

## Anticorruption education ecosystems at State Islamic Universities in Indonesia

Abdul Kholiq<sup>a\*</sup>, Kartika Indah Permata<sup>b</sup>

Universitas Islam Negeri Walisongo Semarang, Jl. Prof. Dr. Hamka No.3 – 5, Semarang 50185, Indonesia

<sup>a</sup> [abdul\\_kholiq@walisongo.ac.id](mailto:abdul_kholiq@walisongo.ac.id); <sup>b</sup> [kartika.i@walisongo.ac.id](mailto:kartika.i@walisongo.ac.id)

\* Corresponding Author

**Abstract:** The corruption crisis in Indonesia has reached a dangerous level and must receive attention from all parties, including higher education institutions. Otherwise, it could lead to destruction in Indonesia. Despite focusing merely on describing anticorruption education ecosystems in religious universities, this study is significant for Indonesia's sustainable growth. Hence, this research aims to identify anticorruption education ecosystems at State Islamic Universities (PTKIN) in Indonesia. Using a descriptive quantitative method, the data was collected through a questionnaire with the indicators: (1) anticorruption value-creating networks; (2) a clean and transparent governance system, and (3) collective awareness of the need for a movement to fight corruption (shared logic). The questionnaire was distributed to Vice Rectors II (general administration, planning and finance) and the Heads of the SPI (Internal Supervisory Unit) at PTKIN. The results of this research proved that the characteristics of the educational ecosystem at PTKIN were quite supportive of anticorruption education, with an average score of 3.4833 (score category C). This finding still did not meet community expectations. Therefore, to create a better anticorruption education ecosystem, tighter laws and dedication from PTKIN leadership were required.

**Keywords:** Anticorruption Education Ecosystems; State Islamic Universities (PTKIN); Value-creating networks; Governance system; Shared logic

**How to Cite:** Kholiq, A. & Permata, K., I. (2023). Anticorruption education ecosystems at State Islamic Universities in Indonesia. *Integritas: Jurnal Antikorupsi*, 9(2), 283-292. <http://dx.doi.org/10.32697/integritas.v9i2.950>



### Introduction

Corruption in Indonesia has reached an alarming stage (Diansyah et al., 2011; Hakim, 2012). This concern is due to corruption becoming a transactional practice that is considered normal (banality) and is entrenched in everyday life (Manurung, 2012; Umam, 2014). There are also signs that the government's commitment to anticorruption initiatives is deteriorating. Even though the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) was formed in 2002, the group has not been able to lift Indonesia's position out of those of the most corrupt countries in the world. Based on survey data from 2021, Indonesia's corruption perception index score was 37 and was ranked 102nd out of 180 countries surveyed - below Tanzania (94), Sri Lanka (94), and Timor Leste (86) (*Corruption Perceptions Index, 2020*; Sumaryati, 2020).

Corruption, or *riswah/ghulul* in religious terminology, refers to the act of misusing power or authority for personal benefit, including but not limited to monetary gain (Begovic, 2005; Gusnardi, 2014; Iyanda, 2012). Based on its form, corruption is not limited to "bribery" (Hamzah, 1984), but according to the Corruption Crime Law (2002) takes the form of: (1) Breaking the law to enrich oneself and harm the State, (2) Abusing authority for one's own interests. and can be detrimental to the State's finances, (3) Bribing civil servants, (4) Giving gifts to other parties because of their position, (5) Accepting bribes, (6) Accepting gifts related to one's position, (7) Bribing, (8) Embezzling money or allowing embezzlement, (9) Blackmailing other parties, (10) Acting fraudulently, (11) Taking over State land and harming other people, (12) Accepting gratuities and not reporting to the KPK, and (13) People who hold official secrets and do not provide information (Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 30 at 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission).

Corruption is contrary to religious values and social norms, and is a source of major problems in the country (Begovic, 2005; Bowser, 2001; Porta, 2000; Seligson, 2002). As an reprehensible

crime, corruption must be resolved using unique methods. In addition to efforts to eradicate corruption, prevention efforts are needed to suppress the development of corruption in Indonesia (Manurung, 2012; Suryani, 2013). The Indonesian government has established a strategy to prevent corruption through anticorruption education (Kadir, 2018). Through anticorruption education, anticorruption values and enthusiasm can be instilled from an early age, so that the mentalities and personalities of the younger generation are intolerant of corruption and they have the courage to fight corruption. Anticorruption education is needed to create a clean culture (Dewantara et al., 2021; Gusnardi, 2014). Countries that do not have good education (anticorruption) systems have higher levels of corruption (Evrensel, 2010). Therefore, anticorruption education must be delivered from an early age, from primary to higher education (Akbar & Vujić, 2014; Vaknin, 2009).

From the perspective of Islamic education, anticorruption education is referred to as *tahdhib*, the process of forming morals or character (Karbakhsh & Ahmadi Safa, 2020). Therefore, this education does not just transfer knowledge, but requires reasoning, and internalization of values and morals so that morals or anticorruption characteristics are formed. There are at least six fundamental values in anticorruption education, namely honesty, independence, justice, discipline, responsibility and courage (*syajaáh*) (Arliman, 2017). Education that supports this value orientation should create guilt among those tempted to commit corruption, and anger among witnesses (Kadir, 2018).

In the context of corruption prevention in Indonesia, it is no exaggeration that Islamic Religious Universities (PTKI) are expected to play an active role in efforts to eradicate corruption in Indonesia. Because, bearing the identity of a 'religious' institution, there is a 'moral' responsibility to participate in building an anti-corruption culture in society. The academic community is expected to act as agents of change and driving force for the establishment of a life order that is free from corruption. The 'Islamic' identity should be enough to guarantee that PTKI can serve as a role-model for a good educational ecosystem for the growth of an anti-corruption culture. In this case, an anti-corruption culture can only be formed through anti-corruption education supported by a good educational ecosystem.

The term ecosystem, which is widely used in various fields of scientific study, including education, was first introduced by ecologist Arthur George Tansley (1935) to refer to the relationships between organisms in an environment and the interactions that occur between organisms to be able to live together (Elrick, 2021; Valk & Arnold G., 2014). Thomas & Autio (2014) define an ecosystem as a collection of interdependent network organizations engaged in "shared value creation". Referring to several of these definitions, an ecosystem can be understood as a complex network of interconnected systems. Furthermore, Thomas & Autio (2014) also categorized the ecosystem concept into three characteristics, namely value-creating networks, a governance system, and shared logic (Autio & Thomas, 2014; Falkner et al., 2018).

Within education, the ecosystem concept is used as a framework for defining educational operational components and processes (Gundogan et al., 2015). Kozyreva (2022) explains that the educational ecosystem includes all elements that are connected through educational interaction processes (such as teaching and learning activities, management, evaluation, innovation, and so on) to achieve common goals. In this case, these elements not only include parties within the relevant educational institutions, but also include the community, stakeholders, and policyholders at a broader level (Abdul-Jabbar & Kurshan, 2015). In the context of Indonesian national education, the term educational ecosystem is included in the Strategic Plan of the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia for 2015-2019, as quoted: "...The formation of people as well as an educational and cultural ecosystem with character based on a spirit of mutual cooperation".

The question is, how is an anticorruption education ecosystem built at PTKIN? So far, studies regarding anticorruption education in higher education generally discuss regulatory issues (Hasanah, 2018; Kadir, 2018), values (character) education (Dewantara et al., 2021; Harto, 2014; Hidayat, 2019) and models for implementing anticorruption education (Arifin, 2015; Gusnardi, 2014; Hakim, 2012; Kristiono, 2018; Prasetyo et al., 2021). These studies focus more on how anticorruption values can be taught to students either through separate courses or through

integration models with existing courses. There is one crucial aspect that has not been touched upon by previous researchers; educational ecosystems, or the environment as a determining factor for students' mental and intellectual development. How will students' anticorruption mentality be formed, if the institution is still tolerant of corrupt practices or its officials are even caught in corruption cases? Therefore, anticorruption education will only be effective if the (educational) ecosystem at the university is conducive. In this case, research which focuses on anticorruption education ecosystems in higher education is still very limited.

This research addresses the shortcomings of existing studies by looking at anticorruption education ecosystems built by religious colleges, which have implications for whether anticorruption education is effective. The formation of students' anticorruption attitudes is closely related to the educational environment (Duska & Whelan, 1982; Perdana, 2018). Specifically, this study aims to answer how PTKIN respond to government policy obligating educational organizations to institutionalize anticorruption behavior through anticorruption courses. A deep understanding of anticorruption education ecosystems in religious universities can provide a model for problem solving action plans for handling cases of corruption in Indonesia. It is hoped that this study can contribute to a cultural revolution towards an anticorruption cultural ecosystem in Indonesia.

This research is based on the argument that the effectiveness of anticorruption education is influenced by the condition of an educational ecosystem. The non-functioning of elements of an anticorruption education ecosystem, such as a network for transmission of values, organizational governance, or the interrelation between elements in building an anticorruption movement, results in a non-conducive anticorruption education ecosystem. For example, the failure of a monitoring system causes immoral actions to proliferate so that they become habits and are accepted as truth. Therefore, anticorruption education ecosystems in universities greatly determine the effectiveness of anticorruption education in forming students' anticorruption mentalities.

### Methods

This research analyzes anticorruption education ecosystems in religious colleges. Anticorruption education will not be effective if it is not supported by a good ecosystem for the growth of anticorruption culture. A college environment characterized by religion (Islam) can be a good ecosystem for anticorruption education. Religious character can be an asset in creating a learning environment that is conducive to spiritual and anticorruption mentality formation of the academic community. Religion is related to anticorruption teachings (Ko & Moon, 2014). Anticorruption education ecosystems in religious universities can be used as a support to build anticorruption culture in Indonesia.

This research uses a descriptive quantitative method. Quantitative data was extracted using Google forms to collect information about anticorruption education ecosystems in religious colleges. Data collection was carried out through questionnaires, with variables extracted from Thomas and Aution's (2014) ecosystem theory: (1) anticorruption value creation networks; (2) a clean and transparent governance system, and (3) collective awareness of the need for a movement to fight corruption (shared logic). The value-creation network revolves around the process of internalizing values of an organization within a dynamic symbiotic relationship between components. (Autio & Thomas, 2014). The governance system is responsible for managing all components of an organization by determining necessary rules and cultural norms (Autio & Thomas, 2014). Meanwhile, shared logic consists of cognitive elements and includes legitimacy and meaning. Legitimacy is related to acceptance of norms through understanding the aims and objectives of the ecosystem. Meaningfulness is related to the growth of responsibility and collective awareness to collaborate in the face of challenges, as well as awareness to build reciprocal relationships so as to emerge a collective identity that is realized in the form of shared logic (Adner, 2012; Autio & Thomas, 2014; Iansiti & Levien, 2006).

Of the 37 PTKINs, there were 24 PTKINs who provided feedback on the questionnaires distributed. The respondents of this research were Vice Chancellor II (general administration, planning, and finance) and SPI (Internal Supervisory Unit) administrators at religious colleges. Based on the responsibilities within higher education management, these two figures are considered to have

strong authority when monitoring the safety of educational institutions from the dangers of corruption. The data obtained was then analyzed using descriptive analysis techniques and interpreted qualitatively through the following five-scale quantitative data conversion table (Sukarjo, 2006).

**Table1.** Five Scale Score Conversion

Category	Scoring Intervals	Qualitative Data
A	$X > 4,21$	Very Good
B	$3,67 < X \leq 4.21$	Good
C	$2,60 < X \leq 3,67$	Average
D	$1,79 < X \leq 2,60$	Deficient
E	$X \leq 1,79$	Very Deficient

## Results and Discussion

Anticorruption education in universities is effective in a good anticorruption cultural ecosystem. No matter how strong anticorruption education is, if it is not supported by a conducive ecosystem, it will cause value conflicts and confusion for students, who might reject these values. Students not only need to receive instruction (sermons/*khotbah*) about values, but also need a conducive environment, lecturers with integrity, campus officials committed to the actualization of these values, as well as a massive movement from the campus community to uphold anticorruption values in daily behavior. Therefore, the anticorruption education ecosystem requires harmony between anticorruption (value-creating networks), a clean and transparent governance system, and collective awareness of the need for a movement to fight corruption (shared logic).

### Value-Creating Networks

The categorization of anticorruption value creation (value-creating networks) data at PTKIN was developed based on 8 questions (questionnaires) and can be described in Table 2.

**Table 2.** Distribution of scores on value creation-networking characteristics

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD	Category
VC1 The curriculum for all courses is created by incorporating Islamic ideals	24	1	5	4.04	.999	B
VC2 The course curriculum already contains anticorruption values	24	1	5	3.37	.970	C
VC3 The socialization of anticorruption values is sufficient through existing courses	24	1	5	3.21	.932	C
VC4 There is no special need for anticorruption courses	24	1	5	3.37	1.173	C
VC5 The academic community already understands the types of corruption	24	2	4	3.17	.702	C
VC6 The academic community understands the latent dangers of corruption	24	2	5	3.96	.806	B
VC7 The academic community dares not to be corrupt	24	3	5	3.87	.797	B
VC8 The academic community dares to fight corruption (dares to report if they know about acts of corruption)	24	2	5	3.50	.978	C
Valid N (listwise)	24					
				Average	3.56	C

Source: Processed based on the research data

Table 2 shows that the value network in PTKIN is built on the integration of Islamic values, which is reflected in the PTKIN curriculum (VC1), which is developed on the basis of Islamic values (score category B). Islamic values in the PTKIN curriculum also include anti-corruption values (VC2), although the socialization of anti-corruption values (VC3) to form a network of communities with the same understanding and views on corruption still needs to be improved (score category C). The network of Islamic values developed by the PTKIN curriculum does not automatically lead to a good understanding of the different types of corruption (rating category C). Therefore, special courses (VC4) or socialization on anti-corruption at PTKIN are still needed (rating C). If we look more specifically at the characteristics of value creation networks in (VC6) and (VC7), we see that the components of Islamic religious universities have a good awareness of



the latent dangers of corruption (score category B), as well as a commitment not to commit corruption (score category B). However, the courage to fight corruption (VC8) by reporting when they find out about corruption in their environment (score category C) still needs to be improved.

Based on the average score (3.56), anticorruption value creation networks at PTKIN meet the sufficient criteria for quality qualitative data (score category C). From a value creation network perspective, it can be understood that the anticorruption education ecosystem within PTKIN is generally quite supportive, although integration and socialization of anticorruption values can still be improved. The Islamic focus within the PTKIN curriculum can actually be an asset when developing anticorruption values which reinforce religious values.

### Clean and Transparent Governance System

The distribution of data on a clean and transparent governance system in the PTKIN environment developed based on 13 question items (questionnaire) can be described as in Table 3.

**Table 3.** Distribution of scores on governance system characteristics

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD	Category
GS1 Leadership's commitment to anticorruption	24	3	5	4.54	.588	A
GS2 All officials and lecturers have an integrity pact	24	2	5	4.21	.833	A
GS3 Governance is based on risk management	24	2	5	3.92	.830	B
GS4 Planning is prepared based on IKU/Renstra	24	3	5	4.50	.590	A
GS5 RKAKL reviewed	24	4	5	4.67	.482	A
GS6 Monitoring and evaluation of program implementation is carried out	24	3	5	4.42	.654	A
GS7 Prepare accountable activities and financial reports	24	4	5	4.50	.511	A
GS8 Effective internal supervisory institution/unit	24	2	5	4.29	.859	A
GS9 Officials (KPA/PPK) receive gifts from partners	24	2	5	4.29	.908	A
GS10 Officials (KPA/PPK) or lecturers receive parcels/gifts.	24	2	5	3.96	1.042	B
GS11 There are still fees for students other than UKT (for example graduation celebration fees, etc.)	24	1	5	4.12	1.227	B
GS12 LAKIP was announced to the public	24	1	5	3.46	1.062	C
GS13 There is a PPID (Information & Data Management Officer)	24	2	5	4.13	.850	B
Valid N (listwise)	24					
Average				4.23		A

Source: Processed based on the research data

Based on Table 3, it shows that the characteristics of the governance system at PTKIN generally run very well. A closer look at the characteristics of the governance system in (GS 1) and (GS 2) reveals that PTKIN's management is highly committed (GS 1) to establishing a clean and transparent university governance system (score category A), and that civil servants, lecturers and teaching staff also possess excellent integrity (GS 2) (score category A). The spirit to build a good university governance within PTKIN is very good, with the awareness of using good risk management (GS3) in organizational management (score category B). Likewise, the management cycle runs very well (score category A), starting from planning based on Renstra/ICU (Key Performance Indicators) (GS4), RKAKL review (GS5), program monitoring and evaluation (GS6), and accountable reporting (GS7), and the effective functioning of the control and monitoring system carried out by SPI (GS8). Furthermore, the components within PTKIN also have good synergies to prevent any acts of corruption, as demonstrated by the absence of acceptance of gratification or illegal charges to students other than UKT (single tuition fee), as shown by GS9, GS10 and GS11. In the aspect of openness, it seems that PTKIN still needs to improve, especially in the publication of LAKIP (GS12) (score category C), although PTKIN already has an institution of PPID (Information and Data Management Officer) (GS13) that functions well (score category B).

Based on data on the governance system criteria as presented in table 03, PTKIN's governance system is supportive of an anticorruption education ecosystem as indicated by its average score (4.23) (score category A). From a governance system perspective, universities/colleges within the PTKIN environment are managed using the principles of good university governance, with a focus on clean, accountable and transparent management. Transparency, however, can still be improved within PTKIN.

### Anticorruption Movements (Shared Logic)

The third indicator of the anticorruption education ecosystem variable is shared logic, which is the existence of an anti-corruption movement carried out by the campus community in the PTKIN environment. The distribution of data on the anticorruption movement (shared logic) in the PTKIN environment developed based on 5 questionnaire items is described in Table 4.

**Table 4.** Distribution of shared logic characteristics scores

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD	Category
SL1 The campus held an open anticorruption declaration	24	2	5	3.79	.977	B
SL2 Number of lecturers' academic works (books/research/journals) with anticorruption themes	24	1	4	2.79	.932	C
SL3 Anticorruption seminars/workshops/discussions	24	1	4	3.33	.868	C
SL4 The campus commemorates anticorruption day	24	1	5	3.04	.955	C
SL5 The campus is building an anticorruption movement with students and the community	24	1	5	3.38	1.096	C
Valid N (listwise)	24					
				Average	3.27	C

Source: Processed based on the research data

Based on Table 4, the characteristics of the anti-corruption movement (shared logic) in PTKIN generally show that it has not run satisfactorily. In fact, in order to build an anti-corruption education ecosystem in higher education, a communal movement for anti-corruption campaign that is carried out on a massive scale is needed. A communal movement for anti-corruption will create a common awareness that corruption is a common enemy that must be fought, thus creating an attitude of public antipathy toward corruption and the courage to fight corruption. Based on the results of the research, universities in the PTKIN environment already have a commitment to eradicate corruption, as evidenced by public anti-corruption statements (SL1) by universities (score category B). However, the anti-corruption declaration was not followed by a massive movement, either academic in nature through the publication of academic works (SL2), anti-corruption seminars (SL3), or social movements campaigning against corruption such as commemorating anti-corruption days (SL4) or mobilizing anti-corruption movements with students and the community (SL5). Overall, the percentage of community movements campaigning against corruption is still in the insignificant category (score category C).

Based on the achievement of the average score (3.27) on the criteria for the anti-corruption movement (shared logic) within PTKIN, it shows a sufficient category (score category C). This score shows that the PTKIN has not achieved the maximum in the building of a social movement to make the people aware of the dangers of corruption. In fact, as an educational institution based on the Islamic religion, there is a moral responsibility to contribute to the building of a clean Indonesia that is free from the threat of corruption. Corruption is the enemy of the society and it is a religious duty to fight against it (Abdulkareem & Ye-zhuang, 2017).

Anticorruption education in higher education has so far been limited to theory, revolving around studying anticorruption values (Subkhan, 2020). Curricula have not yet touched on character-building for students to imbue in them the courage to reject corrupt practices and dare to take action against corruption. Universities need to work to prove themselves as institutions that can safeguard the nation's integrity as well as become a driving force for the anticorruption movement in Indonesia (Kadir, 2018). In the midst of Indonesia's corruption crisis, universities and colleges are faced with the challenge of forming national character, as well as transferring knowledge of technology, mastering skills and arts, and also building enthusiasm and competence as agents of social change to create a country free from the threat of corruption (Suacana, 2004). Moreover, being a religious college, PTKIN have an extra burden to prove that the spirit of 'religion' can be a solution to the corruption crisis in Indonesia. Anticorruption education ecosystems are proof of PTKINs' commitment to being a driving force for integrity as well as stopping corruption in this country.

This study found a picture that the educational ecosystem in the PTKIN environment is quite supportive for anti-corruption education, but it still does not meet the expectations of society. Based on the results of data analysis on the three characteristics of the measured anti-corruption

education ecosystem, Islamic universities in Indonesia showed an average score (3.4833) (score category C). This shows that although the educational ecosystem of PTKIN is quite conducive to anti-corruption education, it has not met the expectations of the community. Public expectations of PTKIN are very high, with the Islamic label, universities within PTKIN should be a role model as a center for developing national integrity and a driving force for the anti-corruption movement in Indonesia.

This study also implies that there is no compatibility between the infrastructure, educational structure, and culture of anticorruption education in PTKIN. Only the educational structure supports a transparent higher education governance system (table 03), even without institutional structure that specifically operates to bolster anticorruption efforts. In terms of infrastructure and cultural aspects, which are shown through value-creating networks and shared logic (score category C), it can be inferred that Good University Governance is not yet followed by the spirit to build an anticorruption value system. Whereas, such value creation which is disseminated through various ways, for instance by institutionalizing anticorruption education as a course, is significant for ensuring the shared internalization of the danger of corruption. In fact, PTKIN believe that the network of Islamic values developed through the curriculum already embodies anticorruption education values. However, the integration of Islamic values into the PTKIN curriculum does not automatically lead to an understanding of types of corruption and anticorruption values. Similarly, the anticorruption movement's low score demonstrates that campuses have not played their role as a driving force in a communal movement against corruption. Thus, even though the educational ecosystem within PTKIN environments is quite supportive towards anticorruption education, it still needs to be optimized, especially in regard to infrastructural and cultural aspects.

Anti-corruption education as a character education requires a stage of reasoning and internalization of the anti-corruption character values (Kadir, 2018). According to Suseno in (Djabbar, 2009), an education that supports value orientation is an education that makes people feel ashamed when they are tempted to commit corruption and makes them feel angry when they witness corruption. The process of value internalization is influenced by the social environment, cognition development, empathizing and cognition struggles (Duska & Whelan, 1982). Therefore, teachers, parents, and the surrounding community must be able to model anti-corruption behavior, especially the implementation of the values of honesty, justice, and responsibility in everyday life.

The higher education anticorruption education ecosystem is determined by three factors, namely infrastructure, structure, and culture. Infrastructure encompasses the existence of university policies that ensure the proper functioning of an anticorruption value creation network, either through anticorruption education courses or policies regarding the integration of anticorruption values into the university curriculum. Students not only should understand anticorruption values, but also corruption and the impacts it can have. Structural factors are built through well-functioning university organizational governance, with zero tolerance for corrupt practices. These provide evidence to carry out GUG (Good University Governance) relevant to the anticorruption values taught to students. Universities must be managed using the principles of justice, responsibility and transparency so that there is not room for corrupt practices. In addition, universities can establish institutions that specifically work in the anticorruption field, for example corruption study centers. Cultural factors are developed through communal movements to fight corruption. Anticorruption culture must be institutionalized as a routine activity on campus. Campus should be a place where one feels ashamed if they engage in corrupt practices. Corruption must become a common enemy. Campuses must also become centers for social movements against corruption, both through academic activities and communal awareness movements about the dangers of corruption.

The results of this research prove that the integration of Islamic values in the higher education curriculum within PTKIN does not fully guarantee the formation of a good educational ecosystem for anticorruption education. This research also provides a different perspective from previous studies. Studies conducted by Arifin (2015), Kadir (2018), Kristiono (2018), and Subkhan (2020) describe anticorruption education from a regulatory perspective, and integration of anticorrupt-

ion values, models, methods and media in higher education. Research that takes an anticorruption education ecosystem perspective is still very limited. This research can complement previous research which focuses on anticorruption character education, especially at the higher education level.

The results of this research show that the corruption crisis in Indonesia is a real threat that must receive attention from all actors, including universities. Universities have a large responsibility, not only to participate in prevention efforts through anticorruption education, but also to foster good ecosystems for anticorruption education. It is ironic that several higher education officials have been caught up in corruption cases, as it shows that universities are not sterile from corrupt practices. Higher education institutions should be a driving force in upholding integrity. However, some are overrun with corruption. The future of Indonesia could be destroyed due to corruption. Therefore, preventative efforts need to be taken, one of which is education. Some steps include: (1) universities must build good educational ecosystems for anticorruption education; (2) it is necessary to include PAK (Anticorruption Education) courses in higher education curricula; (3) regulations are needed to require every lecturer can integrate anticorruption values in every lecture; and, (4) there should be a massive movement to build anticorruption cultural ecosystems in higher education. These preventative efforts will work only if they are supported by all elements involved in PTKIN, particularly structural and functional staff within the institution who work as the primary driving forces for the integration of anticorruption education.

### Conclusion

This study has found that the condition of the educational ecosystem in the universities within the PTKIN is quite supportive for the anti-corruption education. However, these achievements are still not in line with the expectations of most Indonesians. Being a "religious" university does not guarantee that PTKIN has an educational ecosystem conducive to anti-corruption education. The integration of religious values into course learning is no guarantee that students will have an understanding of corruption. For the internalization of anti-corruption values, students are in need of a good and conducive ecosystem for anti-corruption education. In the midst of the corruption crisis, PTKIN must be able to prove itself as an institution that is capable of producing young people with integrity in addition to professionalism.

The limitations of this research lie in its broad perspective on anticorruption education ecosystems in higher education within PTKIN. In fact, each PTKIN institution has its own management practices, including in providing anticorruption education. Based on these limitations, it is necessary to carry out further studies by focusing on more specific units of analysis, for example forms of integration of anticorruption values in learning courses or anticorruption culture on campus.

### References

- Abdul-Jabbar, M., & Kurshan, B. (2015). Educational ecosystems: A trend in urban educational innovation. *Perspectives on Urban Education*, 12(1), 7–13.
- Abdulkareem, M., & Ye-zhuang, T. (2017). The effect of religious beliefs, participation and values on corruption: Survey evidence from Iraq. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*, 8(8). <https://doi.org/10.14569/IJACSA.2017.080840>
- Adner, R. (2012). *The wide lens: A new strategy for innovation*. NY: Portfolio Penguin.
- Akbar, Y. H., & Vujić, V. (2014). Explaining corruption. *Cross Cultural Management*, 21(2), 191–218. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CCM-03-2013-0050>
- Arifin, S. (2015). Model implementasi pendidikan antikorupsi di perguruan tinggi Islam. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Keislaman*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.52185/kariman.v3i1.47>
- Arliman, L. (2017). Konsep dan gagasan pengenalan pendidikan antikorupsi bagi anak dalam rangka mewujudkan generasi yang bebas korupsi. *Jurnal Kajian Syari'ah Dan Masyarakat*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.19109/nurani.v17i1.1348>



- Autio, E., & Thomas, L. D. W. (2014). Innovation ecosystems: Implications for innovation management. *Oxford Handbook of Innovation Management, September*, 204–228. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199694945.013.012>
- Begovic, B. (2005). *Corruption: Concepts, types, causes and consequences*. 3(26), 1–9.
- Bowser, D. (2001). *Corruption; Trust and the danger to democratization in the former Soviet Union*.
- Corruption Perceptions Index. (2020). *Transparency international: The global coalition against corruption*.
- Dewantara, J. A., Hermawan, Y., Yunus, D., Prasetyo, W. H., Efriani, E., Arifiyanti, F., & Nurgiansah, T. H. (2021). Anticorruption education as an effort to form students with character humanist and law-compliant. *Jurnal Civics: Media Kajian Kewarganegaraan*, 18(1), 70–81. <https://doi.org/10.21831/jc.v18i1.38432>
- Diansyah, F., Yuntho, E., & Fariz, D. (2011). Penguatan pemberantasan korupsi melalui fungsi koordinasi dan supervisi Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi (KPK). *Indonesia Corruption Watch*.
- Djabbar, F. (2009). *Tentang kurikulum antikorupsi*.
- Duska, R., & Whelan, M. (1982). *Perkembangan moral : Perkenalan dengan Piaget dan Kohlberg/ Ronald Duska dan Mariellen Whelan*. Yayasan Kanisius.
- Elrick, L. E. (2021). The ecosystem concept: a holistic approach to privacy protection. *International Review of Law, Computers & Technology*, 35(1), 24–45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600869.2020.1784564>
- Evrensel, A. Y. (2010). Institutional and economic determinants of corruption: A cross-section analysis. *Applied Economics Letters*, 17(6), 551–554. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504850802297814>
- Fakhis, A. Z. P., & Taufiqurrohmah, A. H. A. (2021). Strengthening anticorruption concept to elevate society 5.0. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Sustainable Innovation Track Humanities Education and Social Sciences (ICSIHES 2021)*, 224–230. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211227.036>
- Falkner, K., Vivian, R., & Williams, S.-A. (2018). An ecosystem approach to teacher professional development within computer science. *Computer Science Education*, 28(4), 303–344. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08993408.2018.1522858>
- Gundogan, M. B., Eby, G., & Yuzer, T. V. (2015). *Capturing definitions for a sustainable distance education ecosystem through an online Delphi study* (pp. 125–139). <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-4666-6493-7.ch005>
- Gusnardi. (2014). Pendidikan anti korupsi di perguruan tinggi: Perlukah? *Pekbis Jurnal*, 6(2), 86–93.
- Hakim, L. (2012). Model integrasi pendidikan anti korupsi dalam kurikulum pendidikan Islam. *Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Islam -Ta'lim*, 10(2), 141–156.
- Hamzah, A. (1984). *Korupsi di Indonesia: Masalah dan pemecahannya*. Gramedia.
- Harto, K. (2014). *Pendidikan anti korupsi berbasis agama*. 20(1), 121–138.
- Hasanah, S. U. (2018). Kebijakan perguruan tinggi dalam menerapkan pendidikan anti korupsi. *Jurnal Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan*, 2(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.31571/pkn.v2i1.744>
- Hidayat, A. S. (2019). Pendidikan kampus sebagai media penanaman nilai-nilai antikorupsi bagi mahasiswa. *Jurnal Sosial Dan Budaya Syar'i*, 6(1).
- Iansiti, M., & Levien, R. (2006). The keystone advantage: What the new dynamics of business ecosystems mean for strategy, innovation, and sustainability. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 20(2), 88–90. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4166241>
- Iyanda, D. O. (2012). Corruption: Definition, theories & concepts. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review (OMAN Chapter)*, 2(4), 37.
- Kadir, Y. (2018). Kebijakan pendidikan anti korupsi di perguruan tinggi. *Gorontalo Law Review*, 1(1), 25–38. <https://doi.org/10.32662/golrev.v1i1.95>

- Karbaksh, R., & Ahmadi Safa, M. (2020). Basic psychological needs satisfaction, goal orientation, willingness to communicate, self-efficacy, and learning strategy use as predictors of second language achievement: A structural equation modeling approach. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 49(5), 803–822. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-020-09714-7>
- Ko, K., & Moon, S.-G. (2014). The relationship between religion and corruption: are the proposed causal links empirically valid? *International Review of Public Administration*, 19(1), 44–62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/12294659.2014.887353>
- Kozyreva, L. D., Kotov, A. I., Morozova, N. D., Alexandrova, N. V., & Migunova, E. V. (2022). Formation of educational ecosystem as a key priority of the Russian education development strategy. *Proceedings of the International Scientific and Practical Conference Strategy of Development of Regional Ecosystems "Education-Science-Industry" (ISPCR 2021)*, 208(Ispcr 2021), 251–256. <https://doi.org/10.2991/aebmr.k.220208.036>
- Kristiono, N. (2018). Penanaman nilai antikorupsi bagi mahasiswa FIS Unnes melalui mata kuliah pendidikan anti korupsi. *Refleksi Edukatika : Jurnal Ilmiah Kependidikan*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.24176/re.v9i1.2807>
- Manurung, R. T. (2012). Pendidikan anti korupsi sebagai satuan pembelajaran berkarakter dan humanistik. *Jurnal Sositologi*, 11(27).
- Pemerintah Republik Indonesia. (2002). Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2002 tentang Komisi Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi. *Lembaran Negara RI Tahun 2002 No. 137*, 1–13.
- Perdana, N. S. (2018). Implementasi peranan ekosistem pendidikan dalam penguatan pendidikan karakter peserta didik. *Refleksi Edukatika : Jurnal Ilmiah Kependidikan*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.24176/re.v8i2.2358>
- Porta, D. della. (2000). Social capital, beliefs in government, and political corruption. *Disaffected Democracies* (pp. 202–228). Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780691186849-013>
- Prasetyo, D., Muharam, R. S., & Sembada, A. D. (2021). Integrasi pendidikan antikorupsi dalam pendidikan kewarganegaraan di perguruan tinggi. *Jurnal Pancasila Dan Kewarganegaraan*, 9(2). <http://doi.org/10.25273/citizenship.v9i2.8385>
- Seligson, M. A. (2002). The impact of corruption on regime legitimacy: A comparative study of four Latin American countries. *The Journal of Politics*, 64(2). <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2508.00132>
- Suacana, W. G. (2004). *Pendidikan antikorupsi di perguruan tinggi*. <http://Wgsuacana.Files.Wordpress.Com>.
- Subkhan, E. (2020). Pendidikan antikorupsi perspektif pedagogi kritis. *Integritas: Jurnal Antikorupsi*, 6(1).
- Sukarjo. (2006). Kumpulan materi evaluasi pembelajaran. *Jurusan Teknologi Pembelajaran Program Pascasarjana UNY*.
- Sumaryati. (2020). Penguatan pendidikan antikorupsi perspektif essentialisme. *Integritas: Jurnal Antikorupsi*, 06(1), 1–14.
- Suryani, I. (2013). Penanaman nilai-nilai anti korupsi di lembaga pendidikan perguruan tinggi sebagai upaya preventif pencegahan korupsi. *Jurnal Visi Komunikasi*, 12(2), 306–323.
- Tansley, A., G. (1935). The use and abuse of vegetational concepts and terms author. *Ecology*, 16(3), 284–307.
- Umam, A. K. (2014). Islam, korupsi dan good governance di negara-negara Islam. *Jurnal Al-Ahkam*, 24(2), 195. <https://doi.org/10.21580/ahkam.2014.24.2.146>
- Vaknin, S. (2009). *Financial crime and corruption 3rd edition* (L. Rangelovska, Ed.). A Narcissus Publications Imprint.
- Valk, V. der, & Arnold G. (2014). From formation to ecosystem: Tansley's response to Clements' climax. *Journal of the History of Biology*, 47, 293–321. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10739-013-9363-y>