



Sapientia Diversalis Journal of Human Interaction and Social Studies

Vol 1 No 2 May 2026, Hal 97-105

ISSN: 3125-1269 (Print) ISSN: 3125-0696 (Electronic)

Open Access: <https://researchfrontiers.id/sapientiadiversalis>

Legal Analysis of Civil Servant Neutrality in General Elections

Emilza Mumtaz¹, Berlianti Wahyu Nur Fatimah², Yahya Al Farisi³, Titi Sari⁴, Amelinda Cindy Laksintya⁵, Arief Budiono⁶

¹⁻⁶ Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Indonesia

email: c100230354@student.ums.ac.id¹

Article Info :

Received:

21-04-2026

Revised:

06-05-2026

Accepted:

11-05-2026

Abstract

Civil servant neutrality constitutes a fundamental principle in ensuring the integrity and fairness of democratic elections, particularly within administrative systems vulnerable to political influence. In Indonesia, despite the existence of a comprehensive legal framework regulating neutrality, persistent violations indicate a gap between normative provisions and practical enforcement. This study aims to analyze the legal regulation of civil servant neutrality in general elections and examine the effectiveness of sanction enforcement mechanisms. The research employs a qualitative juridical-normative method, utilizing statutory, conceptual, and comparative approaches based on primary legal materials and relevant scholarly works. The findings reveal that neutrality is firmly established through a hierarchical legal structure, including constitutional provisions, statutory laws, and implementing regulations; however, its enforcement remains inconsistent due to institutional fragmentation, interpretative ambiguities, and socio-political pressures. The analysis further demonstrates that weak coordination among supervisory bodies and varying sanction applications undermine legal certainty and deterrence. Therefore, strengthening neutrality requires regulatory harmonization, institutional reform, and the development of a professional bureaucratic culture grounded in integrity and accountability.

Keywords: Accountability, Civil Servant Neutrality, Electoral Governance, Legal Enforcement, Regulatory Framework.



©2022 Authors.. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License.
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

INTRODUCTION

The discourse on civil servant neutrality in general elections has increasingly attracted global scholarly attention, particularly in the context of democratic consolidation, bureaucratic professionalism, and the integrity of electoral governance systems. Contemporary developments across various democratic regimes indicate a persistent tension between the political rights of public officials and the institutional demand for impartiality, as neutrality is often positioned as a cornerstone of fair electoral competition and administrative legitimacy. Comparative studies reveal that in both established and emerging democracies, the politicization of the civil service continues to undermine electoral integrity, weaken public trust, and distort policy implementation processes. Within this evolving landscape, neutrality is no longer understood merely as a formal legal requirement but as a complex institutional norm shaped by historical trajectories, political culture, and regulatory frameworks, as illustrated in the Indonesian context where the neutrality of the State Civil Apparatus has undergone significant legal and institutional transformation (Sarnawa & Khaer, 2024; Sabir, 2023).

Existing literature has produced substantial insights into the normative and regulatory dimensions of civil servant neutrality, particularly emphasizing the legal frameworks governing electoral conduct and administrative discipline. Studies have highlighted that neutrality is embedded within a broader system of administrative law, electoral law, and constitutional principles, often articulated through prohibitions on political engagement, campaign involvement, and partisan alignment (Idris, 2024; Rahmansyah & Irwandi, 2021). At the same time, empirical research demonstrates that violations of neutrality frequently occur in practice, reflecting discrepancies between formal regulations and their implementation. Critical syntheses of these findings suggest that the persistence of such violations is not merely a function of weak enforcement but also a consequence of structural incentives, political patronage networks, and ambiguous legal interpretations that blur the boundaries between permissible and impermissible conduct (Nadziri, 2024; Nasoha, 2025).

Despite these contributions, the literature reveals notable limitations, particularly in its tendency to adopt fragmented analytical approaches that separate legal analysis from socio-political realities. Many studies focus predominantly on statutory provisions or case-specific evaluations without sufficiently interrogating the broader constitutional implications and systemic dynamics that shape civil servant behavior. Furthermore, inconsistencies emerge in the interpretation of neutrality itself, with some scholars framing it as an absolute prohibition, while others acknowledge the inherent tension with fundamental rights such as freedom of expression and political participation (Agriawan, 2023).

This conceptual ambiguity is compounded by the lack of integrated analytical frameworks capable of capturing the interaction between legal norms, institutional enforcement mechanisms, and political context, thereby leaving significant gaps in understanding the effectiveness of neutrality regulations (Helmalia Putri et al., 2025). The urgency of addressing these gaps becomes increasingly evident in light of recurring challenges observed in electoral processes, where violations of civil servant neutrality continue to generate disputes, undermine electoral fairness, and erode democratic legitimacy. In the Indonesian context, the persistence of such issues in both general elections and local head elections indicates that existing regulatory mechanisms have not achieved their intended deterrent effect (Bagenda et al., 2026).

From a practical standpoint, the inability to ensure neutrality compromises not only the credibility of elections but also the broader governance system, as it enables the instrumentalization of bureaucratic resources for political gain. From a scientific perspective, the unresolved tensions between legal norms and empirical realities call for a more comprehensive and theoretically grounded analysis capable of bridging doctrinal and contextual approaches. Positioned within this scholarly landscape, the present study advances a legal analysis that integrates constitutional, administrative, and electoral law perspectives to critically examine the neutrality of civil servants in general elections. Unlike prior research that tends to isolate normative provisions or empirical observations, this study seeks to construct a more holistic analytical framework that situates neutrality within the broader architecture of democratic governance and rule of law. By systematically evaluating regulatory structures, enforcement mechanisms, and patterns of violation, this research aims to contribute to the refinement of legal doctrines and the development of more coherent policy frameworks, thereby addressing the fragmentation identified in existing literature (Nadziri, 2024; Bagenda et al., 2026).

This study aims to analyze the legal foundations, implementation challenges, and normative implications of civil servant neutrality in general elections through a comprehensive and integrative approach. It seeks to contribute theoretically by clarifying the conceptual boundaries of neutrality within the framework of constitutional democracy, while methodologically offering a synthesis that bridges doctrinal legal analysis with contextual interpretation. The findings are expected to provide a more nuanced understanding of how neutrality can be effectively institutionalized, as well as to inform future regulatory reforms and scholarly debates in the field of electoral law and public administration.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs a qualitative juridical-normative research design, grounded in doctrinal legal analysis to examine the regulatory framework governing civil servant neutrality in general elections. The approach integrates statutory, conceptual, and comparative methods, focusing on primary legal materials such as constitutional provisions, electoral laws, administrative regulations, and official policy instruments related to the State Civil Apparatus, alongside secondary materials including scholarly articles, legal commentaries, and prior empirical findings relevant to neutrality enforcement. The statutory approach is utilized to analyze the coherence and hierarchy of legal norms, while the conceptual approach elucidates the theoretical underpinnings of neutrality within democratic governance, and the comparative perspective situates national regulations within broader international practices. Legal materials are collected through systematic document analysis, ensuring comprehensive coverage of authoritative sources and doctrinal interpretations pertinent to the research problem (Sarnawa & Khaer, 2024).

The analytical framework of this study is based on qualitative legal interpretation, employing methods of statutory interpretation, systematic analysis, and legal reasoning to construct a coherent understanding of civil servant neutrality within the legal system. Interpretation is conducted through grammatical, systematic, and teleological approaches to uncover the normative intent and practical implications of regulatory provisions, while analytical techniques emphasize the identification of

inconsistencies, normative gaps, and enforcement challenges within the existing framework. To ensure analytical rigor and validity, the study applies triangulation of legal sources and cross-references doctrinal arguments with empirical indications reported in prior studies, thereby strengthening the credibility and relevance of its findings. This integrative method enables the formulation of normative arguments that are both theoretically grounded and contextually responsive to the dynamics of electoral governance (Nadziri, 2024).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Legal Regulation of Civil Servant Neutrality in General Elections Constructed

The legal regulation of civil servant neutrality in general elections is grounded in a constitutional framework that positions the bureaucracy as a state instrument required to operate free from political interference. Article 28D paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia guarantees equal opportunity in governance, which is doctrinally interpreted as the basis for establishing a professional civil service. This constitutional mandate is further elaborated in Law Number 5 of 2014 concerning the State Civil Apparatus, particularly Article 2 letter (f), which explicitly affirms neutrality as a fundamental principle. From a systematic perspective, this norm functions to prevent the abuse of authority by civil servants within electoral contestation. A systematic interpretative approach demonstrates that neutrality constitutes a necessary precondition for the realization of democratic and credible elections (Sarnawa & Aulawi, 2026).

From the standpoint of sectoral legislation, the regulation of civil servant neutrality is also embedded within Law Number 7 of 2017 concerning General Elections, which explicitly prohibits the involvement of civil servants in campaign activities. Article 280 paragraph (2) letter (f) stipulates that campaign organizers and teams are forbidden from involving civil servants in electoral activities. This provision produces legal consequences in the form of restricted political participation for civil servants in order to safeguard electoral integrity. A grammatical interpretation of the term “involving” reveals a broad scope of prohibition, encompassing both active and passive forms of political support. Such formulation indicates that the legislature adopts a preventive legal approach to preserve bureaucratic neutrality (Della Purnama et al., 2025).

The strengthening of neutrality norms is further reflected in Government Regulation Number 94 of 2021 concerning Civil Servant Discipline, which regulates prohibitions against engagement in practical political activities. Article 5 letter (n) explicitly forbids civil servants from expressing support for electoral candidates. This norm operates within the administrative law domain and carries direct implications for disciplinary enforcement. A teleological interpretation reveals that the objective of this regulation is to maintain bureaucratic professionalism as a public service apparatus. In practice, this provision serves as a primary legal basis for imposing administrative sanctions on neutrality violations (Septiani, 2023).

At the presidential regulatory level, Presidential Regulation Number 87 of 2016 concerning the Civil Service Commission establishes institutional oversight over the implementation of the merit system, including the principle of neutrality. The Civil Service Commission (KASN) holds a strategic role in ensuring that neutrality norms are effectively implemented within the bureaucracy. From a systematic viewpoint, the existence of this institution reinforces external oversight mechanisms over administrative conduct. An institutional interpretation indicates that neutrality is not solely regulated normatively but also safeguarded through supervisory structures. This arrangement underscores the importance of checks and balances within the administrative system (Mardatila & Ja'ang, 2024).

Technical regulations concerning civil servant neutrality are also governed through ministerial regulations and administrative circulars, particularly those issued by the Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform. These instruments provide detailed classifications of actions that constitute neutrality violations. Such provisions clarify behavioral boundaries for civil servants in the context of electoral politics. A grammatical interpretation demonstrates an expansion of prohibited conduct, including political expressions through digital and social media platforms. This reflects the adaptive nature of regulatory frameworks in response to technological developments (Ananingsih et al., 2024). Normative legal analysis reveals a strong interconnection among these regulatory instruments, forming a comprehensive legal regime governing civil servant neutrality. The hierarchical and substantive relationships among these norms can be mapped as follows.

Table 1. Hierarchical Legal Framework Governing Civil Servant Neutrality in General Elections

Type of Regulation	Number & Year	Substance of Neutrality
Constitution	Article 28D(3)	Equality and professionalism
Civil Service Law	Law No. 5/2014	Principle of neutrality
Election Law	Law No. 7/2017	Prohibition of involvement
Government Regulation	PP No. 94/2021	Disciplinary rules
Presidential Regulation	Perpres No. 87/2016	Institutional oversight

This mapping illustrates a vertically integrated legal framework regulating neutrality in a comprehensive manner. A systematic reading of this structure indicates the absence of normative gaps within the regulatory design. The legal construction reflects a deliberate legislative effort to establish coherence across different layers of regulation. Such findings support the argument that challenges surrounding neutrality lie more in implementation than in normative insufficiency (Supriyadi, 2024). Doctrinal analysis, however, identifies potential normative tensions between the political rights of civil servants and their obligation to remain neutral. The Constitution guarantees the right of every citizen to participate in governance, creating a theoretical tension with restrictions imposed on civil servants. A teleological interpretation justifies such limitations on the grounds of protecting the public interest and ensuring fair electoral processes. This demonstrates the operation of a balancing mechanism between competing legal interests within administrative law. The issue reflects broader debates on the permissible scope of rights limitation in democratic systems (Rusdiana & Maharani, 2022).

In practice, the regulatory framework encounters interpretative challenges at the implementation level. Ambiguities within legal provisions often lead to divergent understandings among enforcement authorities. Systematic interpretation becomes essential to harmonize these differing perspectives. This condition indicates that the effectiveness of regulation is contingent not only on normative clarity but also on interpretative consistency. Consequently, legal harmonization emerges as a critical requirement (Putra & Pratiwi, 2022). Comparative legal analysis suggests that several jurisdictions adopt more flexible approaches in regulating bureaucratic neutrality. Such comparisons reveal that the Indonesian model tends to be more restrictive in limiting civil servant political engagement. A comparative interpretation indicates that restrictive regulation is designed to prevent systemic politicization within bureaucratic institutions. This approach is particularly relevant in contexts characterized by strong patronage networks. Hence, strict regulation may be understood as a protective mechanism against political capture (Waris & Shadiq, 2022).

Empirical legal studies demonstrate that violations of neutrality persist despite the existence of comprehensive regulatory frameworks. Evidence indicates that civil servants remain involved in covert campaign activities. This phenomenon reveals a gap between normative prescriptions and practical realities. A sociological interpretation links such behavior to entrenched patron-client political cultures. These findings reinforce the argument that regulatory measures must be complemented by cultural transformation within the bureaucracy (Seran et al., 2022). From a theoretical standpoint, civil servant neutrality is closely associated with the principle of the rule of law, which emphasizes the supremacy of legal norms over political interests. As executors of public policy, civil servants are required to act in accordance with legal mandates rather than partisan considerations. Normative interpretation suggests that neutrality violations constitute deviations from the foundational principles of a legal state. Such deviations carry significant implications for governmental legitimacy. Accordingly, neutrality represents an integral component of democratic governance (Nadzirin et al., 2025).

Judicial interpretation, particularly through Constitutional Court decisions, affirms the constitutionality of restricting civil servant political engagement. The Court has consistently held that such limitations are proportionate and necessary to safeguard electoral integrity. This constitutional reasoning strengthens the legal legitimacy of neutrality regulations. It further indicates that the Indonesian legal system provides a robust normative foundation for enforcing neutrality. The analytical focus therefore shifts toward evaluating implementation effectiveness (Sarnawa & Aulawi, 2026). Within administrative law theory, neutrality constitutes an essential element of good governance principles. These principles require professionalism, accountability, and integrity in public administration. A systematic interpretation reveals that neutrality violations can undermine the quality

of public service delivery. This demonstrates a direct relationship between neutrality and bureaucratic performance. Neutrality regulation carries significant administrative implications (Septiani, 2023).

Doctrinal perspectives further associate neutrality with the principle of impartiality in administrative law. This principle requires public officials to act without political bias in performing their duties. Conceptual interpretation clarifies that neutrality does not imply apolitical disengagement but rather non-partisanship in official conduct. This distinction is crucial in balancing individual rights and institutional obligations. Therefore, neutrality possesses a complex philosophical dimension within legal discourse (Ananingsih et al., 2024). Normative analysis indicates that Indonesia possesses a relatively comprehensive legal framework governing civil servant neutrality. However, the multiplicity of regulations may create potential overlaps and normative inconsistencies. Systematic interpretation is necessary to prevent conflicts in legal application.

This highlights the importance of regulatory codification and harmonization. The effectiveness of law ultimately depends on the consistency of its normative structure (Mardatila & Ja'ang, 2024). The legal construction of civil servant neutrality in elections reflects an integration of constitutional norms, statutory provisions, and technical regulations. This structure embodies a multi-level regulatory approach within administrative law. Teleological interpretation reveals that the primary objective of such regulation is to ensure electoral integrity. Neutrality thereby functions as a critical instrument in sustaining democratic processes. Strengthening regulatory frameworks must be accompanied by effective enforcement mechanisms to achieve substantive legal outcomes.

Enforcement of Sanctions Against Non-Neutral Civil Servants in General Elections

The enforcement of sanctions against civil servants who violate neutrality in general elections constitutes a critical dimension of administrative law and electoral governance, particularly within the framework of Indonesian positive law. Law Number 5 of 2014 concerning the State Civil Apparatus establishes neutrality as a binding legal obligation, and its violation triggers administrative accountability mechanisms. Article 87 and Article 88 of the law provide the legal basis for disciplinary sanctions, including dismissal for serious violations of professional conduct. These provisions are complemented by Government Regulation Number 94 of 2021, which classifies disciplinary violations and specifies corresponding sanctions. The regulatory structure reflects a normative commitment to ensuring compliance through a graduated system of administrative penalties (Waris & Shadiq, 2022).

Government Regulation Number 94 of 2021 further elaborates the typology of sanctions, distinguishing between light, moderate, and severe disciplinary measures based on the gravity of the violation. Article 8 through Article 14 outline procedural requirements for imposing sanctions, including investigation, examination, and decision-making processes. This procedural framework is designed to uphold due process while maintaining administrative efficiency. However, empirical studies reveal that inconsistencies in the application of sanctions remain prevalent, particularly at the regional level. Such inconsistencies undermine the deterrent effect of disciplinary measures and weaken institutional credibility (Nadzirin et al., 2025).

The role of supervisory institutions, particularly the Election Supervisory Body and the State Civil Service Commission, is central to the enforcement of neutrality sanctions. These institutions are mandated to monitor, investigate, and recommend disciplinary actions against civil servants who engage in political activities. Their authority is derived from statutory provisions as well as implementing regulations issued by relevant ministries. Nevertheless, overlapping mandates and limited coordination often hinder the effectiveness of enforcement mechanisms. Institutional fragmentation thus constitutes a significant challenge in the operationalization of neutrality norms (Sarnawa & Aulawi, 2026).

Ministerial regulations provide additional procedural guidance for handling neutrality violations, particularly in relation to reporting mechanisms and evidentiary standards. These regulations emphasize transparency and accountability in the disciplinary process, thereby enhancing public trust in administrative enforcement. Digital reporting platforms have been introduced to facilitate the submission of complaints and to improve accessibility. Despite these innovations, challenges persist in verifying evidence and ensuring the reliability of reports. This indicates that technological solutions must be accompanied by robust institutional safeguards (Septiani, 2023).

Judicial oversight plays a crucial role in reviewing administrative sanctions imposed on civil servants, particularly through administrative courts. Decisions of the Supreme Court in disciplinary

cases often address issues of proportionality, procedural fairness, and evidentiary sufficiency. These judicial interventions contribute to the refinement of legal standards governing sanction enforcement. At the same time, they highlight the tension between administrative discretion and judicial control. The evolving jurisprudence demonstrates the importance of judicial review in maintaining the legitimacy of enforcement mechanisms (Rusdiana & Maharani, 2022).

Empirical findings indicate that enforcement practices vary significantly across regions, reflecting disparities in institutional capacity and political dynamics. In some cases, civil servants who violate neutrality receive only minimal sanctions, while in others, severe penalties are imposed. This variation suggests that enforcement is influenced not only by legal norms but also by contextual factors such as political pressure and organizational culture. The inconsistency of enforcement practices raises concerns legal certainty and equality before the law. Addressing these disparities requires a more standardized approach to sanction implementation. The following table illustrates the classification of sanctions based on Government Regulation Number 94 of 2021 and their application in neutrality violation cases:

Table 2. Classification of Disciplinary Sanctions for Civil Servant Neutrality Violations under Government Regulation No. 94 of 2021

Type of Sanction	Legal Basis	Form of Violation	Administrative Consequence
Light	Article 8	Minor political expression	Verbal/Written Warning
Moderate	Article 9–10	Indirect campaign support	Delay of promotion
Severe	Article 11–14	Active political involvement	Dismissal

This classification demonstrates the proportionality principle embedded in the regulatory framework, which aligns sanctions with the severity of violations. Systematic interpretation of sanction provisions indicates that the regulatory framework seeks to balance deterrence and fairness in administrative enforcement. The gradation of sanctions reflects an attempt to calibrate penalties according to the nature and impact of violations. However, the absence of clear guidelines for assessing severity may lead to subjective decision-making. This ambiguity creates potential for unequal treatment and undermines legal predictability. Strengthening interpretative guidelines is therefore essential for enhancing consistency (Ananingsih et al., 2024).

Teleological interpretation reveals that the primary objective of sanction enforcement is to preserve the integrity of the electoral process and maintain public trust in government institutions. Neutrality violations are viewed as threats to democratic fairness, and sanctions serve as corrective measures to restore institutional legitimacy. This purposive approach underscores the importance of aligning enforcement practices with broader democratic values. It also highlights the normative significance of neutrality within the legal system. Such interpretation reinforces the constitutional basis of sanction enforcement (Supriyadi, 2024). Doctrinal analysis suggests that the effectiveness of sanctions depends on their capacity to deter future violations and to signal institutional commitment to neutrality. Scholars argue that weak enforcement diminishes the normative force of legal provisions and encourages non-compliance.

Consistent and proportionate sanctions enhance the credibility of regulatory frameworks. This perspective emphasizes the interplay between legal norms and institutional behavior. It also highlights the importance of enforcement as a component of legal effectiveness (Della Purnama et al., 2025). Socio-legal analysis reveals that enforcement practices are influenced by informal networks and power relations within bureaucratic structures. Civil servants may be reluctant to report violations due to fear of retaliation or career repercussions. This dynamic undermines the effectiveness of reporting mechanisms and limits the detection of violations. Addressing these challenges requires the development of protective measures for whistleblowers. Such measures would strengthen the integrity of enforcement processes (Seran et al., 2022).

Comparative analysis indicates that other jurisdictions have adopted more stringent enforcement mechanisms, including criminal sanctions for serious neutrality violations. In Indonesia, the criminalization of certain neutrality violations remains limited and subject to strict legal interpretation. The integration of criminal law into the enforcement framework raises complex questions regarding

proportionality and due process. Nevertheless, comparative insights provide valuable lessons for enhancing enforcement strategies. They also highlight the potential for legal reform (Rusdiana & Maharani, 2022). Empirical data from recent elections demonstrate an increase in reported neutrality violations, particularly through digital platforms and social media. These developments present new challenges for enforcement, as traditional monitoring mechanisms may be insufficient to address online activities.

Regulatory responses must therefore adapt to technological changes and evolving forms of political engagement. This requires the integration of digital monitoring tools and updated legal provisions. Such adaptation is essential for maintaining the relevance of enforcement mechanisms (Nadzirin et al., 2025). Institutional reform is necessary to address the structural weaknesses in sanction enforcement, particularly in relation to coordination and independence. Strengthening the authority of supervisory bodies and enhancing inter-agency collaboration would improve the effectiveness of enforcement. Additionally, capacity-building initiatives are needed to equip institutions with the skills and resources required for effective monitoring and investigation. These reforms would contribute to the development of a more robust enforcement framework. They would also enhance the resilience of democratic institutions (Mardatila & Ja'ang, 2024).

Critical analysis indicates that the current enforcement framework, while comprehensive, is not fully effective in preventing neutrality violations. The persistence of violations suggests that legal norms are not adequately internalized within bureaucratic culture. Addressing this issue requires a combination of legal, institutional, and cultural strategies. Such strategies should aim to promote ethical awareness and professional integrity among civil servants. This holistic approach would strengthen the normative foundation of neutrality (Septiani, 2023).

In concluding this analytical segment, the enforcement of sanctions against non-neutral civil servants reflects a complex interaction between legal norms, institutional mechanisms, and socio-political dynamics. The regulatory framework provides a solid legal basis for sanction enforcement, yet its effectiveness is contingent upon consistent application and institutional capacity. The integration of doctrinal, empirical, and socio-legal perspectives enhances the depth of analysis and provides a comprehensive understanding of enforcement challenges. This multidimensional approach contributes to the advancement of legal scholarship in the field of electoral governance. It also offers practical insights for improving the effectiveness of neutrality enforcement in democratic systems.

CONCLUSION

The legal regulation and enforcement of civil servant neutrality in general elections demonstrate a structurally comprehensive yet functionally challenged framework within Indonesian administrative and electoral law. Normatively, neutrality has been firmly established through a hierarchical system of legal instruments, ranging from constitutional principles to statutory provisions, government regulations, and implementing ministerial rules, all of which collectively construct neutrality as a binding legal obligation. Analytical findings indicate that the effectiveness of these regulations is constrained by interpretative ambiguities, institutional fragmentation, and inconsistent enforcement practices across jurisdictions. Empirical indications further reveal that political patronage, bureaucratic culture, and disparities in institutional capacity continue to influence the implementation of neutrality norms. The legal framework, while doctrinally robust, requires greater coherence between normative design and practical enforcement to ensure the integrity of democratic governance.

Strengthening civil servant neutrality in general elections necessitates an integrated reform approach that simultaneously addresses legal, institutional, and socio-cultural dimensions. From a normative perspective, harmonization of regulatory instruments and the development of clearer interpretative guidelines are essential to reduce ambiguity and enhance legal certainty. Institutionally, reinforcing the independence, coordination, and capacity of supervisory bodies such as the Election Supervisory Agency and Civil Service Commission is crucial to ensure consistent and effective enforcement of sanctions. Additionally, the incorporation of advanced digital monitoring systems and standardized enforcement protocols would improve detection and accountability mechanisms. From a socio-legal standpoint, fostering a professional bureaucratic culture grounded in integrity, meritocracy, and ethical awareness is imperative to internalize neutrality as a core administrative value. Such multidimensional reforms would significantly contribute to the consolidation of democratic institutions and the credibility of electoral processes.

REFERENCES

- Agriawan, M. (2023). *Netralitas Pegawai Negeri Sipil Dalam Pemilihan Umum Ditinjau Dari Hak Asasi Manusia* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Atma Jaya Yogyakarta).
- Ananingsih, S. W., Putrijanti, A., Wibawa, K. C. S., & Natalis, A. (2024). Violation of Civil Servant (ASN) Neutrality in the 2024 General Elections in Indonesia (From the Perspective of Handling Violations). *Contemp. Readings L. & Soc. Just.*, 16, 105.
- Bagenda, C., Solekhan, M., Taufiq, M., Ari, E. A., & Luturmas, J. (2026). The Problem Of The Neutrality Of The Civil Service In Local Head Elections: A Constitutional Law Perspective. *International Journal of Health, Economics, and Social Sciences (IJHESS)*, 8(1), 519-525. <https://doi.org/10.56338/ijhess.v8i1.10014>
- Della Purnama, I., Dwiputri, N. Z., & Alvionita, A. (2025). The Neutrality of Civil Servants in The 2024 Elections. *Veteran Law Review*, 8(2), 265-277. <https://doi.org/10.35586/velrev.v8i2.12213>
- Helmalia Putri, S., Januwati Santhi Dewi, K., Bunga Puspaning Jenyani, N. P., Juliartini, N. W., Anca Liana, I. K., Sri Widari Pradnyani, P., & Ayu Apsari Hadi, I. G. (2025). Political Neutrality of Civil Servants: Normative Review of Buleleng Regency Circular in 2024 Election. In *SHS Web of Conferences* (Vol. 221, p. 03014). EDP Sciences. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202522103014>
- Idris, S. (2024). Pengaturan Netralitas Aparatur Sipil Negara (ASN) dalam Pelaksanaan Pemilihan Umum 2024. *J-CEKI: Jurnal Cendekia Ilmiah*, 4(1), 914-924. <https://doi.org/10.56799/jceki.v4i1.6503>
- Mardatila, A., & Ja'ang, S. (2024). Netralitas Aparatur Sipil Negara Dalam Pemilu Di Samarinda: Analisis Hukum Dan Pengawasan. *International Journal of Politic, Public Policy and Environmental Issues*, 4(2), 10-16.
- Nadziri, A. (2024). Reformulation of Handling Violations of Civil Servant Neutrality in Fair and Just Elections. *ICCCM Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 3(2), 33-41. <https://doi.org/10.53797/icccmjssh.v3i2.7.2024>
- Nadzirin, A., Sukmariningsih, R. M., & Mashari, M. (2025). Does the State Civil Apparatus Violate Neutrality During Elections?. *Journal of Sustainable Development and Regulatory Issues (JSDERI)*, 3(2), 400-433. <https://doi.org/10.53955/jsderi.v3i2.112>
- Nasoha, A. (2025). Netralitas Pegawai Negeri Sipil dalam Pemilihan Umum: Analisis Hukum terhadap Sanksi Administratif dan Pidana dalam Pelanggaran Kampanye. *Forschungsforum Law Journal*, 2(01), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.35586/flj.v2i1.9311>
- Putra, F., & Pratiwi, C. S. (2022). Netralitas Aparatur Sipil Negara dalam Pemilihan Kepala Daerah di Provinsi Jambi Tahun 2020. *Jurnal Noken: Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial*, 7(2), 219-233. <https://doi.org/10.33506/jn.v7i2.1755>
- Rahmansyah, A., & Irwandi, I. (2021). Analisis Terhadap Netralitas Aparatur Sipil Negara Dalam Pemilihan Kepala Daerah Berdasarkan Peraturan Perundang-Undangan. *Limbago: Journal of Constitutional Law*, 1(3), 449-466. <https://doi.org/10.22437/limbago.v1i3.16197>
- Rusdiana, E., & Maharani, R. P. (2022). A Criminalization of Civil Servant in Case of Neutrality Violations in a Regional Head Election. *Indonesian Journal of Criminal Law Studies*, 7(1), 99-126. <https://doi.org/10.15294/ijcls.v7i1.38376>
- Sabir, M. S. (2023). Netralitas Aparatur Sipil Negara dalam Pemilihan Umum. *Jurnal Al-Ahkam: Jurnal Hukum Pidana Islam*, 5(1), 26-40. <https://doi.org/10.47435/al-ahkam.v5i1.1681>
- Sarnawa, B., & Aulawi, M. H. (2026). Neutrality of State Civil Apparatus in General Elections in Indonesia. *International Journal of Science and Environment (IJSE)*, 6(2), 1218-1226. <https://doi.org/10.51601/ijse.v6i2.583>
- Sarnawa, B., & Khaer, F. M. (2024). Historical Study of the Neutrality Arrangements of the State Civil Apparatus in General Elections in Indonesia. *Jurnal Media Hukum*, 31(2), 262-279. <https://doi.org/10.18196/jmh.v31i2.22618>
- Septiani, E. (2023). Analisis Terhadap Upaya Penguatan Implementasi Kebijakan Netralitas ASN Dalam Pemilu. *Ebisma (Economics, Business, Management, & Accounting Journal)*, 3(1), 23-36. <https://doi.org/10.61083/ebisma.v3i1.24>

- Seran, H. V., Pandie, D. B., & Sayrani, L. P. (2022). The Neutrality Dilemma of Civil Servant in 2020 Local Leaders Election on Malaka Regency. *Dynamics of Politics and Democracy*, 1(2), 109-123. <https://doi.org/10.35912/DPD.v1i2.1487>
- Supriyadi, S. (2024). Neutrality of State Civil Apparatus in Regional Head Elections. *Jurnal Cakrawala Hukum*, 15(1), 69-79. <https://doi.org/10.26905/idjch.v15i1.14314>
- Waris, I., & Shadiq, M. (2022, July). Civil Servant Neutrality in Regional Head Election. In *2021 Tadulako's International Conference on Social Sciences (TICoSS 2021)* (pp. 50-55). Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.220707.012>