

Effectiveness of Regulations and Institutions for Eradicating Corruption in Southeast Asia: A Comparative Study of Indonesia and Vietnam

Sarip Hidayat¹, Suwari Akhmaddhian¹, Erga Yuhandra¹, Lam Thanh Danh²

¹ Faculty of Law, Kuningan University, Indonesia

² Faculty of Law, Ton Duc Thang University, Vietnam

E-mail: sarip.hidayat@uniku.ac.id



<https://doi.org/10.25134/unifikasi.v12i02.1214>

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Article History

Received: June 11, 2025

Revised: October 11, 2025

Accepted: December 17, 2025

Keywords

Corruption Eradication;
Indonesia and Vietnam;
Institutions;
Regulations.

Corruption is a major problem in Southeast Asia because it slows down economic growth, reduces public trust, and can destabilize governments. Therefore, this study aimed to identify and analyze how corruption is addressed in Indonesia and Vietnam. A socio-legal method was used by combining normative analysis of anti-corruption rules. The results showed that in Indonesia, the fight against corruption was mainly led by Corruption Eradication Law and Law on Corruption Eradication Commission. Following the discussion, enforcement was conducted by Corruption Eradication Commission. In Vietnam, anti-corruption efforts were managed under Law on Anti-Corruption and implemented through institutions such as Government Inspectorate and Central Steering Committee for Anti-Corruption Work. Indonesia had comprehensive regulations and an independent institution that played a significant role in investigating, prosecuting, and adjudicating corruption cases. However, changes made to the law in 2019 were observed by many as weakening the independence and effectiveness of the institution. Vietnam relied on a centralized method led by Communist Party through "Blazing Furnace" campaign, which successfully prosecuted high-ranking officials. Its long-term effectiveness remained questionable due to limited judicial independence and transparency. A comparative analysis showed that Indonesia prioritized the rule of law as well as checks and balances. Meanwhile, Vietnam relied on political consistency and centralized decision-making to eradicate corruption. The analysis assumed that successful corruption eradication depended on the synergy among regulations, independent institutions, and sustained political commitment. These included strengthening the independence of institutions, clarifying the authority of different law enforcement agencies, and using digital tools to increase public oversight.



Introduction

Corruption is a classic problem faced by many countries, especially in Southeast Asia¹. Corruption hinders progress in achieving various Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) targets related to poverty eradication (SDGs 1), good health and well-being (SDGs 3), and quality education (SDGs 4)². A study by Tagor Indra Mulia Lubis and Bagus Ramadi described corruption as a systemic crime undermining society and involving the abuse of office by individuals for personal gain. This is comparable to injustice in Islamic law (*fiqh jinayah*)

¹ Laura Foley, "Criminality, Chaos and Corruption: Analyzing the Narratives of Labor Migration Dynamics in Malaysia," *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal* 32, no. 2 (2023): 208–33, <https://doi.org/10.1177/01171968231189139>.

² Abroon Qazi, "Risk Forecasting for Shortfalls in Achieving Sustainable Development Goals: A Corruption Perspective," *Journal of Safety Science and Resilience* 6, no. 2 (June 2025): 237–49, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnlssr.2024.10.003>.

which considers it a violation of trust and belief.³ Silvando Rananda Sukma said that although Indonesia's legal framework is sufficient to prosecute criminal acts of corruption, various obstacles such as the involvement of law enforcement officials as perpetrators often arise in practice, demonstrating the complexity of practice and the impact of legal culture on law enforcement.⁴ Corruption not only wastes a lot of state money, but also damages social structures, democracy, public trust in government, and hinders economic growth and political stability.

According to the Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) published by Transparency International (TI), Southeast Asian countries continue to face various challenges in their efforts to eradicate corruption. Further, as stated by Nehruddin and Askar, the increasing perception of corruption, as indicated by the CPI, is hampering FDI growth in the ASEAN region, indicating declining investor confidence due to vulnerabilities in government transparency and integrity.⁵ These efforts are overseen by the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK). The KPK is actively strengthening laws, such as criminalizing interstate bribery (also known as foreign bribery), and enhancing its capacity through cross-jurisdictional investigative training in collaboration with the UNODC. These efforts demonstrate Indonesia's commitment to combating complex transnational corruption.⁶ Despite differences in performance between countries, the region generally ranks in the lower to middle range of the global corruption perception index. This demonstrates that corruption in Southeast Asia is systematic, involving political and bureaucratic actors, and difficult to eradicate with a repressive legal approach.

Indonesia and Vietnam are two countries in Southeast Asia that are interesting to study comparatively in the terms of anti-corruption regulations and institutions. Both countries face complex corruption issues, but have different political systems, legal cultures, and institutional characteristics. Indonesia is a democracy with a multi-party system, while Vietnam is a single-party state under the leadership of the Communist Party of Vietnam (CPV). These differences in political structures have implications for the formation of anti-corruption regulations and institutions, so that a comparative study of the two countries can provide a deeper understanding of the effectiveness of corruption eradication models in Southeast Asia. Corruption is also a problem in Vietnam. Massive bribery and embezzlement cases, such as the death sentence handed down to Truong My Lan in the multi-billion dollar Saigon bank scandal, show how serious the corruption problem is in Vietnam.⁷ Therefore, Vietnam is combating crony capitalism (also known as chronic capitalism) by establishing a

³ Tagor Indra Mulia Lubis and Bagus Ramadi, "Theoretical Studies Regarding Corruption, Corruption Crimes, and Perspective Studies on Islamic Criminal Law Theory (Fiqh Jinayah)," *Al-Arfa: Journal of Sharia, Islamic Economics and Law* 1, no. 2 (2023): 84-96, <https://doi.org/10.61166/arfa.vii2.38>.

⁴ Silvando Rananda Sukma, "Tindak Pidana Korupsi Di Indonesia: Pendekatan Yuridis Normatif Dan Empiris," *Journal Terekam Jejak (JTJ)* 3, no. 1 (2025): 1-11.

⁵ Nehruddin Nehruddin and Askar Askar, "Threat of Corruption to Foreign Direct Investment and Economic Growth in Southeast Asia," *Tamansiswa Management Journal International* 5, no. 1 (2022): 23-29, <https://doi.org/10.54204/tmji/vol512022005>.

⁶ Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi KPK, "https://kpk.go.id/id/ruang-informasi/berita/kpk-dorong-penguatan-regulasi-indonesia-tentang-antisuap-lintas-negara?utm_source=chatgpt.com," 2025.

⁷ Deutsche Welle, "Truong My Lan Divonis Mati, Pemberantasan Korupsi Vietnam Terlalu Kejam?," Detik.com, 2024, <https://news.detik.com/dw/d-7296987/truong-my-lan-divonis-mati-pemberantasan-korupsi-vietnam-terlalu-kejam>.

legal and institutional system. This system includes legal reforms on investment, competition, and anti-corruption in accordance with the most relevant international standards.⁸

The Republic of Indonesia has a long experience in building regulations and institutions to eradicate corruption, especially since the reform era in 1998. The enactment of Law Number 31 of 1999 in conjunction with Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption has become the main legal basis for law enforcement against corruptors. Besides, Indonesia was considered as one of the countries with a strong anti-corruption institution model in Southeast Asia after establishing the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) in 2002. The KPK has broad authority to investigate, prosecute, and prevent criminal acts of corruption. However, its journey has not always been smooth. The institution has faced numerous major issues over the years, including political interference, the criminalization of investigators, and the 2019 revision of the KPK Law, which was widely seen as weakening its independence. Following the revision, a supervisory board was established, wiretapping powers were restricted, and the government's political commitment to combating corruption was debated. Besides the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), other Indonesian institutions, such as the Attorney General's Office, the National Police, and the Supreme Audit Agency (BPK), participate in combating corruption. However, due to overlapping authority, lack of cooperation between institutions, and dishonesty on the part of some law enforcement officials, anti-corruption efforts often fail.

Vietnam's anti-corruption efforts have taken a unique and highly centralized approach within a single-party system. Formally, the process is controlled by the Central Steering Committee for the Prevention and Control of Corruption and Negative Phenomena (CSCANP), which is led directly by the General Secretary of the Communist Party of Vietnam, the country's highest political office. This supports consistent and systematic action against corruption, including against high-ranking state officials.⁹ This centralized approach is realized in a nationwide anti-corruption campaign known as "Blazing Furnace," or in Vietnamese called *chiến dịch đốt lò*, which was initiated during the leadership of Nguyễn Phú Trọng since 2016.¹⁰ The anti-corruption campaign known as "Blazing Furnace" has become a symbol of Vietnam's seriousness in eradicating corrupt practices, in which many high-ranking officials, including ministers and heads of state-owned companies, have been successfully prosecuted.

However, Vietnam's anti-corruption approach is not without criticism. The overwhelming concentration of power in the hands of the party raises concerns about the independence of the legal process and the transparency of information to the public.¹¹ Low transparency, party dominance over all aspects of government, and crony capitalism remain serious challenges for Vietnam. In this context, although the results of Vietnam's anti-corruption campaign appear massive, its long-term effectiveness remains questionable as it

⁸ Vu Minh Chau, "Legal Institutional Framework To Counter Crony Capitalism In Vietnam's Investment-Led Growth Transition," *International Journal of Law and Legal Ethics (Ijlle)* 3, no. 2 (2022): 6–13.

⁹ Vietnam News Agency, "Top Leader Chairs Anti-Corruption Steering Committee's Meeting," 2024, <https://en.vietnamplus.vn/top-leader-chairs-anti-corruption-steering-committees-meeting-post291915.vnp>.

¹⁰ Aniruddha Ghosal, "Real Estate Tycoon's Death Sentence Is a Turning Point in Vietnam's Anti-Corruption Campaign," 2024, <https://apnews.com/article/vietnam-trial-death-sentence-anticorruption-campaign-943b7ab86e88905ebc7334c13cf123ff>.

¹¹ Arief Zainuddin et al., "Dispute Resolution Model for Village Head Election Results: Examining the Authority of Regents/Mayors from the Perspectives of the Principles of Justice and Independence," *Indonesia Law Reform Journal* 5, no. 2 (2025): 228–60, <https://doi.org/10.22219/ilrej.v5i2.41087>.

depends on the political will of the elite and is not fully supported by an independent institutional system. Comparatively, the Indonesian model, with its independent institutions, and the Vietnamese model, with its centralized party system, both have advantages and disadvantages. Indonesia has a system allowing for checks and balances, but this is often weakened by political interests and regulations. In contrast, Vietnam has the ability to quickly prosecute corruption cases at the elite level due to political centralization, but faces problems in terms of transparency, accountability, and independent legal protection.

These differences make comparative studies crucial. Through comparative studies, the best strategies for eradicating corruption in Southeast Asia can be identified, whether through strengthening institutional independence, regulatory reform, or political consistency in supporting the anti-corruption agenda. The results of this study are expected to not only provide academic contributions to enrich the literature on governance and anti-corruption law, but also provide practical input for policymakers in Indonesia, Vietnam, and other Southeast Asian countries. Further, this study is relevant to the regional agenda, particularly within the framework of the ASEAN Political-Security Community (APSC), which is committed to promoting good, transparent, and accountable governance in the region. With increasing regional integration, efforts to eradicate corruption in each country cannot be viewed in isolation, but must be part of a collective agenda to create political stability, increase public trust, and support sustainable economic growth in Southeast Asia. Therefore, the following question is formulated: What are the regulations and institutions for eradicating corruption in Indonesia and Vietnam? Finally, it is expected that this study will benefit both countries and have broader relevance for strengthening governance at the regional level.

Research Methods

This study applied a socio-legal research method, namely an approach that not only analyzes law from a normative aspect in the form of statutory regulations and legal doctrine, but also analyzes how the law works in social reality.¹² This study combined a normative analysis of anti-corruption regulations with an empirical analysis of the function and success of anti-corruption institutions in Vietnam and Indonesia. This method was chosen as corruption is intertwined with legal culture, law enforcement practices, and socio-political dynamics influencing institutional performance. This is because corruption is intertwined with the applicable legal text. The data was obtained by analyzing laws and regulations, policies, annual reports of anti-corruption agencies, and literature. Additionally, secondary data, such as reports from international organizations, journal articles, and media reports, were also used to understand the social and political context behind the law's implementation. The analysis was conducted comparatively by comparing the legal framework, institutions, and implementation of anti-corruption policies in Indonesia and Vietnam, so that an overview on the similarities, differences, and factors influencing the effectiveness of anti-corruption efforts in both countries can be obtained.

Results and Discussion

1. Corruption Eradication Regulations in Indonesia and Vietnam

¹² Sunardi Purwanda and Andi Sri Rezky Wulandari, "Socio-Legal Studies: Methodical Implications of Legal Development in Indonesia," *Al 'Adl* 16, no. 2 (2023): 152-63.

Corruption is one of the biggest challenges to governance in Southeast Asia. Countries in this region face corruption issues that impact not only law enforcement but also economic development, public trust, and political stability.¹³ Despite having different historical backgrounds, political and legal systems, Vietnam and Indonesia place eradicating corruption as a national priority.¹⁴ Thus, corruption impacts law enforcement, public trust, economic growth, and political stability. Although Vietnam and Indonesia have different historical backgrounds, political and legal systems, both are focused on eradicating corruption. Integrity, accountability, and transparency are embedded in laws addressing corruption eradication. Therefore, a comprehensive study of the laws of both countries was conducted to identify how they were created, implemented, and successfully addressed the complex phenomenon of corruption.

a. Corruption Eradication Regulations in Indonesia

Indonesia has made eradicating corruption a priority in state law and policy, especially since the 1998 reform era. The regulation that is the main basis for eradicating corruption is Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption, as amended by Law Number 20 of 2001. This law describes various forms of criminal acts of corruption, including abuse of authority, bribery, gratuities, conflicts of interest in the procurement of goods/services, and acts that harm state finances. Furthermore, Indonesia also has Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission (later revised by Law Number 19 of 2019). This law serves as the legal basis for the establishment of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), an independent institution granted extensive authority to investigate and prosecute corruption cases. This regulation reinforces the state's commitment to providing an institution relatively free from political interference, although the KPK's independence has often been debated.

In addition to specific regulations, the eradication of corruption is also strengthened by a number of other regulations, such as Law Number 28 of 1999 concerning State Organizers who are clean and free from Corruption, Collusion, and Nepotism, Law Number 15 of 2002 concerning the Crime of Money Laundering, as well as a number of regulations related to gratuities, transparency of public services, and procurement of government goods/services. Indonesia has also ratified the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) through Law Number 7 of 2006, demonstrating its commitment to aligning national regulations with global standards for eradicating corruption. This ratification strengthens Indonesia's legal framework for prevention, prosecution, and international cooperation related to the recovery of assets obtained from corruption.¹⁵ The implementation of the UNCAC also encourages Indonesia to strengthen coordination between institutions, such as the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), the National Police, and the Prosecutor's Office, to

¹³ Nguyen Thi Thu Hoa, Nguyen Thi Thuy, and Nguyen Nghi Thanh, "Factors Affecting Corruption in the Public Sector: Evidence From Vietnam," *Journal of Liberty and International Affairs* 9, no. 2 (2023): 50-73, <https://doi.org/10.47305/JLIA2392063tt>.

¹⁴ Narfin Susilawati, Andi Tenri Asniar Rahman, and Jihan Imala, "Reformulation of Bribery Provisions for Foreign Public Officials and International Organizations in Indonesia's Anti-Corruption Law," *Journal of Law, Politic and Humanities* 5, no. 4 (2025): 2928-40, <https://doi.org/10.38035/jlph.v5i4.1659>.

¹⁵ Ardy Gunawan Tomagola et al., "The Effectiveness of Indonesia's Anti-Corruption Law on Legal Reform and Implementation," *West Science Law and Human Rights* 2, no. 03 (2024): 251-58, <https://doi.org/10.58812/wslhr.v2i03.1129>.

ensure effective law enforcement in accordance with global standards.¹⁶ Despite the comprehensive regulatory framework, its effective implementation still faces various challenges. Some regulatory weaknesses include overlapping regulations, inconsistent law enforcement, and the emergence of new regulations deemed to weaken the independence of anti-corruption agencies. The controversy surrounding the 2019 revision of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) Law is a clear example of how regulations can be influenced by political interests, impacting the performance of corruption eradication in Indonesia.

b. Anti-Corruption Regulations in Vietnam

Vietnam, a single-party political system under the leadership of the Communist Party, has a distinct approach to anti-corruption regulations. The primary regulation governing corruption eradication in Vietnam is the Law on Anti-Corruption (LAC), which is firstly enacted in 2005 and significantly revised in 2018 to expand its scope to include private sectors and to strengthen prevention, detection, and enforcement mechanisms.¹⁷ This revision of the LAC is considered one of the most important legal reforms in Vietnam in the last decade as it provides a comprehensive framework to regulate the conduct of public officials, asset disclosure, and whistleblower protection.¹⁸ Vietnam's anti-corruption law places great importance on transparency, integrity, and accountability for public officials. One key provision in this law is that public officials are required to declare their wealth and income.¹⁹ This is done to prevent abuse of power. Further, there are also regulations guaranteeing transparency in the state financial management, the procurement of goods and services, and the appointment and promotion process in public sectors. Under this legal framework, Vietnam also has enforcement agencies, such as the Government Inspection Council and anti-corruption units in each ministry. The Communist Party's political dominance has led to the eradication of corruption in Vietnam. In practice, anti-corruption laws work hand-in-hand with the party's disciplinary system in which violators can be punished and even dismissed from their positions.²⁰ The new regulations provide a broader legal basis for cracking down on corrupt practices involving business entities, including state-owned enterprises (SOEs) and private companies, as the 2018 revisions added the private sector to anti-corruption oversight. However, the effectiveness of Vietnam's regulations remains frequently questioned due to the lack of independence of the judicial system and the party's dominance in every aspect of government. Many observers believe that even the regulations appear strict, their implementation is often selective depending on political interests and internal party control.

c. Comparative Analysis of Indonesian and Vietnamese Regulations

¹⁶ Ridwan Arifin, Sigit Riyanto, and Akbar Kurnia Putra, "Collaborative Efforts in ASEAN for Global Asset Recovery Frameworks to Combat Corruption in the Digital Era," *Legality: Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum* 31, no. 2 (2023): 329-43, <https://doi.org/10.22219/ljih.v31i2.29381>.

¹⁷ Hoa, Thuy, and Thanh, "Factors Affecting Corruption in the Public Sector: Evidence From Vietnam."

¹⁸ Hoang Anh Nguyen and Viet Phuong Nguyen, "Enhancing Whistleblower Protection Against Corruption Based on Addressing Inadequacies and Enhancing Digital Technology Applications in Vietnam," *Journal of Ecohumanism* 3, no. 4 (2024): 1238-49, <https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v3i4.3654>.

¹⁹ Nguyen and Nguyen.

²⁰ Vu Minh Chau, "Legal Institutional Framework To Counter Crony Capitalism In Vietnam's Investment-Led Growth Transition."

Anti-corruption regulations in Indonesia and Vietnam have several similarities and differences. In terms of similarities, both countries have specific laws that specifically regulate corruption. Both have also aligned their regulations with international standards, such as ratification of the UNCAC. Besides, both Indonesia and Vietnam emphasize prevention through transparency, reporting of public officials' assets, and oversight of procurement. However, there are fundamental differences in the political and institutional context. On one hand, Indonesian regulations emphasize the independence of the anti-corruption agency through the establishment of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), although this has recently faced challenges. On the other hand, in Vietnam, anti-corruption regulations are closely tied to the single-party political system, resulting in more centralized implementation and often intermingling with party discipline mechanisms. Another difference is the scope of the regulations in which Indonesia has regulated many types of corruption from the outset, while Vietnam only expanded the regulations to the private sector in the 2018 revision. The effectiveness of the regulations also differs. In Indonesia, the weaknesses of the regulations are evident in frequent revisions causing public debate, and inconsistencies in law enforcement. Meanwhile, in Vietnam, the strict regulations are often not matched by judicial independence, creating the impression that corruption eradication is more political than legal.

2. *Corruption Eradication Institutions in Indonesia and Vietnam*

Eradicating corruption requires not only strong regulations but also institutions capable of carrying out prevention, oversight, investigation, and legal enforcement functions consistently and with integrity. Good regulations will be ineffective if not supported by institutions with clear authorities, adequate resources, and guaranteed independence. Therefore, institutional studies are crucial in understanding how anti-corruption efforts are implemented in Indonesia and Vietnam. These two countries have different political backgrounds and legal systems, which have direct implications for the structure and performance of their anti-corruption institutions.

a. Corruption Eradication Institution in Indonesia

Indonesia has one of the most well-known anti-corruption institutions in the region, namely the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) which was established based on Law Number 30 of 2002, then revised by Law Number 19 of 2019. The KPK was designed as an independent institution having extraordinary powers, including investigations, inquiries, prosecutions, as well as coordinations and supervisions of the police and prosecutors in corruption cases.²¹ However, the 2019 revision has weakened the position of the KPK, which previously stood outside the government bureaucratic structure, becoming a more integrated part of the state system as well as adding a layer of oversight (Supervisory Board), which has caused criticism about the KPK's independence.²² Various studies have shown that these changes have reduced the effectiveness and operational authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK). For instance, Wahyuningrum *et al.* (2020) argued that the law reforms have eliminated

²¹ Rahmad Prasetyo and Faisal Santiago, "KPK's Performance Dynamics in Combating Corruption After the 2019 Revision of the KPK Law," *Demokrasi: Jurnal Riset Ilmu Hukum, Sosial Dan Politik* 2, no. 3 (2025): 329-40, <https://doi.org/10.62383/demokrasi.v2i3.1220>.

²² Muhammad Habibi, "Independensi Kewenangan Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi Pasca Perubahan Undang-Undang Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi," *Cepalo* 4, no. 1 (2020): 41-54, <https://doi.org/10.25041/cepalo.v4n01.1962>.

the institution's essential independence.²³ In addition, Prasetyo and Santiago highlighted that the 2019 revision of the Law also affected the KPK's performance in eradicating corruption.²⁴ Apart from the Corruption Eradication Committee (KPK), there are other institutions playing a role in eradicating corruption, including the Attorney General's Office, the Indonesian National Police, and the Supreme Audit Agency (BPK), which has an audit function regarding state financial management. The Indonesian Ombudsman also plays a role in overseeing public services to prevent maladministration that could potentially lead to corruption. At the executive level, the Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform (KemenPAN-RB) also plays a role in promoting a clean governance system.

However, among all these institutions, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) is the primary symbol of Indonesia's commitment to eradicating corruption. This institution has successfully uncovered numerous major cases involving high-ranking state officials, regional heads, and even members of the legislature. However, the KPK faces significant challenges, particularly following the 2019 revision of the law, which is considered to weaken its independence. One significant change is the status of KPK employees to state civil servants (ASN) which has implications for potential bureaucratic intervention. Furthermore, the establishment of the KPK Supervisory Board, which has the authority to grant wiretapping permits, has also caused debate about the extent to which the institution's independence remains intact. On the other hand, the effectiveness of Indonesia's anti-corruption institutions is also influenced by inter-agency coordination. Although the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) has broad authority, synergy with the prosecutor's office, the police, the Supreme Audit Agency (BPK), and the government's internal oversight apparatus is still necessary. Unfortunately, relations between these institutions are not always smooth, often resulting in overlapping authority and inter-institutional rivalries. This has become an institutional barrier to be addressed to ensure a more integrated approach to corruption eradication.

b. Anti-Corruption Institutions in Vietnam

Vietnam's anti-corruption system is closely tied to the political power structure of the Communist Party of Vietnam (CPV). The core anti-corruption body is the Central Steering Committee for Anti-Corruption Work (CSCACW), established in 2013 and controlled by the current party elites, particularly the CPV's Secretary-General.²⁵ This committee directs various anti-corruption policies and coordinations between state institutions, reflecting that anti-corruption institutions in Vietnam are political and highly centralized. Vietnam has a different institutional approach compared to Indonesia. As a country with a single-party political system, corruption eradication in Vietnam is closely linked to the structure of the Communist Party of Vietnam (CPV). State institutions involved in corruption eradication operate not only within the legal framework but also in coordination with the party's internal oversight mechanisms. Technical institutions, such as the Government Inspectorate (GI) and the State Audit

²³ Kartika Sasi Wahyuningrum, Hari Sutra Disemadi, and Nyoman Serikat Putra Jaya, "Independensi Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi: Benarkah Ada?," *Refleksi Hukum: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 4, no. 2 (2020): 239-58, <https://doi.org/10.24246/jrh.2020.v4.i2.p239-258>.

²⁴ Rahmad Prasetyo and Faisal Santiago, "KPK's Performance Dynamics in Combating Corruption After the 2019 Revision of the KPK Law."

²⁵ Ngoc Anh Nguyen and Duc Nhuan Nguyen, "Anti-Corruption in Vietnam - an Institutional Analysis," *Cogent Social Sciences* 11, no. 1 (2025), <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331886.2025.2460320>.

Office of Vietnam (SAV), have the authority to inspect and audit irregularities by public officials and state agencies. For example, the 2018 Law on Anti-Corruption (LAC) stipulates that inspection bodies can take action on corruption cases at various levels of government and in state-owned enterprises.²⁶

One of the main institutions in eradicating corruption in Vietnam is the Government Inspectorate (GI), an agency under the executive functioning to supervise, inspect and investigate corrupt practices in government administration. Besides, the State Audit Office of Vietnam (SAV) serves a similar function to Indonesia's Supreme Audit Agency (BPK), namely auditing the management and use of state finances. In addition to state institutions, the Communist Party of Vietnam plays a dominant role in eradicating corruption through its Central Steering Committee for Anti-Corruption, led directly by the Party's Secretary-General. This committee coordinates anti-corruption policies, oversees the implementation of regulations, and directs state institutions in handling major cases. This party mechanism makes the eradication of corruption in Vietnam more political as officials proven to have committed corruption are not only subject to criminal charges, but can also be dismissed from their positions through the party's disciplinary mechanism.

Recent academic studies confirm that despite the strong political will at the central level, anti-corruption institutions in Vietnam are relatively weak at the local level. A study by Ngoc Anh Nguyen and Duc Nhuan Nguyen (2025) describes that the effectiveness of anti-corruption institutions is highly dependent on the support of party elites, and local structures are still far from ideal.²⁷ Besides, Vietnam has anti-corruption units within various ministries and government agencies. However, these institutions are hierarchical and centralized as all strategic policies are controlled by the Party. A frequently highlighted weakness of this system is the lack of judicial independence in handling corruption cases, leaving law enforcement vulnerable to being influenced by internal party political interests. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of institutions in Vietnam is evident from several major operations succeeded in netting high-ranking state officials, including ministers and Political Bureau members, which considered as proof of the party's seriousness in carrying out 'blazing furnace' campaign to clean the bureaucracy from corruption.

c. Comparative Analysis of Corruption Eradication Institutions in Indonesia and Vietnam

Institutionally, Indonesia and Vietnam have different models reflecting their political systems. Indonesia established an independent institution, in this case the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), that is legally outside the executive, legislative, and judicial powers. This model aims to give the KPK autonomy in carrying out its authority without direct interference from political forces. Although the independence of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) has recently been debated, the existence of this institution remains an advantage for Indonesia in building an anti-corruption institutional system. In contrast, Vietnam has not established an independent institution completely separate from political power. Anti-corruption institutions in Vietnam are embedded within the executive and party structures. The

²⁶ Khanh Hoang et al., "Anti-Corruption Campaign and Firm Financial Performance: Evidence From Vietnam Firms," *Evaluation Review* 46, no. 2 (2022): 103-37, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193841X211072707>.

²⁷ Nguyen and Nguyen, "Anti-Corruption in Vietnam - an Institutional Analysis."

Government Inspectorate and the State Audit Office of Vietnam serve as technical institutions, while the strategic role is held by the Central Steering Committee which is directly led by party elites. This model reflects that corruption eradication in Vietnam is more of a party-driven national political agenda than a fully independent legal mechanism. Another difference lies in institutional coordination. In Indonesia, the main challenge lies in inter-institutional coordination which often occurs partially and gives rise to conflicts of authority. Meanwhile, in Vietnam, institutional coordination is relatively solid due to centralized control by the Party, but this also poses the risk of politicization in case handling. However, both countries face similar challenges, namely limited resources and limited official integrity. In Indonesia, issues of the political interference and the weakening of independent institutions remain major problems. Meanwhile, in Vietnam, the weak judicial independence and the potential for selective law enforcement pose serious challenges to the credibility of anti-corruption institutions.

Conclusion

Based on the description, it can be concluded that the anti-corruption regulations in Indonesia and Vietnam show the state's commitment to eradicating corruption, but each country applies a different approach following their political system. Indonesia has created an extensive legal framework by enacting specific laws and ratifying international conventions. Besides, Indonesia has also established the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) as an independent institution to strengthen this legal framework. Meanwhile, the Anti-Corruption Law and other instruments reinforced by the Communist Party's political control mechanisms demonstrate the importance of anti-corruption regulations in Vietnam. In addition, the regulatory freedom differs significantly between Vietnam and Indonesia. Indonesia prioritizes the rule of law, while Vietnam combines it with stronger political power. Further, Vietnam and Indonesia also have different institutional models. While facing regulatory weakening and coordination issues with other institutions, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) in Indonesia is established as an independent institution with extensive authority. In contrast, Vietnam's party discipline system, controlled directly by the party elites, relies on cooperation between the executives. Although this model allows for more political effectiveness in eradicating corruption in Vietnam, it does not guarantee judicial independence. Thus, this study found that the success of corruption eradication is influenced by existing institutions, regulations, political consistency, legal independence, and cultural integrity.

Suggestion

Based on the description, it is suggested to strengthen the independence of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) in Indonesia by ensuring that the law no longer weakens its authority. Further, to prevent overlapping authority, law enforcement agencies, such as the prosecutor's office, the police, the Supreme Audit Agency (BPK), and internal oversight bodies, should collaborate through clear working mechanisms. Besides, political commitment between the legislative and executive is also needed to prevent the misuse of anti-corruption laws for personal gain. To prevent corruption, bureaucratic reform, transparency in public services, and digitalization of oversight systems must be continuously improved. Vietnam still needs to strengthen judicial independence to ensure that law

enforcement adheres to the principles of justice and is not merely a political tool. This has been achieved due to the Communist Party's political commitment to eradicating corruption. Further, Vietnam should encourage the private sector, the civil society, and the media to support government transparency and accountability. In the future, to ensure that Vietnam's anti-corruption regulations and institutions are not only politically effective but also long-lasting, continued efforts must be made to harmonize the rule of law and political control.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank the Faculty of Law, Universitas Kuningan and the Faculty of Law, Ton Duc Thang University, Vietnam for their support so that this joint research can be published in scientific journals.

References

- Agency, Vietnam News. "Top Leader Chairs Anti-Corruption Steering Committee's Meeting," 2024. <https://en.vietnamplus.vn/top-leader-chairs-anti-corruption-steering-committees-meeting-post291915.vnp>.
- Arifin, Ridwan, Sigit Riyanto, and Akbar Kurnia Putra. "Collaborative Efforts in ASEAN for Global Asset Recovery Frameworks to Combat Corruption in the Digital Era." *Legality: Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum* 31, no. 2 (2023): 329–43. <https://doi.org/10.22219/ljih.v31i2.29381>.
- Foley, Laura. "Criminality, Chaos and Corruption: Analyzing the Narratives of Labor Migration Dynamics in Malaysia." *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal* 32, no. 2 (2023): 208–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01171968231189139>.
- Ghosal, Aniruddha. "Real Estate Tycoon's Death Sentence Is a Turning Point in Vietnam's Anti-Corruption Campaign," 2024. <https://apnews.com/article/vietnam-trial-death-sentence-anticorruption-campaign-943b7ab86e88905ebc7334c13cf123ff>.
- Habibi, Muhammad. "Independensi Kewenangan Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi Pasca Perubahan Undang-Undang Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi." *Cepalo* 4, no. 1 (2020): 41–54. <https://doi.org/10.25041/cepalo.v4n01.1962>.
- Hoa, Nguyen Thi Thu, Nguyen Thi Thuy, and Nguyen Nghi Thanh. "Factors Affecting Corruption in the Public Sector: Evidence From Vietnam." *Journal of Liberty and International Affairs* 9, no. 2 (2023): 50–73. <https://doi.org/10.47305/JLIA2392063tt>.
- Hoang, Khanh, Hieu T. Doan, Thanh T. Tran, Thang X. Nguyen, and Anh Q. Le. "Anti-Corruption Campaign and Firm Financial Performance: Evidence From Vietnam Firms." *Evaluation Review* 46, no. 2 (2022): 103–37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193841X211072707>.
- KPK, Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi. "https://kpk.go.id/id/ruang-informasi/berita/kpk-dorong-penguatan-regulasi-indonesia-tentang-antisuap-lintas-negara?utm_source=chatgpt.com," 2025.
- Lubis, Tagor Indra Mulia, and Bagus Ramadi. "Theoretical Studies Regarding Corruption, Corruption Crimes, and Perspective Studies on Islamic Criminal Law Theory (Fiqh Jinayah)." *Al-Arfa: Journal of Sharia, Islamic Economics and Law* 1, no. 2 (2023): 84–96. <https://doi.org/10.61166/arfa.vii2.38>.
- Nehrudin, Nehrudin, and Askar Askar. "Threat of Corruption to Foreign Direct Investment and Economic Growth in Southeast Asia." *Tamansiswa Management Journal International* 5, no. 1 (2022): 23–29. <https://doi.org/10.54204/tmji/vol5i2022005>.
- Nguyen, Hoang Anh, and Viet Phuong Nguyen. "Enhancing Whistleblower Protection

- Against Corruption Based on Addressing Inadequacies and Enhancing Digital Technology Applications in Vietnam.” *Journal of Ecohumanism* 3, no. 4 (2024): 1238–49. <https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v3i4.3654>.
- Nguyen, Ngoc Anh, and Duc Nhuan Nguyen. “Anti-Corruption in Vietnam - an Institutional Analysis.” *Cogent Social Sciences* 11, no. 1 (2025). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2025.2460320>.
- Purwanda, Sunardi, and Andi Sri Rezky Wulandari. “Socio-Legal Studies: Methodical Implications of Legal Development in Indonesia.” *Al 'Adl* 16, no. 2 (2023): 152–63.
- Qazi, Abroon. “Risk Forecasting for Shortfalls in Achieving Sustainable Development Goals: A Corruption Perspective.” *Journal of Safety Science and Resilience* 6, no. 2 (June 2025): 237–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnlssr.2024.10.003>.
- Rahmad Prasetyo, and Faisal Santiago. “KPK’s Performance Dynamics in Combating Corruption After the 2019 Revision of the KPK Law.” *Demokrasi: Jurnal Riset Ilmu Hukum, Sosial Dan Politik* 2, no. 3 (2025): 329–40. <https://doi.org/10.62383/demokrasi.v2i3.1220>.
- Sukma, Silvando Rananda. “Tindak Pidana Korupsi Di Indonesia: Pendekatan Yuridis Normatif Dan Empiris.” *Journal Terekam Jejak (JTJ)* 3, no. 1 (2025): 1–11.
- Susilawati, Narfin, Andi Tenri Asniar Rahman, and Jihan Imala. “Reformulation of Bribery Provisions for Foreign Public Officials and International Organizations in Indonesia’s Anti-Corruption Law.” *Journal of Law, Politic and Humanities* 5, no. 4 (2025): 2928–40. <https://doi.org/10.38035/jlph.v5i4.1659>.
- Tomagola, Ardy Gunawan, Wahid Yaurwarin, Jakobus Anakletus Rahajaan, Agustinus Jonas Sahetapy, and Reni Wahyuni Kalauw. “The Effectiveness of Indonesia’s Anti-Corruption Law on Legal Reform and Implementation.” *West Science Law and Human Rights* 2, no. 03 (2024): 251–58. <https://doi.org/10.58812/wslhr.v2i03.1129>.
- Vu Minh Chau. “Legal Institutional Framework to Counter Crony Capitalism in Vietnam’s Investment-Led Growth Transition.” *International Journal of Law and Legal Ethics (Ijlle)* 3, no. 2 (2022): 6–13.
- Wahyuningrum, Kartika Sasi, Hari Sutra Disemadi, and Nyoman Serikat Putra Jaya. “Independensi Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi: Benarkah Ada?” *Refleksi Hukum: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 4, no. 2 (2020): 239–58. <https://doi.org/10.24246/jrh.2020.v4.i2.p239-258>.
- Welle, Deutsche. “Truong My Lan Divonis Mati, Pemberantasan Korupsi Vietnam Terlalu Kejam?” *Detik.com*, 2024. <https://news.detik.com/dw/d-7296987/truong-my-lan-divonis-mati-pemberantasan-korupsi-vietnam-terlalu-kejam>.
- Zainuddin, Arief, Muhammad Ali Safa’at, Tunggul Anshari Setia Negara, Riana Susmayanti, and Sholahuddin Al-Fatih. “Dispute Resolution Model for Village Head Election Results: Examining the Authority of Regents/Mayors from the Perspectives of the Principles of Justice and Independence.” *Indonesia Law Reform Journal* 5, no. 2 (2025): 228–60. <https://doi.org/10.22219/ilrej.v5i2.41087>.

How to Cite :

Hidayat, Sarip, Suwari Akhmaddhian, Erga Yuhandra, Haris Budiman, and Lam Thanh Danh. “Effectiveness of Regulations and Institutions for Eradicating Corruption in Southeast Asia: A Comparative Study of Indonesia and Vietnam”. *Unifikasi: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 12, no. 02 (December 31, 2025): 184–195