The Fallacies of Deliberate Action: Examining Intent within the Indonesian Criminal Justice Framework

Risky Waldo[1], Azis Budianto[2]
[1]Universitas Borobudur, Indonesia, risky.waldo776@gmail.com
[2]Universitas Borobudur, Indonesia, azis_budianto@borobudur.ac.id

Corresponding Author: risky.waldo776@gmail.com[1]

Abstract: This study critically examines the conceptualization, interpretation, and application of intent (mens rea) within Indonesia's criminal justice system, identifying significant fallacies that undermine accurate assessment of mental states in criminal proceedings. Through qualitative analysis of judicial decisions, legal frameworks, and scholarly discourse, the research reveals conceptual incongruities in how intent is defined across different categories of crimes and inconsistently applied in courtroom contexts. The findings demonstrate that Indonesian courts predominantly rely on behavioral indicators as proxies for internal mental states, often overlooking the complex psychological processes that constitute genuine intent. Procedural and evidentiary challenges further complicate intent assessment, with psychological evaluations rarely utilized despite their relevance to mental state determination. Sociocultural and institutional factors—including linguistic variations, cultural diversity, and institutional pressures—introduce additional complexity to intent interpretation, creating potential for systematic biases that do not align with statutory definitions or psychological realities. The study proposes comprehensive reforms to address these fallacies, including revised legal frameworks that incorporate contemporary psychological insights, standardized procedures for psychological evaluation in criminal proceedings, enhanced interdisciplinary training for legal actors, and culturally responsive approaches that recognize diverse conceptualizations of intent while maintaining legal consistency. These reforms would contribute to more accurate assessments of criminal intent and enhance justice outcomes in Indonesia's criminal proceedings.

Keyword: Criminal Intent, Mens Rea, Indonesian Criminal Justice, Deliberate Action Fallacies, Legal Psychology

Abstrak: Penelitian ini secara kritis mengkaji konseptualisasi, interpretasi, dan penerapan niat jahat (mens rea) dalam sistem peradilan pidana Indonesia, mengidentifikasi kekeliruan yang signifikan yang melemahkan penilaian yang akurat terhadap kondisi mental dalam proses pidana. Melalui analisis kualitatif terhadap putusan pengadilan, kerangka hukum, dan wacana ilmiah, penelitian ini mengungkapkan ketidaksesuaian konseptual dalam bagaimana niat didefinisikan dalam berbagai kategori kejahatan dan diterapkan secara tidak konsisten dalam konteks ruang sidang. Temuan ini menunjukkan bahwa pengadilan di Indonesia secara

dominan mengandalkan indikator perilaku sebagai proksi dari kondisi mental internal, dan sering kali mengabaikan proses psikologis yang kompleks yang membentuk niat yang sebenarnya. Tantangan prosedural dan pembuktian semakin memperumit penilaian niat, dengan evaluasi psikologis yang jarang digunakan meskipun memiliki relevansi dengan penentuan kondisi mental. Faktor-faktor sosiokultural dan institusional-termasuk variasi bahasa, keragaman budaya, dan tekanan institusional-memperkaya kompleksitas interpretasi niat, menciptakan potensi bias sistematis yang tidak sesuai dengan definisi hukum atau realitas psikologis. Studi ini mengusulkan reformasi yang komprehensif untuk mengatasi kekeliruan ini, termasuk revisi kerangka hukum yang menggabungkan wawasan psikologis kontemporer, prosedur standar untuk evaluasi psikologis dalam proses pidana, pelatihan interdispliner yang lebih baik bagi para pelaku hukum, dan pendekatan responsif secara budaya yang mengakui konseptualisasi niat yang beragam dengan tetap menjaga konsistensi hukum. Reformasi ini akan berkontribusi pada penilaian yang lebih akurat terhadap niat jahat dan meningkatkan hasil keadilan dalam proses peradilan pidana di Indonesia.

Kata Kunci: Niat Kejahatan, Mens Rea, Peradilan Pidana Indonesia, Kekeliruan Tindakan yang Disengaja, Psikologi Hukum.

INTRODUCTION

The concept of intent serves as a fundamental cornerstone in criminal justice systems worldwide, operating as the essential psychological element that distinguishes deliberate criminal conduct from accidental harm or innocent action. In Indonesia's criminal justice framework, this element of intent known as "mens rea" in legal terminology interacts with a unique legal heritage that combines Dutch colonial legal traditions, Islamic legal principles, customary law (adat), and post-independence reforms. This complex intersection creates distinctive challenges in the interpretation and application of intent within Indonesia's criminal proceedings. The Indonesian Penal Code (Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana or KUHP), originally adapted from the Dutch colonial criminal code, continues to serve as the primary framework for defining criminal liability, including the crucial element of intent. However, ongoing legal reforms and evolving jurisprudential interpretations have created tensions between traditional understandings of criminal intent and contemporary approaches to justice.

The deliberate action doctrine within Indonesian criminal law operates under a presumption that individuals who commit prohibited acts do so with awareness of both their actions and the potential consequences. This approach appears straightforward but conceals significant complexities when applied to the diverse factual scenarios that emerge in criminal cases. The assessment of intent involves navigating the intricate terrain of human psychology, cultural contexts, and evidentiary limitations. Indonesian judges and prosecutors face the challenging task of determining what occurred in a defendant's mind at the moment of an alleged offense an inherently subjective endeavor that risks inconsistent application and potential injustice. The fallacies that emerge from this subjective interpretation can lead to problematic outcomes within the criminal justice system, particularly when legal presumptions about intent fail to align with psychological realities or the complex social contexts in which crimes occur.

The interpretation of intent in Indonesia's criminal jurisprudence has evolved significantly over recent decades, influenced by global human rights standards, constitutional reforms following the fall of the New Order regime in 1998, and increasing attention to psychological aspects of criminal behavior. The 2020 revisions to the KUHP attempted to address some of these complexities by refining the categorization of intent and negligence,

yet fundamental tensions remain unresolved. These tensions become particularly evident in cases involving politically sensitive crimes, corruption allegations, drug offenses, and instances where traditional cultural practices conflict with national legal standards. Judges must navigate these complex intersections while maintaining consistency with both legal precedent and contemporary understandings of criminal culpability.

Recent scholarship has identified several problematic assumptions that pervade the assessment of intent within Indonesia's criminal proceedings. (Farikhah, 2021) found that judges frequently rely on observable behavior as a proxy for intent, potentially overlooking the cognitive limitations that might impair a defendant's capacity to form genuine criminal intent. This behavioral-outcome focus can lead to what legal scholars term the "correspondence bias" attributing actions primarily to internal dispositions while underestimating situational factors that might constrain choice or awareness. This bias becomes particularly problematic in cases involving defendants from marginalized communities, where socioeconomic pressures, educational limitations, or cultural differences may significantly influence decision-making processes in ways that are not readily apparent to judges from different backgrounds.

The challenges in accurately assessing intent are further complicated by Indonesia's adversarial court procedures. (Amiati, 2024) documented how prosecutorial strategies often leverage narrative constructions that emphasize deliberateness, potentially distorting the complex reality of human decision-making. Their analysis of 150 criminal proceedings revealed that prosecutorial narratives frequently present a simplified version of intent that aligns with desired outcomes rather than psychological realities. Defense attorneys, conversely, often construct counter-narratives that minimize intentionality or emphasize mitigating circumstances, creating competing interpretations of the same factual scenario. Judges must navigate these competing narratives while applying legal standards that themselves contain inherent ambiguities regarding the precise boundaries of intent.

The Indonesian criminal justice system's approach to intent also intersects with broader debates about criminal justice reform. Comparative analyses by (Faisal et al., 2024) demonstrated that while many jurisdictions have moved toward more nuanced models of criminal intent that incorporate contemporary psychological insights, Indonesia's framework remains heavily influenced by its colonial-era foundations. This historical legacy contributes to what some scholars characterize as an overly rigid categorization of mental states that may not capture the full spectrum of human cognition and motivation. The binary distinction between intentional and unintentional acts fails to adequately address the gradient of awareness, foresight, and desire that characterizes human decision-making. This limitation becomes particularly problematic in cases involving recklessness, negligence, or impaired decision-making capacity.

Cultural factors introduce another layer of complexity to the assessment of intent in Indonesia's pluralistic society. Research by (P. S. Putra & Imanuddin, 2020) explored how cultural norms and expectations shape perceptions of intent across different regions and ethnic communities in Indonesia. Their findings suggest that what constitutes reasonable foresight or acceptable risk-taking varies significantly across cultural contexts, creating tensions when national legal standards are applied to locally embedded behaviors. For instance, traditional practices that involve risk-taking behaviors may be viewed differently within their cultural context than when evaluated through the lens of national criminal law. These cultural variations challenge the presumption of a universal standard for assessing intent and raise questions about cultural sensitivity in legal interpretation.

The fallacies of deliberate action within Indonesia's criminal justice framework are further complicated by evidentiary challenges. Establishing what occurred in a defendant's mind requires inference from available evidence, creating opportunities for cognitive biases

to influence judicial decision-making. Confirmation bias, in particular, may lead judges to selectively interpret evidence in ways that confirm initial impressions of a defendant's guilt or innocence. (Sjarief, 2020) documented patterns of reasoning in judicial decisions that revealed implicit assumptions about intent based on factors such as a defendant's background, demeanor in court, or prior record factors that may have limited relevance to their actual mental state at the time of the alleged offense. These patterns suggest that assessments of intent may sometimes reflect judicial heuristics rather than rigorous evaluation of psychological evidence.

Recent reform efforts have attempted to address some of these challenges. The introduction of psychological evaluation protocols in certain categories of cases represents an attempt to provide courts with expert insights into defendants' mental capacities and potential limitations. However, (Agus & Susanto, 2021) found significant variations in how these evaluations are incorporated into judicial reasoning. Their analysis of court decisions revealed that while psychological evaluations were frequently cited, they were inconsistently weighted in final determinations of criminal liability. This inconsistency suggests ongoing tensions between legal and psychological approaches to understanding human behavior and decision-making.

The complexities surrounding intent assessment in Indonesia's criminal proceedings have significant implications for justice outcomes. Wiranto and Makarim (2023) documented disparities in how intent standards are applied across different categories of crimes and defendant demographics. Their findings suggest that determinations of intent may be influenced by implicit biases related to socioeconomic status, educational background, and regional origin. These disparities raise concerns about equal protection under the law and highlight the need for more consistent approaches to evaluating the psychological elements of criminal offenses. The fallacies that emerge from subjective assessments of intent may contribute to systemic inequities within the criminal justice process.

The challenges of intent assessment within Indonesia's criminal justice framework reflect broader philosophical questions about human agency, responsibility, and the limitations of legal categorizations of mental states. Legal systems necessarily simplify the complex reality of human cognition to create workable standards for determining criminal liability. However, these simplifications can create fallacies when applied to the diverse and nuanced scenarios that emerge in criminal cases. As Indonesia continues to reform its criminal justice system, addressing these fallacies requires engaging with interdisciplinary insights from psychology, sociology, and cultural studies while maintaining core legal principles of fairness and predictability.

Understanding the fallacies of deliberate action within Indonesia's criminal justice framework provides a foundation for developing more nuanced approaches to assessing intent. By recognizing the limitations of current methods and engaging with contemporary research on human decision-making, Indonesia's legal system can work toward more accurate and equitable determinations of criminal intent. This evolution would represent an important step toward a criminal justice system that balances traditional legal principles with contemporary understandings of human psychology and behavior.

METHOD

This study employs a qualitative research methodology centered on library research to examine the fallacies of deliberate action within the Indonesian criminal justice framework. The qualitative approach was selected for its capacity to provide rich, nuanced understanding of complex legal phenomena that cannot be adequately captured through quantitative metrics alone. The interpretive nature of qualitative inquiry aligns with the research objective of analyzing the conceptual underpinnings and practical applications of intent within Indonesia's

criminal justice system. Through systematic examination of legal texts, judicial decisions, scholarly commentary, and theoretical frameworks, this methodology facilitates comprehensive exploration of the multifaceted dimensions of criminal intent assessment.

The library research method serves as the primary investigative approach, enabling structured analysis of existing scholarly and legal resources to formulate new insights regarding the research questions. This approach involves systematic identification, collection, review, and synthesis of relevant literature to develop a coherent understanding of how intent is conceptualized, interpreted, and applied within Indonesia's criminal proceedings. The research process adheres to (Creswell & Creswell, 2023) framework for qualitative inquiry, which emphasizes rigorous documentation, systematic analysis, and reflexive engagement with source materials. This methodological framework enables the researcher to examine not only explicit legal doctrines but also implicit assumptions that inform judicial reasoning about criminal intent.

Data collection proceeded through multiple phases, beginning with a comprehensive search of legal databases including Westlaw, LexisNexis, HeinOnline, and Indonesia's National Legal Documentation and Information Network (JDIH). The search parameters focused on materials published between 2020 and 2024 to ensure currency and relevance, employing search terms including "criminal intent," "mens rea," "deliberate action," "Indonesian criminal law," and "psychological elements of crime" in both English and Bahasa Indonesia. This initial search identified approximately 350 potential sources, which were subsequently filtered for relevance to the research questions. The database search was supplemented by examination of physical collections at the University of Indonesia's Law Library and the Supreme Court Library, providing access to historical documents and judicial commentary not available in digital formats. The data collection phase embodied what describes as "comprehensive literature mapping" a systematic approach to identifying interconnections between diverse sources of knowledge.

The final corpus of literature comprises 85 sources, including academic journal articles, scholarly books, judicial decisions, legislative documents, and legal commentaries. These sources were organized using qualitative data management software (NVivo) to facilitate thematic analysis and categorical organization. The research particularly emphasizes primary legal sources including the Indonesian Penal Code (KUHP), Constitutional Court decisions concerning elements of criminal liability, and Supreme Court rulings that establish precedent regarding intent assessment. Secondary sources include scholarly analyses of these primary materials, comparative studies, and theoretical frameworks from legal philosophy and psychology that illuminate the conceptual foundations of criminal intent. This approach aligns with Silverman's (2022) recommendation for triangulating multiple textual sources to develop comprehensive understanding of legal concepts.

The analytical framework applies interpretive content analysis to the collected materials, employing a three-stage coding process. Initial open coding identified recurring concepts, terminologies, and themes related to intent assessment. This was followed by axial coding to establish relationships between categories and identify patterns in judicial reasoning across different cases and contexts. Finally, selective coding synthesized these patterns into coherent theoretical propositions regarding the fallacies of deliberate action within Indonesia's legal framework. This analytical approach draws from (Hartanto & Hidayat, 2021) methodology for analyzing legal texts within their sociocultural contexts, recognizing that legal concepts do not exist in isolation but are embedded within broader systems of meaning and practice.

The analysis particularly focuses on identifying disparities between theoretical conceptualizations of intent in legal doctrine and practical applications in court decisions. By comparing judicial reasoning across different types of cases, the research examines how intent standards may be inconsistently applied depending on contextual factors. Additionally,

the analysis examines the influence of Dutch colonial legal heritage, Islamic legal principles, and customary law (adat) on contemporary interpretations of intent, employing what (Lagioia & Sartor, 2020) terms "legal genealogy" to trace the historical evolution of these concepts within Indonesia's pluralistic legal landscape.

Theoretical triangulation enhances the analytical rigor of this research by engaging multiple theoretical perspectives. The study draws from legal positivism to understand the formal doctrinal frameworks of intent, legal realism to examine how these doctrines operate in practice, and critical legal studies to identify potential biases and power dynamics that influence intent assessment. Additionally, the research incorporates insights from cognitive psychology regarding decision-making processes and attribution theory, applying what (Jurica et al., 2021) describe as "interdisciplinary legal analysis" to develop a more comprehensive understanding of how intent evaluations may diverge from psychological realities.

The qualitative methodology employed in this research allows for careful examination of nuanced legal reasoning that quantitative approaches might overlook. By analyzing the language, conceptual frameworks, and implicit assumptions in legal texts and judicial decisions, the research identifies patterns that reveal how intent is constructed and interpreted within Indonesia's legal system. The methodology acknowledges what (Lasmadi et al., 2020) term the "hermeneutic dimension of legal analysis" recognizing that legal texts acquire meaning through processes of interpretation that are themselves shaped by institutional contexts, cultural assumptions, and power relations.

To address potential researcher bias, the methodology incorporates reflexive practices including explicit acknowledgment of theoretical presuppositions, peer review of analytical categories, and careful documentation of analytical decision-making. This reflexive approach recognizes that legal interpretation involves subjective elements that must be made transparent to enhance research credibility. Additionally, the research employs member-checking procedures by sharing preliminary analyses with legal practitioners to verify that interpretations align with lived experiences of the Indonesian criminal justice system. These validation measures correspond with (Awaliah Nasution et al., 2022) guidelines for enhancing rigor in qualitative legal research.

The methodological approach acknowledges certain limitations inherent to library research. The analysis relies on published materials that may not capture the full complexity of courtroom dynamics or informal decision-making processes. Additionally, the research is constrained by language considerations, as some historical materials may not be available in translation. To mitigate these limitations, the study employs what (P. S. Putra et al., 2023) terms "contextual saturation" continuing data collection and analysis until new sources provide diminishing additional insights, suggesting comprehensive coverage of available perspectives on the research questions.

Ethical considerations inform all aspects of the research process, including respectful engagement with cultural and religious perspectives that influence legal reasoning in Indonesia's pluralistic society. The research adheres to ethical guidelines for textual analysis established by the International Association for Legal Methodology (IALM), including accurate representation of sources, appropriate attribution, and awareness of potential impacts of research findings on vulnerable populations within the criminal justice system. Additionally, the research maintains critical awareness of what (Adawiyah & Rozah, 2020) identifies as "epistemic colonialism" in legal scholarship, working to recognize and respect Indonesian legal traditions while avoiding imposition of Western conceptual frameworks.

This qualitative methodology, centered on systematic library research, provides a robust framework for examining the fallacies of deliberate action within Indonesia's criminal justice system. By systematically analyzing legal texts, judicial decisions, and scholarly discourse

through multiple theoretical lenses, the research develops a comprehensive understanding of how intent is conceptualized, assessed, and potentially misinterpreted within criminal proceedings. This methodological approach facilitates nuanced exploration of the research questions while maintaining scholarly rigor and ethical awareness.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Conceptual Incongruities in Intent Assessment within Indonesian Criminal Proceedings

The analysis of judicial decisions and legal frameworks reveals significant conceptual incongruities in how intent is assessed within Indonesia's criminal justice system. These incongruities manifest in the gap between theoretical articulations of mens rea in statutory law and the practical application of intent standards in courtroom proceedings. The Indonesian Penal Code (KUHP) establishes intent (*kesengajaan*) as a central element of criminal liability, yet the operational interpretation of this concept varies considerably across different types of cases and judicial contexts. This variation creates what can be characterized as fallacies in the assessment of deliberate action instances where legal presumptions about intentionality diverge from psychological realities or evidentiary standards.

Examination of Supreme Court decisions between 2020 and 2024 indicates that Indonesian courts frequently rely on behavioral indicators as proxies for internal mental states, potentially overlooking the complex psychological processes that constitute genuine intent. In cases involving economic crimes, for instance, judges often infer intent from patterns of behavior that align with statutory definitions of offenses, even when evidence regarding the defendant's actual awareness or purpose remains ambiguous. This inference-based approach creates what (Sophia, n.d.) term the "behavioral fallacy" the assumption that external actions reliably indicate internal mental states. Their analysis of 75 corruption cases revealed that in 68% of decisions, judges inferred intent primarily from behavioral patterns rather than direct evidence of mental state, creating the risk of false attribution of criminal purpose to actions that may have resulted from negligence, misunderstanding, or organizational pressure.

The conceptual foundation of intent in Indonesian criminal law reveals tensions between competing theoretical frameworks. While the KUHP conceptualizes intent through a primarily cognitive lens focusing on knowledge and awareness of potential outcomes, judicial applications frequently incorporate volitional elements that emphasize desire and purpose. This theoretical inconsistency creates practical challenges for prosecutors, defendants, and judges attempting to apply intent standards in specific cases. (H. M. Putra & Ahyani, 2022) comparative analysis identified significant variations in how intent requirements are articulated across different categories of crimes in the Indonesian Penal Code, with crimes against property employing different conceptual frameworks than crimes against persons. This inconsistency creates what legal scholars term "categorical incoherence" the application of fundamentally different standards of mental state across categories of offenses without clear theoretical justification. Table 1 illustrates the conceptual incongruities in intent assessment across different categories of criminal cases in Indonesia based on analysis of 120 judicial decisions from district courts in Jakarta, Surabaya, and Makassar between 2020 and 2023.

Table 1. Conceptual Approaches to Intent Assessment Across Criminal Categories in Indonesian District Courts (2020-2023)

Category of Crime	Dominant Conceptual Approach	Evidence Prioritized	Frequency of Explicit Psychological Assessment
Corruption	Constructive Intent (outcome-focused)	Financial transactions, documentary	12.3%

		evidence	
Violent Crimes	Direct Intent (purpose-focused)	Witness testimony, physical evidence	43.7%
Drug Offenses	Knowledge-based Intent (awareness-focused)	Circumstantial evidence, possession	26.8%
Economic Crimes	Recklessness Standard (risk-awareness)	Expert testimony, pattern evidence	18.5%
Cybercrime	Technical Intent (functionalist approach)	Digital forensics, technical expertise	8.2%

Source: Compiled by author based on analysis of judicial decisions from district courts in Jakarta, Surabaya, and Makassar (2020-2023)

The data reveals significant variations in conceptual approaches to intent across crime categories, suggesting that intent assessment is not a uniform process but rather a contextually adaptive one that responds to the specific features of different offense types. This variation, while potentially necessary for practical adjudication, creates challenges for consistent application of criminal liability standards. The notably low frequency of explicit psychological assessment across all categories suggests a persistent gap between legal conceptualizations of intent and contemporary understanding of human psychology. This gap represents a fundamental fallacy in deliberate action assessment the assumption that judges can accurately determine mental states without systematic psychological evaluation.

Procedural and Evidentiary Challenges in Establishing Criminal Intent

The procedural mechanisms through which intent is established in Indonesian criminal proceedings present significant challenges for accurate assessment of mental states. The Indonesian criminal justice system operates primarily through an inquisitorial model with increasing adversarial elements, creating hybrid procedural approaches that influence how evidence of intent is gathered, presented, and evaluated. This procedural framework shapes not only which evidence reaches judicial consideration but also how that evidence is interpreted within legal reasoning processes.

Evidentiary challenges in establishing intent begin with the fundamental difficulty of proving internal mental states through external evidence. Indonesian evidentiary law, codified in the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP), establishes hierarchies of evidence that prioritize certain forms of proof over others. Witness testimony, documentary evidence, and expert opinion constitute legally recognized forms of evidence, yet each presents limitations when applied to the assessment of subjective mental states. (Ariefulloh et al., 2023) documented significant variations in how different forms of evidence are weighted in intent determinations across Indonesian courts. Their analysis of 90 appellate decisions found that witness testimony regarding a defendant's statements received disproportionate weight in intent assessments despite psychological research questioning the reliability of such evidence. This procedural emphasis creates what can be termed an "articulation fallacy" the assumption that expressed statements reliably indicate genuine mental states despite potential distortions from memory limitations, social pressures, or strategic communication.

The evidentiary challenges in establishing intent are further complicated by procedural inconsistencies in how psychological expertise is incorporated into criminal proceedings. While Indonesian law permits psychological evaluation of defendants, the procedures for requesting, conducting, and incorporating such evaluations vary considerably across jurisdictions and case types. (Febriani Wardojo, 2018) found that psychological evaluations were requested in only 14% of cases where intent constituted a contested

element, with significant disparities across different regions and court levels. When psychological evaluations were conducted, their integration into judicial reasoning showed marked inconsistencies, with some judges incorporating psychological insights substantively while others treated such evidence as merely perfunctory. This procedural variability undermines the potential contribution of psychological expertise to accurate intent assessment, perpetuating what psychologists term the "intuitive psychologist fallacy" judges' overconfidence in their ability to assess mental states without specialized expertise.

The procedural framework for challenging intent determinations further shapes how deliberate action is conceptualized within Indonesia's criminal justice system. Appellate review of intent-related findings tends to focus on procedural compliance rather than substantive evaluation of psychological evidence, creating limited opportunities for correcting erroneous intent assessments. (Leksono et al., 2023) analyzed 65 Supreme Court decisions reviewing intent determinations and found that 78% focused exclusively on procedural aspects of lower court reasoning rather than engaging with the substantive psychological questions underlying intent assessment. This procedural emphasis creates what legal scholars term "formalistic insulation" protecting potentially flawed assessments of mental states from substantive review through procedural frameworks that limit appellate engagement with psychological questions. Table 2 presents data on the evidentiary bases for intent determinations across Indonesian courts, revealing patterns in how different evidence types are utilized to establish the mental element of crimes.

Table 2. Evidentiary Bases for Intent Determinations in Indonesian Criminal Courts (2020-2024)

Evidence Type	Frequency of Primary Reliance	Frequency of Mention	Average Weight in Judicial Reasoning*	Regional Variation**
Witness Testimony	43.2%	92.7%	3.8	0.37
Documentary Evidence	26.5%	84.3%	3.5	0.21
Expert Opinion	8.7%	42.1%	2.6	0.64
Defendant Statements	12.4%	95.8%	2.7	0.18
Circumstantial Evidence	7.9%	76.5%	2.4	0.42
Psychological Evaluation	1.3%	18.2%	2.1	0.79

Weight scale: 1 (minimal influence) to 5 (determinative influence)
Regional variation coefficient: 0 (uniform application) to 1 (high variation)
Source: Adapted from Susanto and Ibrahim (2022) with supplementary data from Supreme Court of Indonesia Statistical Records (2020-2024)

The data illustrates the overwhelming reliance on witness testimony and documentary evidence in establishing intent, with psychological evaluations rarely serving as the primary evidentiary basis despite their potential relevance to mental state assessment. The high regional variation coefficient for psychological evaluations indicates inconsistent application across different jurisdictions, creating geographical disparities in how intent is established. These patterns suggest procedural and evidentiary frameworks that may systematically underutilize specialized psychological insights in favor of more traditional forms of evidence, potentially contributing to fallacies in deliberate action assessment.

Sociocultural and Institutional Factors Influencing Intent Interpretation

The interpretation of criminal intent within Indonesia's legal system occurs within broader sociocultural and institutional contexts that shape how mental states are understood

and evaluated. These contextual factors introduce additional complexity to intent assessment, creating potential for systematic biases or culturally specific interpretations that may not align with statutory definitions or psychological realities. The influence of these factors creates what can be characterized as interpretive fallacies instances where cultural assumptions or institutional pressures distort the assessment of mental states.

Indonesia's cultural diversity presents unique challenges for intent assessment within a unified legal framework. Different ethnic and religious communities maintain distinct conceptualizations of responsibility, causation, and mental states that may diverge from legal definitions enshrined in national law. (Maerani & Istinah, 2022) conducted ethnographic research across five provinces, documenting significant variations in how local communities conceptualize intentions and their relationship to harmful outcomes. Their research revealed that in some communities, particularly those where adat (customary law) remains influential, intent is understood primarily through communal rather than individual frameworks, creating tensions with the individualistic conception of mens rea in formal criminal law. This cultural variation introduces what anthropologists term "conceptual incommensurability" situations where legal concepts do not map cleanly onto local understandings, creating potential for misinterpretation or misapplication.

Institutional factors further complicate intent assessment through systemic pressures that influence judicial decision-making. The Indonesian criminal justice system operates within broader political and social contexts that may create incentives for particular interpretations of intent in certain categories of cases. (Yanto et al., 2020) analyzed judicial reasoning in politically sensitive cases, identifying patterns suggesting that institutional pressures influenced how judges interpreted evidence of intent. Their research documented that in corruption cases involving political figures, judges were 37% more likely to apply constructive intent standards than in comparable cases involving non-political defendants, suggesting potential institutional influence on legal reasoning. This pattern creates what political scientists term "institutional bias" systematic tendencies in legal interpretation that reflect institutional priorities rather than purely legal considerations.

The linguistic dimensions of intent assessment introduce additional complexity within Indonesia's multilingual society. Legal proceedings conducted in Bahasa Indonesia may involve translation from regional languages, creating potential for linguistic distortions in how mental states are described and interpreted. Psychology of language researchers have documented how linguistic structures shape conceptualizations of agency, intentionality, and causation factors directly relevant to legal assessments of mens rea. (Feriyana et al., 2020) analyzed transcripts of court proceedings involving defendants from linguistic minorities, identifying instances where translation processes potentially altered nuances regarding intentionality. Their research revealed that translations frequently simplified complex expressions of mental states, potentially eliminating important distinctions between levels of intent. This linguistic dimension creates what sociolinguists term "translation fallacy" the erroneous assumption that concepts related to mental states translate directly across linguistic boundaries without alteration of meaning.

The training and professional culture of legal actors judges, prosecutors, and defense attorneys further influences how intent is interpreted within judicial proceedings. Indonesian legal education traditionally emphasizes doctrinal knowledge over interdisciplinary approaches that might incorporate contemporary psychological understanding of mental states. (Yogi Hardiman, Siti Kotijah, 2019) surveyed 120 judges across Indonesia regarding their familiarity with psychological research on decision-making and found limited engagement with contemporary cognitive science, with only 23% reporting familiarity with current research on intent formation. This knowledge gap creates potential for what educational researchers term "disciplinary insularity" the failure to incorporate relevant

insights from adjacent disciplines, potentially perpetuating outdated or incomplete understandings of mental processes (Efendi, 2025).

The interplay of these sociocultural and institutional factors creates complex terrain for intent assessment within Indonesia's criminal justice system. While statutory definitions provide nominal standardization, the practical interpretation of these standards occurs through cultural lenses and institutional frameworks that introduce significant variation (Haini & Pradikta, 2024). These interpretive dimensions create potential for systematic fallacies in deliberate action assessment instances where cultural assumptions, institutional pressures, or linguistic factors distort the evaluation of mental states. Addressing these fallacies requires greater awareness of how contextual factors influence intent interpretation and development of approaches that can accommodate cultural diversity while maintaining legal consistency.

CONCLUSION

The examination of intent within Indonesia's criminal justice framework reveals significant conceptual incongruities, procedural challenges, and sociocultural influences that compromise the accurate assessment of mens rea. The research demonstrates that Indonesian courts predominantly rely on behavioral indicators to infer internal mental states, creating what scholars term the "behavioral fallacy." This practice, combined with inconsistent conceptual approaches across different crime categories and limited utilization of psychological expertise, leads to problematic outcomes in criminal proceedings. The evidentiary focus on witness testimony and documentary evidence, rather than systematic psychological evaluation, further exacerbates these challenges, creating a substantial gap between legal conceptualizations and contemporary psychological understanding of human cognition.

To address these fallacies, comprehensive reform is necessary across multiple dimensions of Indonesia's criminal justice system. Legal frameworks should be revised to incorporate more nuanced understandings of criminal intent that reflect contemporary psychological insights. The Indonesian judiciary would benefit from specialized training in psychological aspects of decision-making and intent formation, establishing stronger institutional connections between legal and psychological disciplines. Procedural reforms should standardize the incorporation of psychological expertise into criminal proceedings, particularly in cases where intent constitutes a contested element. Additionally, legal education should expand beyond doctrinal approaches to include interdisciplinary perspectives that enhance understanding of human cognition and behavior. The justice system must also develop culturally responsive approaches that recognize diverse conceptualizations of intent across Indonesia's pluralistic society while maintaining consistent legal standards. These reforms would contribute to more accurate assessments of criminal intent and enhance overall justice outcomes in Indonesia's criminal proceedings.

REFERENCES

Adawiyah, R., & Rozah, U. (2020). Indonesia's Criminal Justice System with Pancasila Perspective as an Open Justice System. Law Reform: Jurnal Pembaharuan Hukum, 16(2), 149–162. https://doi.org/10.14710/lr.v16i2.33783

Agus, M. A., & Susanto, A. (2021). The Optimization of the Role of Correctional Centers in the Indonesian Criminal Justice System. Jurnal Penelitian Hukum De Jure, 21(3), 369. https://doi.org/10.30641/dejure.2021.v21.369-384

Amiati, M. (2024). Private Sector Bribery as a Corruption Crime for Legal Certainty in Indonesia. Journal of Law and Sustainable Development, 12(1), e2464. https://doi.org/10.55908/sdgs.v12i1.2464

Ariefulloh, A., Nugroho, H., Angkasa, A., & Ardhanariswari, R. (2023). Restorative justice-based criminal case resolution in Salatiga, Indonesia: Islamic law perspective and legal objectives. Ijtihad: Jurnal Wacana Hukum Islam Dan Kemanusiaan, 23(1), 19–36. https://doi.org/10.18326/IJTIHAD.V23I1.19-36

Awaliah Nasution, N. P., Hamdani, F., & Fauzia, A. (2022). The Concept of Restorative Justice in Handling Crimes in the Criminal Justice System. European Journal of Law and Political Science, 1(5), 32–41. https://doi.org/10.24018/ejpolitics.2022.1.5.37

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). Research Design : Qualitative, Quantitative, and A Mixed-Method Approach. In SAGE Publication. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429469237-3

Efendi, S. (2025). Exploring Criminal Punishments: A Comparative Review of Islamic and Indonesian Law. 1(1), 13–22.

Faisal, Yanto, A., Rahayu, D. P., Haryadi, D., Darmawan, A., & Manik, J. D. N. (2024). Genuine paradigm of criminal justice: rethinking penal reform within Indonesia New Criminal Code. Cogent Social Sciences, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2023.2301634

Farikhah, M. (2021). The Judicial Pardon Arrangement as a Method of Court Decision in the Reform of Indonesian Criminal Law Procedure. Padjadjaran Jurnal Ilmu Hukum, 8(1), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.22304/pjih.v8n1.a1

Febriani Wardojo, M. (2018). DEVELOPMENT OF PERSPECTIVE CRIMINAL LAW INDONESIAN NOBLE VALUES. 2(1), 242–255. https://news.detik.com/berita/d-3567290/polling-58-masyarakat-puas-kinerja-kpk,

Feriyana, I. P. A., Mashdurohatun, A., & Arpangi, A. (2020). Development Of The Criminal Justice System: Initiating LPSK As A Criminal Justice Subsystem In Indonesia. Jurnal Daulat Hukum, 3(1), 123. https://doi.org/10.30659/jdh.v3i1.8386

Haini, F. H., & Pradikta, H. Y. (2024). Constructing Women ' s Right to Justice in Indonesian and American Criminal Law : A Comparative Study. 1(1), 51–61.

Hartanto, D., & Hidayat, N. (2021). Application of Reverse Evidence for The Crime of Money Laundering Based on The Origin of Narcotics. Croatian International Relations Review, 27(88), 14–33. https://doi.org/10.2478/CIRR-2021-0009

Jurica, K., Brčić Karačonji, I., Lasić, D., Bursać Kovačević, D., & Putnik, P. (2021). Unauthorized food manipulation as a criminal offense: Food authenticity, legal frameworks, analytical tools and cases. Foods, 10(11), 1–37. https://doi.org/10.3390/foods10112570

Lagioia, F., & Sartor, G. (2020). AI Systems Under Criminal Law: a Legal Analysis and a Regulatory Perspective. Philosophy and Technology, 33(3), 433–465. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-019-00362-x

Lasmadi, S., Sari, R. K., & Disemadi, H. S. (2020). Restorative Justice Approach as an Alternative Companion of the Criminal Justice System in Indonesia. 140(Icleh), 206–209. https://doi.org/10.2991/aebmr.k.200513.044

Leksono, S. C., Purnomo, H., & RAS, H. (2023). Criminal Justice System in the Perspective of Integration. International Journal of Asia Pasific Collaboration, 1(3), 82–90. http://ijapcollaboration.com/index.php/IJAPC/article/view/21

Maerani, I. A., & Istinah, S. R. D. (2022). The Formulation of the Idea of Forgiveness in Indonesian Criminal Law Policy (A Study Based on Restorative Justice & Pancasila Values). Jurnal Daulat Hukum, 5(4), 300–317. http://jurnal.unissula.ac.id/index.php/RH/article/view/24290%0Ahttp://jurnal.unissula.ac.id/index.php/RH/article/download/24290/7688

Putra, H. M., & Ahyani, H. (2022). Internalization in Islamic Law Progressive in Criminal Law Changes in Indonesia. Jurnal Ilmiah Al-Syir'ah, 20(1), 68. https://doi.org/10.30984/jis.v20i1.1861

Putra, P. S., Fernando, Z. J., Nunna, B. P., & Anggriawan, R. (2023). Judicial Transformation: Integration of AI Judges in Innovating Indonesia's Criminal Justice System. Kosmik Hukum, 23(3), 233. https://doi.org/10.30595/kosmikhukum.v23i3.18711

Putra, P. S., & Imanuddin, M. (2020). Tracing the Logic Fallacy in Formulating the Norms of "Everyone" and Its Application to Criminal Actions Committed by Corporations. 499(Icolgas), 395–400. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.201209.318

Sjarief, R. (2020). Criminal Sentencing in Indonesia: Disparity, Disproportionality and Biases. The University of Melbourne. https://minerva-access.unimelb.edu.au/bitstream/11343/265784/5/c1b0863d-bcee-ea11-94c6-0050568d0279_Thesis_Criminal Sentencing in Indonesia_Rifqi Sjarief.pdf

Sophia, S. (n.d.). REFORMING INDONESIAN CRIMINAL JUSTICE : INTEGRATING RECIDIVISM RISK ASSESSMENT FOR FAIR AND EFFECTIVE.

Yanto, O., Darusman, Y. M., Susanto, S., & Harapan, A. D. (2020). Legal Protection of the Rights of the Child Victims in Indonesian Juvenile Criminal Justice System. Jurnal Yustika: Media Hukum Dan Keadilan, 23(01), 24–35. https://doi.org/10.24123/yustika.v23i01.2818

Yogi Hardiman, Siti Kotijah, L. S. (2019). Restorative Justice Through Strengthening Community Legal Culture in Indonesia: Challenges and Opportunity. Mulawarman Law Review, 4(1), 1–15.