedural compliance and disciplinary sanctions instead of fostering internal ethical awareness and professional responsibility. As a result, ethical governance tends to function administratively rather than substantively.

Effective ethical governance requires not only formal disciplinary mechanisms but also institutional commitment to integrity, transparency, professionalism, and accountability. Continuous ethics education, professional training, leadership integrity, and transparent institutional culture are essential for strengthening prosecutorial accountability in the long term.

3.4. Legal and Institutional Reform for Strengthening Prosecutorial Accountability

Based on the findings, this study argues that strengthening prosecutorial accountability in Indonesia requires comprehensive legal and institutional reform addressing structural, procedural, and cultural weaknesses within supervisory mechanisms.

First, supervisory independence should be strengthened through clearer separation between prosecutorial operational authority and disciplinary oversight functions. Independent external oversight institutions should possess stronger authority in monitoring prosecutorial conduct, conducting investigations, and enforcing accountability standards. Enhanced institutional independence may reduce conflicts of interest and improve public confidence in disciplinary enforcement.

Second, transparency within prosecutorial supervision should be significantly improved. Public access to disciplinary procedures, accountability reports, and ethical enforcement outcomes should be expanded while still respecting legal confidentiality requirements. Transparent accountability systems are essential for strengthening democratic governance and institutional legitimacy.

Third, institutional coordination among supervisory bodies should be reinforced to reduce fragmentation and procedural overlap. Integrated supervisory mechanisms involving internal oversight institutions, external commissions, judicial institutions, and anti-corruption agencies may improve accountability consistency and institutional effectiveness.

Fourth, preventive accountability mechanisms should be developed to complement reactive disciplinary enforcement. Preventive supervision may include ethics audits, integrity monitoring systems, digital transparency platforms, periodic professional evaluations, and risk-based institutional supervision. Preventive accountability approaches are important for reducing ethical violations before institutional damage occurs.

Finally, broader institutional culture reform is necessary to strengthen ethical governance within prosecutorial institutions. Ethical values should become integral components of prosecutorial professionalism and institutional identity. Integrity-based leadership, continuous ethics education, merit-based institutional culture, and protection for internal whistleblowers may contribute significantly to sustainable prosecutorial accountability reform.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that Indonesia's prosecutorial supervisory system continues to face significant accountability challenges despite the existence of formal legal frameworks regulating prosecutorial ethics and institutional oversight. Addressing the accountability gap therefore requires multidimensional reform involving legal restructuring, institutional strengthening, transparency enhancement, preventive supervision, and ethical cultural transformation simultaneously.

4. Conclusion

This study concludes that prosecutorial supervision in Indonesia continues to experience significant accountability challenges despite the existence of formal legal and institutional frameworks regulating prosecutorial ethics, disciplinary enforcement, and institutional oversight. The findings demonstrate that Indonesia's prosecutorial supervisory system formally adopts a dual oversight structure consisting of internal supervision within the Attorney General's Office and external supervision through the Prosecutorial Commission. Normatively, this framework is intended to strengthen prosecutorial accountability, ethical professionalism, transparency, and institutional integrity within the criminal justice system.

However, the practical implementation of prosecutorial supervision reveals the existence of a substantial accountability gap between normative legal provisions and institutional reality. The study identifies several major factors contributing to this gap, including centralized supervisory authority, limited independence of external oversight institutions, fragmented institutional coordination, inconsistent disciplinary enforcement, weak transparency, and excessive prosecutorial discretion without effective accountability control. These structural and institutional weaknesses reduce the effectiveness of prosecutorial supervision and increase the risk of abuse of authority, selective prosecution, corruption, and ethical misconduct within prosecutorial institutions.

The findings further indicate that prosecutorial accountability in Indonesia remains predominantly reactive rather than preventive. Supervisory mechanisms frequently respond to ethical violations only after public complaints, media exposure, or political pressure emerge, while preventive monitoring systems and integrity-based accountability mechanisms remain underdeveloped. In addition, limited public access to disciplinary processes weakens transparency, external oversight, and public trust in prosecutorial institutions. Consequently, existing supervisory mechanisms often function administratively rather than substantively in promoting ethical governance and institutional accountability.

Based on these findings, this study argues that strengthening prosecutorial accountability requires comprehensive legal and institutional reform. Such reform should include strengthening the independence of supervisory institutions, improving transparency in disciplinary enforcement, enhancing coordination among oversight bodies, developing preventive accountability mechanisms, and promoting integrity-based institutional culture within prosecutorial institutions. Sustainable prosecutorial accountability cannot be achieved solely through formal regulations but also requires broader institutional transformation emphasizing ethical professionalism, transparency, democratic governance, and public accountability.

Theoretically, this study contributes to legal scholarship by introducing the accountability gap as an analytical framework for evaluating prosecutorial supervision and institutional governance within Indonesia's criminal justice system. Practically, the study provides policy-oriented recommendations for

strengthening prosecutorial oversight and improving ethical governance within prosecutorial institutions. Ultimately, effective prosecutorial accountability is essential not only for preserving institutional credibility but also for reinforcing public trust, legal certainty, democratic governance, and the rule of law in Indonesia.

Supplementary data

The authors confirm that the supplementary data are available within this article.

Data Availability Statement

No supplementary or additional datasets were generated in this study. The research was conducted using legal documents, statutory regulations, judicial ethics guidelines, institutional reports, and publicly accessible academic literature analyzed within the manuscript.

Declaration of Generative AI and AI-assisted Technologies

During the preparation of this manuscript, the authors used generative AI tools only to improve language clarity, grammar, and readability. The authors take full responsibility for the originality, accuracy, and integrity of the content of this manuscript.

Acknowledgments

This research received no external funding.
The authors would also like to express their appreciation to Universitas Tulungagung for academic support during the completion of this study.

Authors' contribution

Conceptualization, Galih Setya Refangga and Abdul Haq; methodology, Galih Setya Refangga; validation, Galih Setya Refangga, Abdul Haq, and Restu Adi Putra; formal analysis, Galih Setya Refangga; investigation, Galih Setya Refangga; resources, Abdul Haq; data curation, Restu Adi Putra; writing original draft preparation, Galih Setya Refangga; writing review and editing, Abdul Haq and Restu Adi Putra; visualization, Restu Adi Putra; supervision, Abdul Haq; project administration, Abdul Haq. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Conflicts of interests

The authors declare no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article.

Ethical statement

This study does not involve human participants, animal experiments, or clinical data. Therefore, ethical approval from an Ethics Committee or Institutional Review Board was not required. The research was conducted using publicly accessible legal documents, statutory regulations, institutional reports, and academic literature.

References

[1] Adhari M. Strengthening judicial oversight institutions in contemporary legal systems. J. Legal Governance. 2025, 12(2):145–162.
[2] Akbar R. Reforming judicial ethics in the digital era: Challenges and opportunities. Int. J. Law Soc. 2025, 9(1):33–48.
[3] Ali S, Rehman A. Institutional synergy and governance effectiveness in judicial systems. Global Governance Rev. 2025, 14(3):201–218.
[4] Amina R, Yusuf H, Prabowo D. Judicial integrity and global standards: Assessing compliance with the Bangalore Principles. Asian J. Comp. Law. 2025, 18(1):77–95.
[5] Appleby G. Transparency and accountability in judicial discipline. Legal Ethics Rev. 2025, 29(1):55–72.
[6] Ardono T, Hariyanti S. Transparency in judicial disciplinary processes and public trust. Indones. J. Law Policy. 2025, 6(2):101–118.
[7] Barroso LR, Campos Mello P. Judicial independence and technological oversight: Balancing autonomy and accountability. Comp. Const. Law J. 2025, 11(2):89–110.
[8] Cheong M. Ethical governance of artificial intelligence in public institutions. Technol. Soc. J. 2024, 8(4):233–249.
[9] Cravens M. Public disclosure and judicial discipline: Implications for accountability. J. Legal Stud. 2023, 52(3):412–430.
[10] Dar S, Khan M, Ali F. Big data analytics in governance: Enhancing institutional monitoring systems. J. Digital Governance. 2025, 7(1):65–82.
[11] Hanh NT. Consistency in judicial sanctions: A comparative perspective. Int. J. Legal Stud. 2025, 13(2):155–173.
[12] Hashmi R, Verma S. Cloud computing in public sector governance: Opportunities and risks. J. Inf. Policy. 2025, 10(1):44–60.
[13] Holland J, Gray C. Judicial discipline and accountability mechanisms. Law Policy Q. 2000, 22(4):389–407.
[14] Huchhanavar R. Independence in judicial disciplinary systems: A comparative analysis. J. Judicial Adm. 2022, 31(2):120–137.
[15] Isjayanto I, Bakti R. Institutional fragmentation in judicial oversight: Evidence from Indonesia. J. Southeast Asian Law. 2025, 10(1):88–105.
[16] Khan M, Ahmed S. Harmonization of judicial standards and procedural fairness. Int. Rev. Law. 2025, 15(2):210–228.
[17] Kumar V, Rastogi R. Inter-agency coordination in governance systems. Public Adm. Q. 2025, 49(1):73–95.
[18] Kurniawan A, Bimantya R. Clarity of ethical standards and judicial discipline. Indones. Law Rev. 2025, 15(1):25–41.
[19] Liu Y, Zhang H, Chen X. Early warning systems in governance: A predictive approach. Governance Policy J. 2025, 19(2):134–150.
[20] Maheswari D. Public complaints and judicial accountability in Indonesia. J. Legal Reform. 2025,

11(2):98–115.
[21] Maheswari D, Sharma K. Digital governance and judicial monitoring systems. Int. J. Public Adm. 2025, 48(5):412–429.
[22] Nazifah N, Rahman A, Siregar M. Organizational culture and ethical compliance in judicial institutions. J. Legal Sociology. 2025, 9(3):201–220.
[23] Peirone F. Rule of law and institutional trust: The role of judicial accountability. Eur. Law J. 2025, 31(1):66–84.
[24] Prado M. Institutional fragmentation and governance inefficiencies. World Dev. J. 2024, 162:106–120.
[25] Prastiwi R, Firmantoro E. Judicial misconduct and corruption cases in Indonesia. J. Anti-Corruption Stud. 2025, 8(1):55–70.