

# Schemas of Gratification and Gratification Situation Assessment in Common People

Alfikalia, Handrix Chris Haryanto, Tia Rahmania, and Muhammad Iqbal  
*Universitas Paramadina*

**Keywords:** Schemas, Gratification, Corruption

**Abstract:** The purpose of this research is to study common people's understanding of gratification and their assessment of gratification situations. The research method used in this study is a qualitative-inductive content analysis that coded and categorized the respondents' answers to several open-ended questions in an online-distributed questionnaire. The coding of the themes from the respondent's answer was grouped into categories, and then abstraction of the themes was performed. The data analyzed came from 72 respondents, 30 women, and 42 men, with age range from 24 - 70 years and the range of education was between junior high school to a doctoral degree. Respondents also came from different regions in Indonesia. The results of the content analysis will look at the themes that emerge from respondents' answers regarding respondents' definitions of gratification and whether respondents view a given situation as a form of gratification or not. The paper will also discuss how respondents' schema on gratification could be related to how they assessed the gratification-related situation.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The terminology of gratification was only recognized in the Indonesian criminal law since 2001, through Law No. 20 of 2001 concerning Amendments to Law No. 31 of 1999 on Eradication of The Criminal Act of Corruption (KPK, 2015). The law, through articles 12B and 12C, regulates criminal threats for every civil servant/state official who accepts all forms of unauthorized giving in carrying out his duties, or is called gratification that is considered a bribe, and does not report it to the Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi (KPK/Commission on The Eradication of Corruption) within 30 days work.

Explanation of Law No. 20 of 2001 defines gratification as a gift in the broadest sense. This means that all gifts received by civil servants or state apparatus are gratification. On the other hand, however, there is an emphasis on Article 12B that gratification can be considered bribes when related to his position and contrary to his obligations or duties, and Article 12C is further strengthened by the statement that criminal penalties do not apply if the gratification is submitted to the KPK within a maximum of 30 days. It can also be concluded from this regulation that The KPK regulates that

gratification may be accepted by civil servants/state apparatus if they are not related to their positions and do not conflict with their duties. Civil servants/state apparatus will not be subject to the consequences of the criminal act of gratification if they report the gift within a maximum period of 30 days.

Law regarding gratification as a form of corruption then has an impact on handling corruption cases. There are some cases where civil servants or state apparatus. A popular case related to corruption gratuity, which is one of the references, is the case of Gayus Halomohan Partahanan Tambunan (KPK, 2015). Based on the KPK Anti-corruption Clearing House website, it is known that the cases with a permanent legal force (*inkracht*) in 2017 were 84 cases, and most of them were cases of gratification to civil servants/state apparatus (*Perkara yang berkekuatan Hukum Tetap (Inkracht) 2017, n.d*)

KPK realizes that sociologically, giving or receiving gifts is a natural thing in social interactions, and is neutral (Tamagola, 2009; Sinaga, 2009; in KPK, 2015). But what must be considered is that if the practice of gift-giving takes place in a power relationship and there is also an interest in it, the neutrality disappears (Tamagola, 2009; in KPK, 2015). Gifts-giving that occurs in a work-and-position relationship can affect the assessment of civil

servants/state apparatus who have certain responsibilities towards individuals/ institutions that provide gratification. In turn, the gift provided can then make public servants/state apparatus could not carry out their responsibilities objectively. Therefore, KPK carries out socialization to the public in various forms, related to gratification as a criminal act of corruption.

The KPK as an institution does not only have a function of enforcing corruption, but also a function of prevention. Corruption prevention efforts are realized with the presence of Deputy for Prevention, whose function is the implementation of corruption prevention through anti-corruption education, dissemination of corruption eradication, and anti-corruption campaign (Office of Deputy for Prevention, 2017). In relation to gratification as a criminal act of corruption, this prevention function is carried out by several directorates within the Deputy for Prevention, including the Directorate of Gratification and the Directorate of Education and Community Services (Dikyanmas).

One of the efforts to prevent gratification is by involving community participation. In the Pedoman Pengendalian Gratifikasi KPK (KPK Guidelines for Controlling Gratification) (2015), it is stated that one tangible form of the role of the community in controlling gratification is by not giving gratification to civil servants or state apparatus. A concrete example presented in the guideline is by not giving gratification in the form of goods or money to the teacher when taking a child's report card. According to the KPK, by not providing goods or money, it means that parents or guardians have taken commendable steps and respect the dignity of civil servants, in this case, teachers.

The teacher is also one of the positions in public services in the field of education. Public service itself is one of the elements that has become the focus of the KPK in gratification control. KPK expects public officials to play a role in running the gratification control system (KPK, 2015). Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services in article 1 (1) states that elements of public service consist of:

- 1) Activities/series of activities undertaken
- 2) in the framework of meeting service needs in accordance with statutory regulations,
- 3) for each citizen and resident, in the
- 4) form of goods, services, and / or administrative services
- 5) provided by public service providers.

The public service providers referred to in this law are all state-run institutions, corporations, independent institutions established under the law for

public service activities, and other legal entities solely for public service activities. In this case, the public service provider could be a government agency, a regionally owned business entity, or an institution whose financial source is not from the government, but its availability is important for the country.

Based on the previous elaboration, we can see that in the prevention of gratification, the KPK is targeting the public not to provide gratification in the context of public services. The KPK in its campaign through the community or anti-corruption extension worker (penyuluh antikorupsi) encouraged participants to rethink the gratification situation they were facing. For example, when student participants of the Community Service Program (KKN) visit the village head's house and are served food, should we accept the food or reject it? If those who come are not KKN participants, will the village head provide food? On the other hand, giving to public service officers, such as teachers or doctors, is still conducted with the motive as a thank you.

Looking at the phenomena in the community related to gratification, it appears that the community has a certain understanding of gratification. What is understood cognitively about a concept can affect the way they think about behavior. One way to see an individual's understanding of something is to look at his schema.

Sternberg and Sternberg (2011) suggested that the schema is a mental framework for organizing knowledge. The schema will help individuals create a meaningful structure of related concepts. Sternberg and Sternberg (2011) summarize some characteristics of schema:

- Can include other schemas
- Usually include general matters, which can vary from one event to another.
- Have different levels of abstraction.

The schema that a person has will affect how he/she responds.

In this paper, we will discuss what common people's schema of gratification is and how they view samples of gift-giving situations that can be considered as gratification.

## 2 RESEARCH METHODS

The data analyzed came from 72 respondents, 30 women and 42 men, with an age range of 24 - 70 years old ( $\bar{x} = 40$ ), from an open-ended question in a questionnaire given online. The respondent's education range from junior high school to a doctoral degree, with the majority of the respondent, has a

master's degree as their highest level of education (43.1%; N = 31). Respondents live in Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, and Bekasi (Jabodetabek), and 16 other provinces in Indonesia, with the majority of the respondents, live in Jabodetabek (41.7%; N = 30). All respondents had used public services such as administrative, education, and health services.

The analysis was carried out on respondents' answers to the following questions: "According to you, what is gratification?" Respondents were also given a description of the situation in which gifts (money, gold, or gift term in general) were given to public service personnel, such as teachers, medical doctors, parking officers, or public service personnel in the government office. Respondents were then asked whether the situation can be classified as gratification or not. There are three choices of answers, namely: yes, no, and it depends. Respondents were then asked to give reasons for their response.

Data processing used in the research is an inductive-qualitative content analysis approach from Ello & Kyngäs (2008). The stages in this approach started with the process of open coding, continue to categorization, and ended with abstraction. The open coding phase directs researchers to make notes in the form of certain keywords related to the answers of respondents. In the categorization stage, the researcher will later group the answers according to the initial categories that appear based on the keywords that have been obtained in the open coding process. The grouping of categories will later build to a final conclusion based on a research question, which in this case, is an abstraction process. To get good research results in an inductive qualitative approach to content analysis, it can use existing standards in qualitative approaches in general (Cho & Lee, 2014). In this research, it directs to the intercoder agreement process in the form of a re-examination and cross-examination process between researchers to be able to obtain an agreement regarding the answers to respondents in the analysis process (Creswell, 2009).

### 3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### 3.1 Results

Results from the content of the analysis of the question "According to you, what is gratification?", Table 1 will show the results of the groupings of the following themes:

Table 1: Themes on the concept of gratification.

| No  | Themes   | N  | %     |
|-----|--|----|-------|
| 1.  | A gift which can affect its recipient                  | 38 | 52.7  |
| 2.  | Gift   | 4  | 5.5   |
| 3.  | A gift that may affect civil servant as the recipients | 3  | 4.17  |
| 4.  | Gifts as a form of thank-you                           | 3  | 4.17  |
| 5.  | Accept things which are not his/her right              | 3  | 4.17  |
| 6.  | Gift related to positions                              | 3  | 4.17  |
| 7.  | Gifts to a civil servant                               | 2  | 2.78  |
| 8.  | Excessive gifts  | 2  | 2.78  |
| 9.  | Unofficial gifts                                       | 1  | 1.38  |
| 10. | Unnecessary gifts                                      | 1  | 1.38  |
| 11. | Gifts that can be good, but can also be bad            | 1  | 1.38  |
| 12. | Others   | 11 | 15.28 |

This grouping shows that there are 11 themes that can be grouped from respondents' answers. There is also another theme named 'others' because the respondent's answer does not answer the question or irrelevant (N = 11; 15.28%).

Most respondents understood gratification as a gift that can affect its recipient (N = 38; 52.7%). In the second place, there is an understanding of gratification as a gift (N = 4; 5.5%). There are 4 themes with the same number of respondents, namely gifts that can affect civil servant as the recipients, gifts as a form of gratitude, accept things which are not his/her right, and gifts due to the position (N = 3; 4.17%). Other themes identified have fewer respondents.

The results of the analysis of the identification of respondents whether a situation is classified as gratification or not, shown in the following table:

Table 2: Identification of gift-giving situations as gratification.

| Situation  | %     |       |       |
|--|-------|-------|-------|
|  | Yes   | No    | D1    |
| 1) Parents present the gift to the homeroom teacher when taking report cards   | 33.3  | 37.5  | 29.17 |
| 2) The parents' association agrees to present gifts of 2 grams of gold to teachers at the school at the end of the school year | 27.8  | 40.3  | 31.9  |
| 3) Giving to doctors who routinely conduct health examination due to chronic illness suffered                                  | 29.16 | 45.83 | 25    |

|   |       |       |       |
|---|-------|-------|-------|
| 4) Giving tip money to parking officers in shopping centers/offices that have a No tipping policy   | 51.38 | 29.17 | 19.44 |
| 5) Giving money to thank public service officers in government offices that have helped your business, even though the officers did not ask | 70.83 | 18.05 | 11.11 |

1 D = It Depends

In situation 1, 37.5% (N=27) of respondents answered that the situation is not a situation of gratification, 33.3% (N=24) of respondents said that the situation is a situation of gratification, and 29.17% (N=21) respondents answered it depends. The variety of the reasons in the 'it depends' answer was as follows: it depended on the intention of the giver when the gift was given, and it also depends on the purpose and the amount of the gifts. Those who answered that situation 1 was not a gratification situation was largely because the report card could not be changed anymore, so the gift could not be considered as gratification.

In Situation 2, 40.3% (N=29) of respondents stated that the situation was not a gratification situation, 31.9% (N=23) said it depends, and 27.8% (N=20) stated that the situation was a gratification situation. Some of the reasons that situation 2 is not a gratification situation are partly because it was agreed upon, all teachers were given, because the assessment process was finished, and it was given as a thank you.

In situation 3, 45.83% (N=33) of respondents stated that the situation was not a gratification situation. 29.16% (N=21) of respondents stated that the situation was a situation of gratification, and 25% (N=18) answered 'it depends.' The reasons respondents answered 'no' included, among others, that it was a thank-you gift, there was an emotional bond, the doctor was not a civil servant, or because it did not affect anything. Those who say "yes" on the grounds that it can change the quality of the doctor's services, or it was the doctor's responsibility.

In situation 4, 51.38% (N=37) stated that the situation was a gratification situation. 29.17% (N=21) answered "no", and 19.44% (N=14) of respondents answered "it depends." Some of the reason for answering 'yes' was partly because in situation 4 there were already clear rules, because they could violate the rules or because some of the customers they will be privileged because they give a tip. It shows that

compared to situations 1, 2, and 3, there were more people who answered 'yes' in situation 4.

In situation 5, 70.83% (N=51) answered that the situation was a gratification situation, 18.05% (N=13) stated that the situation was not the situation, and 11.11% (N= 8) answered 'it depends.' Some of the reasons for the 'yes' answer was that it was their responsibility, it would not be professional for them to receive money, because civil servant receives salaries, it would become a habit that will affect the officer's professionalism, or it will develop to illegal charges by the officers. Those who answered 'no' because they considered it as a thank you for the service or because they were satisfied with the service. Compare to situations 1-4, situation 5 was considered by the majority of the respondents as a gratification situation.

Analysis of respondents' answers showed that situations 1-3 are situations where the intensity of the gratification is less than those of situations 4 and 5.

### 3.2 Discussion

The concept of gratification stipulated in Law No. 20 of 2001 on the Amendments to Law No. 31 of 1999 on the Eradication of The Criminal Act of Corruption, gratification is more directed towards payments or gifts in broad sense, which must be controlled, and also given room for return if the individual as a state apparatus/civil servants receives it

Respondents' conceptions of gratification represent their schema of gratification. Anderson (2015) stated that schemas represent categorical knowledge according to a slot structure, in which slots are attributes that members of a category possess, and each slot is filled with one or more values, or specific instances, of that attribute. Let us see the majority of respondents' schema of gratification as a gift that can affect its recipient. This schema at least has two slots:

Gratification

- First slot: Is a gift
- Second slot: it can affect the recipient of the gift

Anderson (2015) stated in his example of a schema that the first slot is called the *isa slot*, which points to the superset or the higher hierarchy of the concept. The higher hierarchy of gratification is a gift. Gratification is a subgroup of gifts in the concept hierarchy of gifts. The second slot can be called a *function slot* (Anderson, 2015). It means that gratification has a function to affect its recipient. So, for most respondents, the properties of gratification

have two characteristics, which are a subgroup of gift and has the function to affect its recipient.

As we could see from the overall result, common people's concept of gratification was varied. We could see 11 variations on the respondents' definition of gratification. If we group this variation into slot structure, there will be more slots added. With more slots added, the schema of gratification could be presented like this:

#### Gratification

- *isa* slot: Is a gift
- *function* slot: it can affect the recipient of the gift, as a thank you
- *receiver* slot: given to people in general, civil servant, person with position
- *the nature of gift* slot: unspecified, excessive, unofficial, unnecessary, not rightfully for the receiver
- *the impact of the gift* slot: good or bad

According to Anderson (2015), slots represent the attributes of what the concept has. In each slot, there will be a specific value, for example, in the receiver slot, and the value could be people in general, civil servant, or person with the position. Anderson (2015) stated the value in each slot is a default value because they can be changed, or they do not exclude other possibilities.

With this analysis, some questions arise. Is gratification as a criminal act of corruption, is a concept with a lot of attributes? Or whether the attributes that were found in the analysis, were the correct attributes for the concept of gratification as a criminal act of corruption?

The analysis to the majority of respondent's schema of gratification, which is a gift that can affect its recipient, showed that the attributes of the schema were different from what stipulated by the law regarding gratification. Their understanding of gratification is closer to the concept of bribery in article 5 (a) of Law No. 20 of 2001 on the Amendments to Law No. 31 of 1999 on the Eradication of the Criminal Act of Corruption which stated the act of bribery as: "Any person(s) who gives or promises something to a civil servant or state apparatus with the aim of persuading him/her to perform an action or not to perform an action because of his/her position in violation of his/her obligation."

A schema a person has, influence how he/she interpret a situation that presented to them. Beck (1964; in James, Southam, & Blackburn, 2004) define the schema as a structure for screening, coding, and evaluating impinging stimuli. According to Beck (in James, Southam, & Blackburn, 2004), schemas direct

individual attention to previously stored information to generate expectancies and interpretations for new experiences. In this case, the schema a person has for gratification will be used as a basis in determining and evaluating the situation experienced and/or steps to be taken by them.

In the schema of gratification as gifts that can affect its recipient, any gift considered not to intentionally influence individuals, will not be considered a form of gratification. The author's belief that this gratification schema affect respondents' assessment of gratification situations. This can be seen from how the tendency of respondents to assess situations 1, 2, and 3. In situations 1 and 2, the gifts were given after receiving report cards and at the end of the school year. Presenting the gift would not affect the teacher. The schema of gratification as a gift as a form of appreciation could also involve here, seen from the reason of the 'no' answer.

In situation 3, most respondents considered that the situation was not a situation of gratification. Some of the reasons that state that the situation is not a situation of gratification because giving is done for reasons of gratitude and an emotional connection. When compared with gratification schemas as gifts that can affect recipients, situation 3 is not intended to influence recipients. It was also shown from the function slot of gratification, and some people also considered gratification is a gift for appreciation, a form of thank-you.

Situations 4 and 5 were thick with the nuances of duties and responsibilities. Only a small number of respondents relate the duties and responsibilities of the receiver of the gifts in their concept of gratification. But when faced with a situation where there was a gift-giving situation related to the duties and responsibilities of the receiver, more respondents considered the gift-giving situation as gratification. In conclusion, the authors believe that the receiver attribute will be apparent in gratification schema when a situation dealing with the duties and responsibilities of the receiver arise.

Also, it is interesting to consider the receiver profession attribute. Respondents reacted differently with the teacher and medical doctor compared to the parking officer and civil servant in gift-giving situations related to gratification. More respondents consider the gift-giving situation as gratification when the receiver has clear responsibilities and is a civil servant, compare to when the receiver is the teacher or medical doctor visited regularly. Because there are also a teacher and medical doctor who is a civil servant, and they also have responsibilities of

giving the best service to a customer who visited them.

When comparing the profession, it could be understood that interacting with the teacher and a medical doctor visited regularly could create an emotional bond from the giver to the recipient. Giving gifts then considered a good act rather than an act that related to gratification as a criminal act of corruption. Giving gifts as an act that reinforce compassion and eliminate hostility between individuals, is one of the teachings of Prophet Muhammad, PBUH that can be found in hadith (Shihab, 2009). As Indonesia is a country with a majority of its population are Moslems, this teaching of The Prophet Muhammad is encouraged in the Moslem community. On the other hand, this teaching of the prophet can be misused to endorsed gratification that leads to blackmail or bribery.

Baron, et.al., (2008) explains that individual's schema formation was closely related with their previous experience. And their experiences would also relate to their social environment and its socialization processes. Matsumoto and Juang (2003) explained that the existence of socialization experienced by the individual is the process of switching and learning both values, culture and rules that are ultimately understood as beliefs that must be followed when making decision in a social context. In this sense, the schema of gratification as governed by the law, must be continued to be socialized in its correct, clear-cut concept so that people can form a correct schema on gratification and can develop related schema such as which gift is allowed and not allowed related to one's duties and responsibilities.

Padesky (1994) suggests that wrong schema can survive even if there is evidence that denies these schemas. It happened because individuals do not pay attention, obscure evidence, or cut evidence. Regarding gratification, it is also important to consider what values and norms the society have on gift-giving situations, or what consider a gift-giving situation as a gratification. Society schema on gratification could influence whether the law's schema on gratification would be adopted by the individuals.

The research conducted to understand common people schema on gratification has several limitations. Because the data collection was conducted using online questionnaire, only people

with internet access can participate in this research. This research also did not control whether respondents had socialization on the law on gratification. It will be interesting to see the effect of socialization on people's schema on gratification can be researched. Research on public service officer schema on gratification is also interesting to research because they will be the recipient of the gift from their customer. It will be their responsibilities to reject the gift if the customers present them gifts for the service provided.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, J. R., 2015. Cognitive psychology and its implications. Worth Publisher. New York, 8th edition.
- Baron, R., Branscombe, N., Byrne, D., 2008. Social psychology. Allyn & Bacon. Boston, 11th edition.
- Cho, JY., Lee, EH., 2014. Reducing confusion about grounded theor and qualitative content analysis: Similarities and differences. Accessed from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR19/cho64.pdf>
- Creswell, J.W., 2009. Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. Sage. California, 3rd edition.
- Office of Deputy for Prevention, 2017. Downloaded from <https://www.kpk.go.id/en/about-kpk/organizational-structure/office-of-deputy-for-prevention>
- Elo, S., Kyngäs, H., 2008. The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62 (1), 107-115.
- James, I.A., Southam, L., Blackburn, I.A., 2004. Schemas Revisited. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy*, 11 369 - 377
- Matsumoto, D., Juang, L., 2003. Culture and Psychology. Wadsworth. New York, 3rd edition.
- Padesky, C.A., 1994. Schema Change Processes in Cognitive Therapy. *Clinical Psychology and Psychology*, Vol 1 (5), 267-268
- Pedoman Pengendalian Gratifikasi KPK (Gratification Control Guidelines), 2015. Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi. Jakarta
- Perkara yang berkekuatan Hukum Tetap (Inkracht) 2017. Downloaded from <https://acch.kpk.go.id/id/berkas/penindakan/inkracht/inkracht-2017>
- Shihab, Q., 2009. Tafsir Al Misbah. Lentera Hati. Jakarta, 8th edition
- Sternberg, R.J., Sternberg, K., 2011. Cognitive Psychology. Wadsworth. California, 6th edition.
- Law No. 20 of 2001 on the Amendments to Law No. 31 of 1999 on Eradication of The Criminal Act of Corruption