



## Deterrent Effect in System Criminalization Corruption : A Comparative Study System Criminalization of Indonesia and Singapore

Febi Afriani; Eny Kusdarini; Muhammad Julianto

Master's Program in Pancasila and Citizenship Education, Faculty of Social Sciences and Political Sciences,  
Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia

<http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v12i7.6852>

---

### **Abstract**

Corruption is an extraordinary crime that has a broad impact on the social, political and economic stability of a country. In Indonesia, the effectiveness of the punishment system against corruption offenders is often questioned due to weak penalties, slow judicial processes, and low legal certainty. This study aims to compare the effectiveness of the corruption punishment system in Indonesia and Singapore through the deterrent effect theory approach which consists of three main principles: certainty, speed, and severity of punishment. This study uses a normative juridical approach and comparative law method, by analyzing key regulations, recent case studies, and secondary data from journals and research reports. The results show that Singapore has been able to consistently apply the principles of deterrent effect through strict laws, independent law enforcement agencies, and efficient judicial processes. Meanwhile, the punishment system in Indonesia still faces structural and cultural challenges that hinder the effective eradication of corruption. This study concludes that a comprehensive application of the deterrent effect theory can be an important foundation for corruption sentencing reform in Indonesia. This reform includes improving regulations, strengthening institutions, accelerating the legal process, and building a legal culture that supports integrity and accountability.

**Keywords:** *Corruption; Criminalization; Deterrent Effect; Indonesia; Singapore*

### **Introduction**

Corruption is a crime outside the ordinary (extraordinary crime) that not only damages the government system but also threatens the economic, political, and social a country (Mutiarasafitri et al., 2023). Its multidimensional impact encourages various countries, including Indonesia, to develop more effective coping strategies comprehensively. One of the assessed instruments crucial in eradicating corruption is implementing strict and consistent criminal sanctions, such as punishment, imprisonment, fines, and robbery of asset results from crime (Harmaen Anggayudha et al., 2023). The effectiveness of criminalization to prevent perpetrators from committing criminal corruption often shows no optimal results. In Indonesia, many decisions the court of law assessed gave no effect to adequate deterrence. The punishment imposed on perpetrators of corruption is often mild, even in big cases involving significant state losses. The low punishment creates the perception in society that corruption is a crime that is

"profitable" because the potential big profit is not comparable with the risk of the punishment that will be accepted. This is, of course, a weakened function of law as a criminal tool for upholding justice and regulating social behavior.

A comparative study between Indonesia and Singapore is important to examine effectiveness system in press behavior and corruption (Quah, 2017). Comparison This is important because Singapore, as a country in the Southeast Asian region, has experienced challenges with corruption to those of other countries but has succeeded in building a firm and efficient system with minimal intervention in politics. Success in making the example relevant and concrete for Indonesia in order to design policy for more effective criminalization and effect-oriented deterrence. Comparison this is also relevant in a legal and sociological Because both countries have background behind history different colonial, but is at in environment relative geopolitics similar. Indonesia adheres to system law and civil law, while Singapore adheres to system common law inheritance from colonial English. Differences in system law This gives the corner an interesting view about how both countries formulate and enforce criminal law, especially to crime and corruption. In addition, the context of culture, law, level of public trust in institutions enforcing law, and effectiveness of bureaucracy participate in influencing the success of eradicating corruption in each country.

Data from Transparency International via the Index Perception Corruption (CPI) is increasingly strengthening the urgency of comparison. This. In 2023, Singapore will occupy the 5th rank in the world with a CPI score of 83 out of 100. On the other hand, Indonesia is ranked 110th with a score of 34 out of 100. The score shows that corruption is still becoming a serious problem in Indonesia and is not yet handled optimally by the justice system for the crime. Significant differences This reflects that system law in Singapore, in particular in matters of criminalizing corruption, is capable of creating a stronger deterrent effect. Indonesia itself has its own framework of relative law that is adequate, such as Constitution Number 31 of 1999 in conjunction with Constitution Number 20 of 2001 concerning Eradication Action Criminal Corruption. Regulation of the explicit load types, action corruption, main and additional, as well as procedure robbery assets. However Thus, various problems still appear, such as low consistency in judges' decisions, weakness in giving additional punishment, and the proliferation of political intervention in the judicial process (Asdhie Kodiya, 2020; Harefa et al., 2024). Not often is perpetrator corruption that should get heavy punishment precisely sentenced lightly because of gap laws or non-juridical considerations.

Singapore shows more system progress. Through the Prevention of Corruption Act (PCA), this country not only confirms types of action, corruption, and criminal threats, but also determines efficient procedures and frees laws from political influence. The Corrupt Practices Investigation Bureau (CPIB) is tasked with being being in a way independent having wide authority for investigate and take action in cases of corruption. The combination of strict rule of law, fast law enforcement, and a courageous anti-corruption agency makes Singapore successful at pressing down corruption until to minimum point (Quah, 2020, 2024b). This study aims to fill in the emptiness in literature about how principles affect deterrence covering certainty of penalties, speed of process, and severity of sanctions applied in a way that is different in Indonesia and Singapore. Most of the studies previously tended only to highlight normative aspects from framework law or institutional roles in eradicating corruption without directly linking them to the draft effect as an evaluative approach. Studies relevant to comparative, such as by Croci (2025), which analyzes effectiveness and corruption in system justice criminal law in Latin America, as well as by Sahardian et al. (2020), which evaluates the effectiveness of implementing criminal sanctions for crime corruption in Indonesia, show that approaches based on effective deterrence have now become important elements in system reform criminalization in developing countries. Based on matter said, research This compares the criminalization of corruption in Indonesia and Singapore in order to provide recommendations for policy context and strategic criminal law for repair system in Indonesia.

For that, this writing aims to analyze and compare effectiveness system of criminalization to act criminal corruption in Indonesia and Singapore through of the theory of the deterrent effect. Focus on the main study. This is to what extent the principle of certainty punishment (certainty), speed of legal process (celerity), and severity punishment (severity) is applied in the legal systems of both countries, as well as how different implementations impact the level of success in eradicating corruption. Two main questions are proposed in the study. This is (1) how different implementation principles between Indonesia and Singapore handle acts of criminal corruption. and (2) What are the recommendations? strategies that can be offered for reform of the criminal justice system corruption in Indonesia based on learning from Singapore? Different from the study previously, which was generally only a highlight aspect of normative or institutional law, this article put the theory of deterrent effects as the main framework for analysis. Approach This not only offer perspective on law, but also links legal norms with social and institutional behavior. With Thus, the article serves as a theoretical and practical contribution to delving deeper into how system criminalization can, in a way effective in forming anti-corruption behavior at the state level.

## **Method**

The study method used in studies This is a legal normative approach with a method of comparing law (comparative law approach). Approach This chosen for analyzing the difference in the system of criminalizing criminal acts of corruption in Indonesia and Singapore, as well as evaluating the effectiveness of implementing sanctions based on theory deterrent effect. Electing these two countries is based on methodological reasons, namely significant differences in the effectiveness of corruption eradication Indonesia faces systemic challenges in implementing punishment, while Singapore is known own firm, fast, and free law from political intervention. With Thus, the space scope study focused on these two countries to obtain mapping, contrasting, and relevant comparisons towards policy reform and criminalization in Indonesia.

This study uses four approach main, namely approach legislation, approach case, approach comparison, and approach conceptual. Approach legislation used to examine substance law from Constitution Number 31 of 1999 in conjunction with Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Eradication Action Criminal Corruption in Indonesia and the Prevention of Corruption Act (PCA) in Singapore. Approach case used to analyze example concrete implementation law, including cases of corruption in Indonesia (2023–2024) and the Edwin Yeo case in Singapore (2013), in order to see to what extent the deterrent effect is produced through court decisions. An approach comparison was done to evaluate the difference in aspect certainty law, speed of process, and severity of criminal sanctions between both countries. As for the approach conceptualized based on the theory of deterrence effect from Cesare Beccaria and Jeremy Bentham, it emphasizes three elements important in effective punishment, namely certainty, celerity, and severity.

Types of data used in the study This is secondary data consisting of material primary law (regulations, legislation, and court decisions), material law secondary (journal, scientific books, reports, and research), and material law tertiary (dictionary and encyclopedia) law. Data collection techniques are carried out through studies and library research, and data analysis is carried out in a descriptive-qualitative way with stages of identification, comparison, evaluation, and withdrawal. Conclusion and Recommendations policy. Through this approach, study This is expected to give a strategic contribution to strengthening system criminalization of corruption in Indonesia it more firm and effective.

## **Results and Discussion**

### **The Theory of Deterrent Effect According to Cesare Beccaria and Jeremy Bentham**

Effect theory Deterrence theory is one of the classic theories in criminal law that has had a big influence on the formation of modern criminalization systems. This theory was pioneered by Cesare Beccaria and Jeremy Bentham. In his work *On Crimes and Punishments* (1764), Beccaria emphasized that the objective aim of giving punishment is not retaliation, but rather prevention of crime. No repeated, either by the perpetrator or by others. While that, Bentham developed a utilitarian approach through a draft hedonistic calculus, which states that man acts based on a calculation of profit and loss. Therefore, the belief that the punishment is firm, fast, and certain can lower incentive to commit crime.

Effect theory has three main elements certainty, speed, and severity. Certainty means that every offender law must be charged sanctions without exception. Speed refers to the importance of dropping punishment as soon as possible after the crime happened. While that severity means punishment must be heavy enough to create fear and deter crime. In the context of eradicating corruption, implementing the third element This becomes very crucial. A country that is able to apply principles in a way consistent will be more effective in repressing corruption. Effect theory deterrent becomes a framework-relevant analysis in comparing the criminalization system between Indonesia and Singapore. Implementation element third This becomes very crucial. A country that is able to apply principles in a way consistent will be more effective in repressing corruption. Therefore, that theory prevention becomes a framework-relevant analysis in comparing the system of criminalization between Indonesia and Singapore.

Deterrence theory also has strategic value in developing knowledge of criminal law, in particular to crime corruption committed by rational actors and having a strategic position in the system. Because corruption is a dimensional systemic crime, approaching prevention-based punishment through threat sanctions becomes the most sensible choice (Beny et al., 2024). This theory not only functions as a basic normative rule of law but also as an analytical tool for how far the system of criminalization is capable of operating its function in an effective way (Harefa et al., 2024). Effect theory deterrent No just framework think classic, but still very relevant in answer challenge enforcement law criminal contemporary, especially in case corruption. In the context of academic theory implementation This show plays an important theoretical approach in linking norms, institutions, and public behavior law so that it makes it an important instrument in designing rational, fair, and effective laws (Harmaen Anggayudha et al., 2023; Mutiara Safitri et al., 2023).

### **Case Study of Tin Corruption in Bangka Belitung**

The corruption ion case angka Belitung, which was revealed in 2023, became such ae such a big scandal that it it reflects the weakness offenses of the Indonesian legal system system in overcoming corporate crime. ghlights a conspiracy between officials of PT Timah Tbk, a private smelter company, and a number of other parties in activity mining illegal and ongoing money laundering during years. Based on data from the Attorney General's Office and audit results from BPKP, the total state losses incurred from this case reach around Rp. 300 trillion, including damage environment on a wide scale as a consequence of mining sequence of mining activity permission (CNN Indonesia, 2024). Between 2015 and 2022, PT Timah Tbk was known to weave work the same with a number of smelter companies without studying legitimate technical work. The same this involving rent, too heavy, fictitious, and purchase ore tin from illegal sources. Companies such as PT Refined Bangka Tin, PT Stanindo Inti Perkasa, and CV Venus Inti Perkasa are mentioned actively involved in illegal chain distribution pas, 2024). Public figures like Harvey Moeis allegedly become intermediaries between PT Timah and the smelter. Until early 2024, 22 people are set as suspects, including PT Timah's top brass, official's area, and other arises (Tempo, 2024).

In general law, the suspects were charged with anargued with an indictment based on Articles 2 and 3 jo. Article 18 of Law No. 31 of 1999 concerning Eradication Action Criminal Corruption, which has been been updated through Law No. 20 of 2001. In addition, Article 55 of the Criminal Code is used ensnare collective involvement, as well as Articles 3 and 4 of Law No. 8 of 2010 concerning Prevention and Eradication Action Criminal Money Laundering. However, according to SetyawanFadly et al. (2024), enforcement law in case This is is not yet completely optimal because no provision provision applies toinal environmentally life based on Law No. 32 of 2009 and to ensnare corporations in a way that that directly makes themmakes them perpetrators of criminal acts.cts. In fact, the articles in the law allow the fall criminal against legal entities, including freezing, dissolution, and confiscation of assets. Handling this case also reaps widespread criticism from society. Some of of the verdicts handed down were rated too light if compared to thelosses incurred. For example, Alwin Akbar, a former director of of PT Timah's operations, waswas only sentenced totoars's' imprisonment by the Pangkalpinang District Court (DecisionNo. 8/id.Sus-TPK/2024/PNPgp), while other defendants, such as Ryan Susanto alias Afung sentenced to to free although the prosecutor demanded16.5 years in in prison (Detik, 2024). Setyawan Fadly et al. 2024) evaluate that condition. This is contradictory torinciples in theory, affecting certaintyty, speed, and the weight ofight of the punishment that should be the basis of enforcement of law and criminal corruption

This case illustrates the failure to pursue the main entity as the primary perpetrator of the crime. At this point, the company that allegedly played a central role in the criminal ecosystem has yet to be formally held accountable. In the context of Indonesian criminal law, particularly regarding corporate crimes, a legal entity can and should be prosecuted as a legal subject, as stipulated in Article 20 of Law No. 31 of 1999 and Article 7 of Law No. 8 of 2010 (Setyawan Fadly et al., 2024). The environmental impact of these illegal activities is enormous. According to environmental expert Hero Saharjo from IPB, the damage caused by illegal tin mining has reached over 170,000 hectares—far exceeding the licensed mining area, which only covers about 88,900 hectares. The estimated ecological loss amounts to Rp271 trillion, encompassing damage to both forest and non-forest ecosystems (CNN Indonesia, 2024). This illegal practice not only destroys the environment but also undermines fair market competition and tarnishes the reputation of Indonesia's mining sector in the eyes of the international community. The state has attempted to recover losses through the seizure of assets belonging to the suspects. As of March 2024, the Attorney General's Office had confiscated 187 land plots, 66 bank accounts, 55 heavy machinery units, 16 cars, 6 smelters, and 1 gas station. These confiscations are based on Article 18 of the Corruption Law and Article 7 of the Anti-Money Laundering Law. However, the recovery process remains ineffective. Many of the seized assets have yet to be managed productively, and their legal status after confiscation is still unclear (Tempo, 2024).

### **Case Study of Edwin Yeo Seow Hiong in Singapore**

The corruption case involving Edwin Yeo Seow Hiong, an official high in the Corrupt Practices Investigation Bureau (CPIB), revealed the importance of consistency, speed, and assertiveness in law enforcement in Singapore. Yeo, who is assistant director at CPIB, is instead involved in the embezzlement of operational funds institution's anti-corruption This happened between 2008 and 2012, amounting to SGD 1.76 million. The funds are used for activities of personnel who are not related to their duties, such as gambling and enjoying a luxurious lifestyle. Ironically, it was Yeo's actions that involved misuse of CPIB funds in progress long enough without detection by the institution's internal audit system, said. However, when this scandal was revealed, CPIB did not try to cover up the involvement of one of its members and immediately did an internal investigation. CPIB's courage is a deep follow-up case. This shows their commitment to principles of transparency and accountability in opposing corruption, even though they must face the bitter fact that the perpetrator originates from a circle within the institution that is alone (Today Online, 2013).

Handling law towards Yeo reflects the implementation of the principle of certainty and celerity in theory and effect as a deterrent. After being revealed, Yeo was fired, arrested, and tried in a relatively short time. At the beginning In 2014, the Singapore District Court sentenced guilty verdict on five charges, including abuse public trust position and forgery of documents, according to Singapore criminal law, in particular Penal Code Section 409 on criminal breach of trust. Yeo was sentenced to prison for 10 years, a punishment that shows how serious this country is about handling violations of integrity, even those carried out by officials high in institutions enforcing law, such as the CPIB (The Straits Times, 2014).

### **Comparison of the Effectiveness of Criminal Law Sanctions for Corruption in Indonesia and Singapore Based on the Deterrent Effect Theory**

Eradicating criminal corruption needs an approach that is not only repressive in a legal way but also capable of creating deterrent for perpetrators. In the context of this theory, the effect of deterrence theory becomes a relevant basis for formulating policies and practices of punishment. This theory was developed by Cesare Beccaria and Jeremy Bentham, who held the view that man is a creature of rational consideration of profit and loss before acting. Therefore, a definite, swift, and severe punishment is trusted to be capable of preventing crime because it enlarges the risk compared to the benefits gained from criminal action (Beny et al., 2024; Harefa et al., 2024). Three main elements in deterrence theory include certainty of punishment (certainty), namely every perpetrator crime is certain to be punished; speed of punishment (celerity), namely, punishment is dropped quickly after the crime occurs and severity of punishment (severity), which means punishment must be heavy enough to make the perpetrator and others think twice before doing a similar action. Third element This each other complete, and if applied in a way consistent will to form system law that does not only function to respond to crime but also prevent it in an effective way (Beny et al., 2024).

Comparison between Indonesia and Singapore: the effectiveness of implementation theory is clearly seen through the quality regulations and criminalization practices carried out by each country. In Indonesia, the apparatus the law used to take action against perpetrators of corruption is actually available in a normative way, namely through Constitution Number 31 of 1999 in conjunction with Law Number 20 of 2001. The sanctions regulated covering criminal imprisonment, fines, and confiscation of assets. However, in practice, enforcement law still faces various issues, including light sentence, slow legal processes, and high-level intervention politics and judicial discretion (Harmaen Anggayudha et al., 2023. Mutiara Safitri et al., 2023). As a real example, case corruption mining exposed lead since the end of 2023 to be proof of weakness in the implementation of the principle of certainty and speed in the Indonesian criminalization system. Based on data from the Attorney General's Office, value state losses due to cases This is estimated to reach Rp. 271 trillion, involving dozens of companies and public officials (Kusworo & Anggraini, 2025). However, until April 2025, not yet. There is a solid verdict don't trust the main perpetrator or the small part of all parts that suspects prosecution. Pending legal proceedings This indicates low certainty and slowness in handling big corruption cases. As a result, the deterrent effect was not created, and society lost trust in the justice system (Zulfikar, 2022).

Singapore demonstrates how the theory of the deterrent effect can be effectively implemented within a legal system. Through the Prevention of Corruption Act (PCA) and the support of a strong anti-corruption institution—the Corrupt Practices Investigation Bureau (CPIB)—Singapore applies sanctions that are consistent, firm, and in accordance with the law. One case that illustrates this success is that of Edwin Yeo, a CPIB investigator proven to have misused institutional funds. He was swiftly sentenced to 10 years in prison, and the assets gained from his crimes were confiscated by the state (Quah, 2017). The speed of the legal process and the clarity of the sanctions demonstrate that Singapore's legal system does not discriminate between ordinary citizens and state officials in law enforcement (Quah, 2020; Thong & Albakri, 2016). Singapore also excels in its asset confiscation mechanism. The country uses a non-conviction-based asset forfeiture approach, which allows the seizure of assets even before the final

conviction is reached. This mechanism is designed to prevent perpetrators from moving or hiding assets during ongoing legal proceedings. In contrast, Indonesia still relies on a conviction-based system, which requires a legally binding court decision (*inkracht*) before assets can be confiscated. As a result, the confiscation process in Indonesia is often delayed and vulnerable to exploitation by perpetrators seeking to evade accountability (Rahmawati, 2024; Wd Sinulingga & Leviza, 2023). Legal certainty becomes a key differentiator in the effectiveness of the criminal justice systems of both countries. In Indonesia, overlapping regulations create loopholes that allow perpetrators to escape or receive lighter punishments. Additionally, the independence of law enforcement institutions like the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) has come into question since the revision of the KPK Law in 2019, which curtailed its investigative powers, including wiretapping and asset seizure (Harmaen Anggayudha et al., 2023). This weakening inevitably reduces the KPK's ability to enforce sanctions effectively and independently from political pressures. In contrast, Singapore's CPIB is an independent and professional institution that reports directly to the Prime Minister. It operates without bowing to political or personal interests, earning strong public trust and maintaining integrity in every legal process (Quah, 2024a). These strong institutional foundations support the effective application of the deterrent effect because the public can see that law enforcement operates fairly, consistently, and impartially.

Important It is noted that Singapore's success in eradicating corruption is not solely determined by the quality of the law but also by commitment to politics, culture, disciplined law, and consistent law implementation. This country will not tolerate corruption in any form whatsoever, even when the perpetrator originates from the institution of government itself. Therefore, that effect, the deterrent effect, not only impacts individuals but also creates collective awareness in the public that corruption is an action that does not own place in life (Quah, 2018). Temporary that, Indonesia is facing challenge big in realize system the law that has a strong deterrent. In addition to the institutional weakness, the social and cultural permissive laws to practice corruption participate in becoming the main inhibitor. Not infrequently, perpetrators of corruption who have been sentenced still get public sympathy and even return to take office in strategic positions. Phenomenon This shows that the deterrent effect is not only determined by positive law but also by deep-rooted social and political values in the public (Mutiaras Safitri et al., 2023).

With notice all over the above aspects, it is then clear that implementation theory effects deterrent in a way whole and consistent, can become a key main in strengthening the system of criminalization corruption. Singapore has proven that the third element theory This certainty, speed, and severity can be operationalized in a way that is effective in system law nationally. While that, Indonesia still requires profound structural and cultural reforms to follow in the footsteps This reformation must cover strengthening criminal procedure law, simplifying regulation and criminalization, reinforcing institutional enforcement law, and returning independence to the institution against corruption. With Thus, learning from Singapore can become a reflection of strategy for Indonesia in organizing a repeat system of criminalization that is not considered optimal. Through the implementation of principles of theory effect deterrent in a comprehensive way, it is hoped that Indonesia can build a system of law that is not only repressive but also preventive, just, and empowering deterrent to the practice of corruption .

### **Comparison and Implications Criminal Reform Strategies for Corruption in Indonesia Based on the Theory of Deterrent Effect**

A comparison of criminal law systems between Indonesia and Singapore shows a striking difference in handling corruption cases. Difference This can be understood through approach theory and effect deterrence theory, which emphasize the importance of certainty, speed, and severity of punishment for preventing crime (Kusworo & Anggraini, 2025; Quah, 2020).

Table 1: Comparison of Criminalization of Corruption between Indonesia and Singapore

Aspect	Indonesia	Singapore
Certainty law	Less consistent, lots of gap law and multiple interpretations	Firm and determinative, gap minimum law
Process speed	Tend slow, influenced procedure length and politicization	Fast, efficient and free from intervention political
Severity sanctions	Relatively light, rare dropped punishment maximum	Firm, without compromise, including punishment weight and deprivation asset

Consequence from difference This is very much felt in society. In Indonesia, the weakness of punishment causes the impression that law can be offered, even not scary for the perpetrator of corruption (Beny et al., 2024). In contrast, in Singapore, the system of strict laws precisely strengthens anti-corruption culture and improves compliance with the law (Quah, 2017).

For strengthening effect deterrents in Indonesia, some reform strategies that can be under consideration include:

- 1.Revision Constitution to eradicate corruption, with emphasis on defining state losses and strengthening provisions for punishment, including asset robbery (Rahmawati, 2024; Wd Sinulingga & Leviza, 2023).
- 2.Strengthening institution enforcer law, especially in matters of independence and protection from intervention politics. Institutions such as the Corruption Eradication Committee need to be guarded from efforts to weaken them (Harefa et al., 2024).
- 3.Procedural reforms To speed up the judicial process, for example, through digitalization, system laws and restrictions make efforts to make repetitive laws, which slow down decision-making (Harmaen Anggayudha et al., 2023).
- 4.Legal and ethical education for apparatus enforcer law to grow integrity and consistency in enforcement law (Mutia Safitri et al., 2023). System incentives and disincentives in bureaucracy, in order to encourage honest behavior and pressing opportunities and the occurrence of corruption since early (Quah, 2018).

With the implementation of the above strategies in a comprehensive and consistent way, Indonesia can strengthen the effective deterrent in enforcing criminal corruption laws. More than that, legal reform must become part of the effort to build a culture of strong law, which makes honesty and integrity the main marks of life in the state.

## Conclusion

Study this shows that the significant difference between system criminalization and corruption in Indonesia and Singapore lies in the implementation principles that affect deterrent, namely certainty, speed, and severity of punishment. In Singapore, the third principle is applied in a way that is consistent, which is reflected in the speed of the legal process, the severity of sanctions, and the independence of the institution enforcing the law. This contributes big to low-level corruption in the country and its high public trust in the legal system. On the other hand, Indonesia still faces challenges in ensuring effective criminalization, especially related to weak certainty laws, slow judicial processes, and still low-level severity punishment in big cases. Institutional and cultural factors and permissive laws participate to aggravate this condition.



With use theory effect deterrent as a framework analysis, study This confirms that success in system criminalization is not only determined by normative aspects but also by consistency and integrity in its implementation. Therefore, a comprehensive reform is needed, which includes repair regulation , strengthening institution enforcer law, updating procedure law, and developing culture supporting law honesty and integrity. Learning from Singapore gives the description that success in eradicating corruption is not impossible as long as it is supported by the will of politics, a reliable legal system, and a society aware of the law.

## References

- Asdhie Kodiya, B. (2020). Preventive Legal Politics Corruption Through Restrictions on Political Rights Ex Prisoner Corruption Politics of Law Prevention of Corruption Through Restrictions Political Rights of Ex-Corruption Convicts. *Journal Scientific Law Enforcement*, 7 (2). <https://doi.org/10.31289/jiph.v7i2.4451>.
- CNN Indonesia. (2024). Attorney General's Office Says State Losses in Tin Case Reach IDR 300 Trillion . <https://www.cnnindonesia.com>.
- Croci, G. (2025). Effectiveness and corruption in the criminal justice system of Latin America: An overview. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, 49 (1), 81–105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01924036.2023.2292032>.
- Detik. (2024). Afung's Acquittal Verdict and Reaction Attorney General's Office. <https://www.detik.com/>.
- Harefa, JE, Vaskal, E., Pandia, A., Situmorang, AS, Septian Rumapea, M., & Hukum, F. (2024). Journal Prima Legal Science Comparative Analysis Of Corruption Criminal Law Enforcement In Indonesia And Singapore: A Normative Approach Towards The Success Criteria Of Corruption Actions. *Journal Prima Legal Science*, Vol.7 No.1.
- Harmaen Anggayudha , Z., Zevira Alfasha , K., National Research and Innovation , B., & Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, U. (2023). Comparison Of Eradication Of Corruption Criminal Acts In Indonesia And Singapore. *Journal of the Legal and Social Studies Forum*, Vol.5 No.1 (1), 65–78. <https://doi.org/10.15575/vh.v5i1>.
- Kompas. (2024). Illegal Smelter Chain Involved Corruption of PT Timah. <https://www.kompas.com/>.
- Kusworo , DL, & Anggraini , T. (2025). Extensive interpretation of state financial losses in small sector corruption: A comparative study of emerging economies. *Integrity: Journal Anti-Corruption*, 10 (2), 173–186. <https://doi.org/10.32697/integrity.v10i2.1280>.
- Mutiara Safitri, A., Kusumawati , A., & Pamungkas , OG (2023). Comparative Criminal Law Corruption : Comparative Study of Criminal Law Corruption in Indonesia and Singapore. *Journal Humaniora: Journal of Law and Science Social*, Volume 01, No. 04 .
- Quah, JST (2017). Singapore's success in combating corruption: lessons for policy makers. *Asian Education and Development Studies*, 6 (3), 263–274. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AEDS-03-2017-0030>.
- Quah, JST (2018). Combating Corruption in Asian Countries: Learning from Success & Failure. *Daedalus* , 147 (3), 202–215. [https://doi.org/10.1162/daed\\_a\\_00511](https://doi.org/10.1162/daed_a_00511).

- Quah, JST (2020). Singapore's effective anti-corruption recipe: lessons for other countries. In *Handbook on Corruption, Ethics and Integrity in Public Administration*. Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781789900910.00033>.
- Quah, JST (2024a). Anti-corruption agencies. In *Elgar Encyclopedia of Corruption and Society* (pp. 5–8). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781803925806.ch02>.
- Quah, JST (2024b). Singapore's Experience in Curbing Corruption. In *Political Corruption* (pp. 841–853). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003575658-64>.
- Rahmawati, WE (2024). Legal Analysis Of Comparison Of Law In Indonesia And Singapore In Efforts To Return State Losses Through Confiscation Of Corruption Assets. *Journal of Law and Citizenship*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3783/causa.v2i9.2461>.
- Sahardian , I., Thalib , H., & Badaru , B. (2020). Effectiveness of Sanction Imposition Criminal To Crime Action Criminal Corruption. *Kalabbirang Law Journal*, 2 (2). <http://jurnal.ahmar.id/index.php/kalabbirang7878>.
- Setyawan Fadly, O., Ratna Multiwijaya , V., & Suar, A. (2024). Criminal Acts Of Corporate Crimes In The Case Of Tin Corruption In Bangka Belitung. *EnsiEnsiklopedia of Journal*, Vo..6. No.4. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.33559/eoj.v6i4.2597>.
- Tempo. (2024). The Role of Harvey Moeis in Bangka Belitung Tin Scandal . <https://www.tempo.co/>.
- The Straits Times. (2014). Ex-CPIB official Edwin Yeo jailed for 10 years for embezzling \$1.8m. The Straits Times. <https://www.straitstimes.com/>.
- Thong, C.K., & Albakri, M. (2016). 14 Anti-Corruption Enforcement in Singapore. In *Finance, Rule of Law and Development in Asia* (pp. 409–435). Brill | Nijhoff . [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004315815\\_015](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004315815_015).
- TodayOnline. (2013). Edwin Yeo arrested for embedding funds at CPIB. TodayOnline. Retrieved from. <http://www.todayonline.com/>.
- Wd Sinulingga, M., & Leviza, J. (2023). Comparison Of Laws On Confiscation Of Assets From Corruption In Indonesia, Singapore And Hong Kong. *Journal Normative*, Vol.3 No.2.
- Zulfikar, P. (2022). Perspective of the Authority of the Audit Board Finance (BPK) Relation Agreement Extradition of Indonesia and Singapore. *Journal Scientific Law Enforcement*, 9 (1), 74–86. <https://doi.org/10.31289/jiph.v9i1.6682>.

## Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).