

## Dimensions of Public Policy in the Integration of Anti-Corruption Education in Civility Education Courses in Higher Education

Deni Nurdyana Hadimin<sup>1</sup>, and Tatang Sudrajat<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> FISIP Universitas Sangga Buana, Bandung, Indonesia

e-mail: [id.tatangsudrajat@gmail.com](mailto:id.tatangsudrajat@gmail.com)

### Abstract

*Corruption is one of the nation's problems and an extraordinary crime. The role of higher education makes an important contribution as a preventive measure in dealing with it. The issuance of the Minister of Research, Technology and Higher Education Regulation Number 33 of 2019 and several other government regulations is a public policy as a solution. The existence of policy actors, policy institutions and the policy environment is important for the integration of anti-corruption education in general compulsory courses. The research aims to analyze the substance of the anti-corruption education policy and the importance of the relationship between actors, institutions and the policy environment.*

*The research uses normative juridical methods, literature studies and secondary data analysis, by examining the substance of government regulations and various relevant documents. The results of the study show that there are several government regulations which constitute anticorruption policies. Its integration into the Citizenship Education course is very strategic as an effort to prevent corrupt behavior. Government officials at the central and regional levels, Corruption Eradication Commission officials, officials from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research and Technology, university leaders, lecturers teaching Citizenship Education courses, educational figures and activists, and other education stakeholders are policy actors. The Ministry of Education, Culture, Research and Technology, the Corruption Eradication Commission, universities and institutions outside the government are policy institutions. Societal expectations for reduced corruption are part of the policy environment. There are several policy substances in several government regulations that need to be perfected.*

**Keywords:** *public policy, corruption, anti-corruption education, civics education..*

### INTRODUCTION

In any country today, corruption in its various forms still occurs and is one of the manifestations of the barrier to a clean and accountable government. Various efforts have been made by each government to eradicate crimes that are very detrimental to the country's finances and economy. One of the problems plaguing the nation and state of Indonesia today is the high level of corruption. Based on data launched by Transparency International on January 31, 2023 regarding the Corruption Perception Index (CPI) for the 2022 measurement year, it appears that Indonesia's CPI is at a score of 34/100 and is ranked 110th out of 180 countries surveyed. This score has fallen by 4 points from 2021, or is the most drastic decline since 1995 (<https://ti.or.id/indeks-persepsi-korupsi-indonesia-2022-mengalami-penurunan-terworst-sepanjang-history-reformasi/>). Thus, factually this is still a serious problem faced by the nation and state. The crime of corruption at this time seems to have undermined all lines in the life of society and government.

Currently, there is no longer a single state or government institution that is free from this very detrimental mental virus. In the daily lives of citizens, we are often exhibited by corrupt behavior with various variations. What is even more concerning is that this corrupt behavior is considered normal and normal. The permissive attitude of some members of society seems to have exacerbated this condition. The building of the state bureaucracy in almost all ministries/agencies has been damaged by this evil behavior. This has become one of the extraordinary crimes that must be dealt with in an extraordinary manner.

Therefore, one of the hopes for the realization of systematic and preventive measures to deal with corrupt behavior and corruption crimes is in tertiary institutions. As an institution that organizes higher education, it has a strategic role to internalize anti-corruption values through the learning process. This is because one of the functions of higher education as stated in Article 4 of Law Number 12 of 2012 is to develop capabilities and shape national character and civilization which results in the context of educating the nation's life. In addition, the role of this strategy is also related to one of the goals of higher education listed in Article 5, namely developing the potential of students to become human beings who believe in and fear God Almighty and have noble character, are healthy, knowledgeable, capable, creative, independent, skilled, competent, and cultured for the benefit of the nation.

In this regard, the government issued Regulation of the Minister of Research, Technology and Higher Education (Permenristekdikti) Number 33 of 2019 concerning Implementation of Anti-Corruption Education in Higher Education and Decree of the Director General of Higher Education (Kepdirjen Dikti) Number 84/KPT/E/2020. There is a public interest that initiated the issuance of these two government regulations, as a concrete manifestation of the response of public officials to this corruption problem. This is done in accordance with their authority over the problems faced by society, so that it can be called public policy. This public policy according to Post et al. is a plan of action carried out by government officials to achieve broad purpose affecting a substantial segment of a nation's citizens[1].

Therefore, it is interesting to study various aspects related to anti-corruption education and civics courses in higher education institutions. This study aims to analyze the substance of anti-corruption education policies and the importance of the relationship between policy institutions, policy institutions and environmental policies.

## **METHOD**

This study uses normative juridical methods and literature review. The focus of the normative juridical method is on all state and government regulations that are directly or indirectly related to anti-corruption education and Citizenship courses as compulsory subjects in tertiary institutions. The government regulations that are the focus of the research study are Permenristekdikti Number 33 of 2019 concerning Implementation of Anti-Corruption Education in Higher Education and Kepdirjen Dikti Number 84/E/KPT/2020 concerning Guidelines for Implementation of Compulsory Courses in the

Higher Education Curriculum.

In addition, there are several state and government regulations that are directly related to education and higher education, namely Law Number 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System, Law Number 14 of 2005 concerning Teachers and Lecturers, Law Number 12 of 2012 concerning Higher Education, PP Number 4 of 2014 concerning the Implementation of Higher Education and Management of Higher Education, as well as Permendikbud Number 3 of 2020 concerning National Higher Education Standards. Literature review is carried out by collecting, classifying, and reviewing all documents in various forms, in the form of books, journals, reports, papers, website news and other sources of information that are relevant to the research objectives.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Profile, Hierarchy and Policy Context

Discussions on anti-corruption education and civics courses as subjects that must be included in the higher education curriculum are inseparable from state and government regulations. This is determined by public officials according to the authority they have on the basis of their response to public problems in the form of corruption which is still high in relation to higher education. Because this contains public interest content, it is called public policy, whose substantive area is education, so it can be called educational policy. Gerston defines public policy as the combination of basic decisions, commitments, and actions made by those who hold or influence government positions of authority[2]. The form is all laws and regulations concerning or related to anti-corruption education and civics courses.

Law Number 20 of 2003 was enacted on July 8 2003, consisting of 77 articles and declaring that two laws were no longer valid, namely Law Number 48/Prp/1960 concerning Oversight of Foreign Education and Teaching, and Law Number 2 of 1989 concerning the Education System National. Within the framework of the anti-corruption education policy, and by adopting Bromley's opinion [3] regarding the policy hierarchy, Law Number 20 of 2003 is at the policy level, together with Law Number 12 of 2012 and several other related laws. At the organizational level there are PP Number 4 of 2014, Permenristekdikti Number 33 of 2019 and Permendikbud Number 3 of 2020. Meanwhile, Kepdirjen Dikti Number 84/E/KPT/2020 is at the operational level.

The context and relevance of Law Number 20 of 2003 with anti-corruption education is that in Article 37 Paragraph (2) there is Citizenship Education which must be included in the higher education curriculum. Law Number 12 of 2012 which was enacted on August 10, 2012, consists of 100 articles and is the first law to regulate higher education. The context and relevance of this law to anti-corruption education is that in Article 35 it is stated that there are four subjects that must be included in the higher education curriculum, including the Citizenship course.

Law Number 14 of 2005 was enacted on December 30, 2005, consists of 84 articles and is a state regulation at the level of law which first regulates teachers and lecturers. The context and its relevance to anti-corruption education include arrangements regarding

the position and main tasks of lecturers as stipulated in Article 1 point 2. In addition, with regard to competence, which according to Article 1 number 10 is a set of knowledge, skills and behaviors that must be possessed, internalized, and controlled by teachers or lecturers in carrying out professional duties.

Law Number 12 of 2012 which was enacted on August 10 2012, consists of 100 articles, and is a state regulation in the form of a law which for the first time regulates higher education. The context and its relevance to anti-corruption education relates to the provisions in Article 35 Paragraph (3) regarding the existence of Citizenship courses as compulsory subjects in the higher education curriculum. Apart from that with regard to the arrangements regarding learning in Article 1 Number 12, regarding the academic community in Article 1 Number 13, and regarding lecturers in Article 1 Number 14.

PP Number 4 of 2014 which was enacted on January 30 2014, consists of 37 articles as the elaboration and mandate of several articles in Law Number 12 of 2012. This government regulation also states that PP Number 17 of 2010 concerning Management and Implementation of Education is no longer valid. The context and relevance of this government regulation with anti-corruption education, among others, relates to the regulation of learning. In accordance with the provisions of Article 1 Number 14, learning is a process of student interaction with lecturers and learning resources in a learning environment.

Permendikbud Number 3 of 2020 which was enacted on January 24 2020, consists of 70 articles and declares that Permenristekdikti Number 44 of 2014 is no longer valid. Several education policies that underlie it include Law Number 12 of 2012 and Government Regulation Number 4 of 2014. Context and relevance to anti-corruption education, among others, relates to the characteristics of the learning process as part of the standard learning process as stipulated in Article 10. The characteristics of this learning process consist of being interactive, holistic, integrative, scientific, contextual, thematic, effective, collaborative, and student-centered.

Permenristekdikti Number 33 of 2019 was enacted on September 3 2019, consisting of 7 articles, whose juridical references include Law Number 12 of 2012. The context and relevance to corruption as a problem for the nation and the state is that efforts to prevent corrupt behavior and criminal acts of corruption require the implementation anti-corruption education as a process of learning and shaping behavior in tertiary institutions. This regulation from a ministerial-level public official is a policy that has been issued for the first time in a higher education environment.

Kepdirjen Dikti Number 84/E/KPT/2020 which was stipulated on October 19, 2020 consists of nine decision dictums, the juridical references of which include Law Number 12 of 2012, PP Number 4 of 2014, and Permendikbud Number 3 of 2020. Context and relevance with anti-corruption education is that Citizenship is one of the four compulsory subjects in the higher education curriculum as stated in the dictum of the two decrees. In addition, the theme of corruption is one of the discussions that can be explored and inserted in an actual and contextual manner in order to develop the substance of the study, as listed in the Appendix to the Directorate General of Higher Education Number II.

There is clarity of juridical reference in every issuance of this state or government regulation, in the perspective of public policy related to legality and legitimacy as a political and administrative product. In this context, Anderson argues that in its positive forms, public policy is based on law[4]. In line with that, Dye stated that one of the implications of an institutional approach or model in the study of public policy is legitimacy[5]. Policy without law has no power to implement. The legitimation of law is critical in modern democracy. It is called public accountability, which means a formal agreement written for the public shall be accounted for publicly[6].

As a policy product that is a decision of a government administrative official, this Decree of the Director General of Higher Education does not mention in its decision dictum its relation to previous decisions/regulations regarding general subjects that were once in force. At least in the past, the Decree of the Director General of Higher Education Number 43/DIKTI/Kep/2006 concerning Signs for Implementing Personality Development Course Groups in Higher Education. In Article 3 it is stated that the Citizenship Education course is one of the courses included in personality development courses. The Director General of Higher Education Decree Number 84/E/KPT/2020 should have provided firmness regarding the application of the same regulation that had applied in the past. This firmness relates to its status as a product of operational policies that are still valid, or have been amended or even replaced.

### **Substance of Anti-Corruption Education Policy**

As stated in Article 1 of Permenristekdikti Number 33 of 2019, that anti-corruption education is a process of learning and forming behavior that is held in tertiary institutions, which is related to preventing corrupt behavior and criminal acts of corruption. It is held in diploma and undergraduate programs, in public universities and private universities. This anti-corruption education is mandatory in nature through courses in the form of inserts in general compulsory courses (MKWU), now the acronym term is MKWK (compulsory curriculum courses); or relevant courses.

Another important matter in this Kepdirjen Dikti as stated in the third dictum is the assertion that there are four compulsory courses in the higher education curriculum, which are abbreviated in the acronym MKWK, one of which is Citizenship. Another aspect related to anti-corruption education that needs to be encouraged is the assertion contained in the third dictum that the function of the MKWK is to shape the dignified character and civility of students. This is very important and relevant to anti-corruption education, because Indonesian people who have character and are civilized will definitely not commit dishonorable acts such as corruption. The learning that takes place through the Citizenship course will actually be an effective antidote and prevent someone from committing corruption in the future.

As stated in the Attachment to the Kepdirjen Dikti Number II Letter C that the Citizenship course is held in order to form students into citizens who have a sense of nationality and love for the country. This is done by providing an understanding of Pancasila, the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, the Republic of Indonesia

and Bhineka Tunggal Ika and their implementation. Of the nine civics subject substances as listed in the Appendix to the Kepdirjen Dikti Number 84/E/KPT/2020 Number II letter c, there are at least two substances related to anti-corruption education. Both are about the obligations and rights of the state and citizens, as well as law enforcement in Indonesia.

As stated in Article 2 Paragraph (1) Permenristekdikti Number 33 of 2019, that anti-corruption education must be administered through courses, which according to Paragraph (2) are in the form of inserts in general compulsory courses or relevant courses. However, in the Appendix to the Kepdirjen Dikti Number II, the stipulation of a study on corruption as a development of the substance of the MKWK study seems to be only secondary, or optional. Discussion of corruption is only one of the options for developing study substance, apart from local wisdom, drugs, moral decadence, defending the country, love of the motherland, sensitivity to environmental sustainability, disaster response, radicalism, and tax awareness. Supposedly, in line with the provisions of Article 2 Paragraph (1) of the Permenristekdikti Number 33 of 2019, this discussion on corruption is something that is mandatory and imperative in nature.

The two subjects discussed in this Citizenship course, namely the rights and obligations of citizens and law enforcement, have relevance to anti-corruption education because citizens who are able to carry out their obligations, including obeying and submitting to all state laws and regulations, of course they will not do so. acts of corruption. Various steps have been taken as a preventive effort by the government and the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), so that as citizens there is an obligation to follow this. In relation to law enforcement it is also clear that corrupt behavior that is detrimental to state finances and the national economy is something that must be avoided by every citizen. Students as future leaders of the nation must be given a comprehensive understanding of the dangers of corruption, as well as the need for consistent law enforcement.

### **Integrating Anti-Corruption Education in Citizenship Courses**

As an extraordinary crime, efforts to prevent and eradicate corruption must be carried out with full seriousness involving various components of the nation. Universities as institutions that protect, maintain and develop the values of truth are required to be proactive in dealing with problems that undermine state finances, harm the national economy and damage Indonesia's reputation in international relations. This is in accordance with the mandate of Article 3 of Law Number 12 of 2012, that higher education is based, among other things, on scientific truth, honesty, virtue and responsibility. In this regard, anti-corruption education finds the right place to be realized, developed and maintained.

The purpose of the Citizenship course, which is closely related to a sense of nationality and love for the homeland, clearly has a very strong correlation with anti-corruption education. Research by Sudaryatie et al. among other things, he concluded that strengthening the anti-corruption character values instilled in Citizenship course material

by students was considered appropriate and very appropriate. With this, it is hoped that it can break the chain of corrupt behavior by individuals who seek personal gain in the name of power, position and relations[7]. Moral and ethical values that are very necessary in social interaction, including fortifying humans from the possibility of violating social norms, are substantial and strategic in anti-corruption education which is attached to the Citizenship course. According to Surbakti and Krismawanta Surbanti, anti-corruption education for students leads to values education, namely good values. This educational orientation makes people feel ashamed when tempted by corruption, and angry when they witness it. There are three fundamental moral attitudes that make people immune to the temptation of corruption, namely honesty, a sense of justice, and a sense of responsibility [8].

Therefore, there is no other policy option to save this country from the threat of an epidemic of corruption now and for the future, except for integrating anti-corruption education in this Citizenship course. In this regard, Gusnardi argued that the provision of anti-corruption courses in tertiary institutions needs to be realized, because it can shape the mindset of students in viewing corruption issues. Each student is expected to understand and understand the reasons for rejection of things that lead to acts of corruption. This will definitely reduce and even eliminate corrupt seeds [9]. With their reasoning abilities, of course, students can distinguish acts of corruption as despicable and morally flawed from behavior that is anti-corruption and even counter-corruption.

Among the leaders of higher education institutions, including private universities, there needs to be a strong understanding that this anti-corruption education, which is included in the Citizenship course, is the right solution, as a form of its contribution to the benefit of the nation and state. Research by Fatimah and Reja Fahlevi concluded that civics education materials based on anti-corruption education need to be implemented in all universities in Indonesia. This is because it does not only focus on knowledge but also on skills such as analyzing and critical thinking, so that it can form other experiential learning skills [10].

What various components of the nation fought for, including university students and the younger generation in general, against the New Order regime in 1998 was inseparable from their solidarity in fighting corruption, collusion and nepotism. In relation to current educational needs, anti-corruption education that is integrated, among others, in the Citizenship course must be a priority. According to Dewantara et al., anti-corruption education is taught to form students with a humanist, and law-abiding character. Students' law-obedient attitude is reflected in their behavior that is far from corruption, collusion, and nepotism[11]. As educated people who with this course have the provision of knowledge and understanding of corruption as an extraordinary crime, students can appear at the forefront of social change that opens a new chapter against corruption crimes. Aksinusin et al. stated that anti-corruption education aims to build an anti-corruption in students' characters and produce agents of change in society. Anti-corruption learning that is carried out at universities should have the same goals and expected competencies so that students possess similar competencies related to anti-

corruption. Civic education studies in universities can be integrated with anti-corruption education since it teaches good behaviors and anti-corruption values[12].

The condition of the nation today requires universities to pay more attention to the nation's problems which can bankrupt the national economy. Zulqarnain et al. stated that the insertion of anti-corruption values in civic education needs to be done and is a good step in efforts to prevent corruption, especially through educational institutions. The findings show that most of the college students perceive that civic and anti-corruption education is very important to learn and is also relevant to the condition of Indonesia today[13]. Ethical and moral messages can be conveyed in this course, through learning techniques that attract students' interest, thereby making a major contribution to the future of Indonesia which is free from this corrupt behavior.

An important aspect in building a modern rule of law is consistency in law enforcement, which among other things requires the involvement of various components of the nation, including universities. Sociologically referring to the opinion of Talcott Parsons, this law enforcement function is a form of integration function[14]. This function, like other functions, relates to a sector of special social institutions, namely those carried out by the legal subsystem by maintaining procedures and integration between components that have different opinions, views and frameworks of morality for the formation of social solidarity [15]. In reducing corrupt behavior, according to Yanto, higher education plays a role as a driving force and balancer in controlling the duties and responsibilities of law enforcement institutions when carrying out their duties in eradicating corruption. Collaboration with universities is really needed, including involving academics, because they have the power to fight for the values of honesty for society [16].

The tidal wave of corruption that has hit the country without stopping is the tip of the iceberg of a deeper national crisis. The deepest root of this splendor of corrupt practices is the weakening of the power of moral literacy in this nation. Increasing the spirit of worship and houses of worship, as well as the proliferation of laws are not accompanied by sensitivity to public moral values [17]. In this context, efforts to foster moral literacy include anti-corruption education which is included in Citizenship courses. Students as students with various physical and psychological advantages will get a very good opportunity to give their service to the nation and state. With an integral and comprehensive approach, students will be able to map corruption problems so that they can contribute more concretely to the fight against the dangers of corruption.

Students as a strategic element of the younger generation are the chosen citizens of the nation, both intellectually, socially and economically to participate in thinking and doing the best for the nation and state. In this regard, Article 5 of Law Number 40 of 2009 concerning Youth, states that youth has several characteristics, namely fighting spirit, volunteerism, responsibility, and chivalry, and has critical, idealistic, innovative, progressive, dynamic, reformist, and futuristic characteristics. According to Suryani, the active role of students is expected to focus more on efforts to prevent corruption by participating in building an anti-corruption culture in society. Students can act as agents



of change and motors of the anti-corruption movement. Sufficient knowledge about various aspects of corruption is an important provision, which is obtained, among others, through outreach, campaigns, seminars or lectures[18].

In a sociological context, the existence and important role of education can be placed within the framework of social system functions as stated by Talcott Parsons as a function of latent pattern maintenance, as a function of maintaining and/or enforcing patterns and structures of society[14]. According to him, as quoted by Keller[15], this function is related to the sector of special institutions in society, including the cultural subsystem, which is related to the maintenance of cultural values and norms that apply in society for the purpose of preserving the structure of society, so that it can participate in social life, for example the role of educational institutions. As a social institution, education, according to Harris Jr., represents a behavioral pattern through which knowledge, skills, and concepts are transmitted to individuals through teaching mechanisms (human or otherwise). As a social institution, education aids systematically transmitting a cultural heritage from one generation to another and imparting social and moral values[19].

Integrating anti-corruption education in the Citizenship course cannot be done haphazardly. It is no longer the time for lecturers who teach this course to think and act soberly in preparing learning materials. He must be aware that what he is facing is students who are very literate in technology, critical and rational. Therefore, innovation and creativity are needed for the successful implementation of this policy. Lecturers as policy actors are required to always appear as human learners by presenting learning methods and approaches that are compatible with the characteristics of today's millennial generation students. According to Hasanah, anti-corruption learning cannot be carried out conventionally, but must be designed so that aspects of student cognition, affection and behavior can be developed optimally and sustainably[20].

### **Relation of Actors, Institutions and Environment of Anti-Corruption Education Policy**

This discussion on anti-corruption education policy will not be separated from the position and important role of higher education and universities in the national education system. On the other hand, because the problem of corruption is an inseparable part of the problems of the nation or the public interest, this anti-corruption education is basically a concrete manifestation of public policy whose substantive area is education. This aspect of education with its various problems has indeed become a fact in various countries as something that is felt by its citizens as a problem that they cannot solve on their own. In this regard, Parsons mentions that education is one of the key areas of public policy [21]. Another public policy expert, Dunn argues that education is one of the issue areas of public policy[22].

In this regard, higher education as stated in Article 1 number 6 of Law Number 12 of 2012 is an educational unit that organizes higher education, playing an important role. Because anti-corruption education is actually character education, this is relevant to one of the functions of higher education as referred to in Article 4, namely to develop

capabilities and shape dignified national character and civilization in the framework of educating the nation's life. In a public policy perspective, this university can be called a policy institution, because it refers to Howlett and M. Ramesh, that institutions as the structures and organization of the state, society, and the international system[23].

Humans who commit corruption are examples of humans who are not noble, because they reflect human figures who are greedy, selfish, only selfish, and do not care about the interests of others. Therefore, anti-corruption education has strong relevance to one of the goals of education, as stated in Article 5 letter a of Law Number 12 of 2012, namely to develop the potential of students to become human beings who believe and fear God Almighty and have noble character. healthy, knowledgeable, capable, creative, independent, skilled, competent and cultured for the benefit of the nation. Apart from that, as the main position of a tertiary institution is that it cannot stop talking about truth, ethics and morality, this anti-corruption education clearly has a strong connection with the function and role of the tertiary institution as stated in Article 58 Paragraph (1) letter d, i.e. as a center for the study of virtue and moral strength to seek and find the truth. It is in this place that various kinds of debates on ideas and arguments from lecturers and students find their place to find the best way to deal with corruption as a national problem.

Anti-corruption education is a preventive action that can help create an anti-corruption culture. The use of the Student Centered Learning method is an effort to build legal awareness and instill values that shape student integrity. This will foster an anti-corruption culture in students as the younger generation who in time will become actors in development in society[24]. This student-centered learning by paying attention to the environment in a harmonious and balanced manner is one of the principles of implementing higher education, as stipulated in Article 6 letter f of Law Number 12 of 2012.

According to **Khalilurrahman**, higher education institutions can play a role in preventing corruption by internalizing corruption values in academic culture, academic ethics and academic forums. Universities need to consistently and continuously optimize corruption prevention and eradication programs that are integrated into the curriculum and activities of the Tridharma of Higher Education[25]. Anti-corruption education is an action to control or reduce corruption, as a whole effort to encourage future generations to develop an attitude of resolutely rejecting every form of corruption[26]. It is time for campus circles to declare a moral war against corruption simultaneously so that it resonates throughout the country.

There is a challenge for lecturers in civics courses to be creative and innovative in packaging the learning process, so that it is aligned with the interests and needs of students. According to Suryani, lecturers must be good communicators, facilitators and motivators for students. It is not easy to design anti-corruption courses so that they are interesting, not monotonous and effective [18]. In student centered learning, there are various learning techniques that can be packaged by lecturers so that they are interesting and contextual. According to Nanggala, in order to internalize anti-corruption values through the Citizenship course, it would be more effective and fun if it was carried out

using a strategy of analyzing corruption cases, which is a form of contextual learning [27]. Lecturers must immediately adapt to the paradigm of higher education transformation which is the demand of the times. Duderstadt mentions that some of these significant transformations are from teaching to learning organizations, from passive students to active learners, and from solitariness learning to interactive, collaborative learning [28].

Anti-corruption culture is not something that is formed suddenly, but through a long process that requires the seriousness of all parties, especially university leaders as the authority holder. This anti-corruption culture will basically start from the very high public expectations that rampant corruption can be tackled immediately. Community members are very disappointed with the behavior of public officials, who exist in all state and government institutions, at the central and regional levels. This hope and desire to eradicate corruption is also voiced by the campus community, so that cumulatively it is the hope of the public in general. In fact, some circles may very well think that this corruption has become entrenched to a certain extent, as a form of citizen pessimism towards the epidemic of corruption that has attacked all lines of life. The practice of corruption has become common. Sometimes, this action is done because of either someone's financial needs or the influence of a hedonistic lifestyle. Therefore, it is partially correct that people say that corruption has become part of Indonesian culture [12].

This is what in the perspective of public policy can be referred to as the policy environment. Dunn, a public policy expert defines this policy environment as the specific context in which events surrounding a policy issue occur, influences and is in turn influenced by policy stakeholders and public policies[22]. Another expert, Anderson said that demands for policy actions are generated in the environment and transmitted to the political system, at the same time, the environment places limits and constraints upon what can be done by policy makers[4]. From a policy environment that continuously voices public expectations, intellectual community members on campus, especially lecturers as scientists must feel called to stand at the forefront of the fight against corruption crimes.

Lecturers, according to Article 1 number 2 of Law Number 14 of 2005 concerning Teachers and Lecturers are professional educators and scientists with the main task of transforming, developing and disseminating science, technology and art through education, research and community service. Likewise, the same thing is stated in Article 1 point 14 of Law Number 12 of 2012. In campuses as scientific communities and in universities as scientific institutions, lecturers and students are academics. This academic community according to the provisions of Article 1 number 13 is an academic community consisting of lecturers and students.

In the context of anti-corruption education policy, lecturers are one of the policy actors as well as policy implementers. These policy actors according to Gerston who present, interpret, and respond to those issues[2]. This issue will become the initial embryo for the emergence of public problems and if these problems receive intensive

attention, they will enter the policy agenda. An issue cannot automatically enter the policy agenda, because policy issues cover broad dimensions[29]. Howlett and M. Ramesh mention that policies are made by policy subsystems consisting of actors dealing with a public problem. The term "actor" includes both state and social actors, some of whom are intimately involved in the policy process, while others are only marginally so[23].

Together with other parties, in tertiary institutions and outside tertiary institutions, he is part of what Dunn calls policy stakeholders. Apart from lecturers, these policy stakeholders include students, university leaders, education staff, education observers, officials from the ministry of education and culture, KPK leaders and apparatus, members of the DPR, the President and other parties with an interest in anti-corruption education. In the perspective of public policy studies, all state and government regulations regarding anti-corruption education which are public policies in the field of education, together with policy stakeholders and the policy environment are three elements that constitute one unit and are reciprocally related, which Dunn refers to as The Policy System. This public policy expert defines the policy system as the overall institutional pattern within which policies are made, involving interrelationships among three elements: public policies, policy stakeholders, and policy environments[22].

This reciprocal relationship can be seen from the fact that all state and government regulations regarding anti-corruption education are products of political and administrative decisions from public officials who are part of policy stakeholders. In other words, all educational policies regarding anti-corruption education are issued because of the political will and administrative authority of these public officials, in the context of a political system that is in a political superstructure. Likewise, there are roles and interests of other actors who are also part of the policy stakeholders, which in the context of the political system are in the political infrastructure order. They include educational activists, educational observers, anti-corruption activists, anti-corruption non-governmental organization activists and other parties.

Likewise, when the Permenristekdikti Number 33 of 2019 and the Kepdirjen Dikti Number 84/E/KPT/2020 are implemented in tertiary institutions, there will certainly be a reaction in the form of support and input for improvements, regarding the substance of the policy as well as with regard to the dynamics of its implementation. Based on this, there could be efforts to improve the two regulations, both from the formalistic aspect and the substance. It is in this phase that policy stakeholders who are in the political superstructure structure exercise their authority so that a new policy regarding anti-corruption education is enacted. These are all examples of the fact that there is a reciprocal relationship between policy stakeholders and public policy.

According to Article 5 Paragraph (1) Permenristekdikti Number 33 of 2019, higher education leaders are responsible for organizing anti-corruption education, and report it regularly to the Menristekdikti through the Director General of Learning and Student Affairs. This provision seems to be effective only for state universities, because so far based on the applicable institutional regulations, private universities are under the coordination of the Higher Education Service Institution (LLDikti). This is in line with

the provisions as stated in Article 1 paragraph (3), that tertiary institutions consist of state universities and private universities, so the report on the implementation of anti-corruption education by the leaders of these private universities should be submitted to the Minister of Education and Research and Technology through the Head of the local LLDikti.

The success of anti-corruption education will depend on various factors, including university leaders. His concern, sincerity and commitment to the substance of the Permenristekdikti Number 33 of 2019 and the Kepdirjen Dikti Number 84/E/KPT/2020 will greatly determine the effectiveness of implementing policies that will determine the future of this nation. For example, his commitment to the provisions of Number IV letter a of the Attachment to the Kepdirjen Dikti that lecturers in civics courses must receive special training on citizenship education, in addition to having the lowest academic qualifications in the fields of Pancasila and civics education, national security, social sciences, cultural studies, philosophy and science law. In this case, there will be a question regarding the amount of commitment in the form of financial support provided by universities to involve their lecturers in this special training.

Therefore, it is very clear that the seriousness of higher education leaders, especially private universities, is in organizing this MKWK, including the Citizenship course. Ruslan et al's research states that the implementation of anti-corruption education in the Pancasila and Citizenship Education course has not been maximized due to the lack of attention given by the learning organizers [30]. There should be no discriminatory treatment, looking at one eye and considering MKWK as a secondary and complementary subject. The commitment of higher education leaders will greatly determine the success of anti-corruption education. Hasanah's research shows that the implementation of anti-corruption education has not become something immediate and a priority, not all tertiary institutions have implemented anti-corruption education as a special subject or integrated it into other courses[20]. The sincerity, concern and commitment shown by the leadership of the tertiary institution will make the tertiary institution a crater for candradimuka who forge the younger generation into citizens who are not only anti-corruption, but also have counter-corruption attitudes and behavior.

In other words, the integrity of the academic community of a tertiary institution will become a miniature of the future face of Indonesia as a country free from epidemics of corruption. In Suryani's view, higher education leaders play a role in creating a campus as a land of integrity that supports the effectiveness of anti-corruption education[18]. The application of anti-corruption character education in tertiary institutions will foster anti-corruption characters for students. The important role of tertiary institutions is a milestone for building transparency and accountability as a driver of integrity, so that they can stop the seeds of corruption [31]. History will record major changes in this country when students as policy actors contribute to preventing and eradicating corruption. According to Hasanah, students are expected to appear at the front as a driving force for the anti-corruption movement, because they are supported by their basic competencies, namely intelligence, critical thinking skills, and the courage to state the truth[20].

## CONCLUSION

Corruption as an extraordinary crime, is currently in an alarming condition. Anti-corruption education is one of the preventive efforts in dealing with the increasingly rampant behavior that is detrimental to state finances. State and government policies regarding anti-corruption education and citizenship courses must be supported by all groups, especially university leaders. Integrating it into civics courses requires lecturers to be more innovative and creative in order to effectively implement the objectives of this educational policy.

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. E. et al Post, *Business and Society. Corporate Strategy, Public Policy, Ethics*. Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill, 1999.
- [2] L. N. Gerston, *Public Policy Making. Process and Principles. Third Edition*. New York: E Sharpe, 2010.
- [3] D. W. Bromley, *Economic Interest and Institution. The Conceptual Foundation of Public Policy*. New York: Basil Blackwell Inc, 1989.
- [4] J. E. Anderson, *Public Policy-Making*, Second Edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1978.
- [5] T. Dye R., *Understanding Public Policy*, Sixth. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall International, Inc, 1987.
- [6] R. Nugroho, *Public Policy for The Developing Countries*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2012.
- [7] Sudaryatie et al, "Penguatan Nilai Karakter Pendidikan Antikorupsi Melalui Mata Kuliah Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan," *YUSTITIABELEN*, vol. 8, no. 1, Jan. 2022.
- [8] Surbakti and S. Krismawanta, "Analisis Kebijakan Pendidikan Antikorupsi di Perguruan Tinggi," *Justica*, vol. 3, no. 1, Feb. 2021.
- [9] Gusnardi, "Pendidikan Anti Korupsi di Perguruan Tinggi : Perlukah?," *Pekbis J.*, vol. 6, no. 2, Jul. 2018.
- [10] Fatimah and F. Reja, "Internalisasi Materi Ajar Mata Kuliah Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan Berbasis Pendidikan Anti Korupsi di Lingkungan Lahan Basah," *Pros. Semin. Nas. Lingkung. Lahan Basah*, vol. 6, no. 1, Apr. 2021.
- [11] Dewantara and A. Jagad, "Anti-corruption Education as an Effort to Form Students with Character Humanist and Law-Compliant," *J. Civ. Media Kaji. Kewarganegaraan*, vol. 18, no. 1, Apr. 2021, doi: 10.21831/jc.v18i1.38432.
- [12] S. et al Aksinudin, "Instilling anti-Corruption Characters in Civic Education for College Students," *J. Civ. Media Kaji. Kewarganegaraan*, vol. 19, no. 1, 2022, doi: <https://doi.org/10.21831/jc.v19i1.45981>.
- [13] Zulqarnain et al, "Perception of College Students on Civic and Anti-Corruption Education : Importance and Relevance," *Integritas J. Antikorupsi*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2022.
- [14] J. D. Narwoko and B. Suyanto, *Sosiologi. Teks Pengantar dan Terapan*. in Pertama.

- Jakarta: Prenada Media, 2004.
- [15] K. Suzanne, *Penguasa dan Kelompok Elit. Peranan Elit Penentu Dalam Masyarakat Modern (Penerjemah : Zahara M. Noer)*. Jakarta: PT RajaGrafindo Persada, 1995.
- [16] O. et al Yanto, “Mengoptimalkan Peran Perguruan Tinggi Dalam Mengurangi Perilaku Korupsi,” *J. Legis. Indones.*, vol. 17, no. 1, Mar. 2020.
- [17] Y. Latif, *Wawasan Pancasila. Bintang Penuntut Untuk Pembudayaan*. Jakarta: Mizan, 2018.
- [18] I. Suryani, “Penanaman Nilai Antikorupsi di Perguruan Tinggi Sebagai Upaya Preventif Pencegahan Korupsi,” *J. Visi Komun.*, vol. XII, 2013.
- [19] Jr. O. J. Harris, *Managing People at Work. Concepts and Cases in Interpersonal Behavior*. Santa Barbara: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1976.
- [20] S. U. Hasanah, “Kebijakan Perguruan Tinggi Dalam Menerapkan Pendidikan Antikorupsi,” *JPKN J. Pendidik. Kewarganegaraan*, vol. 2, no. 1, Jun. 2018.
- [21] W. Parson, *Public Policy. An Introduction to The Theory and Practice of Policy Analysis*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 1997.
- [22] W. N. Dunn, *Public Policy Analysis : An Introduction*. London: Prentice-Hall International, Inc, 1981.
- [23] M. Howlett and R. M., *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems*. Toronto: Oxford University Press., 1995.
- [24] Wibawa et al and S. Dhevy, “Pendidikan Antikorupsi Sebagai Tindakan Preventif Perilaku Koruptif,” *MUQODDIMA J. Pemikir. Dan Ris. Sociol.*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2021.
- [25] Khalilurrahman, “Internalisasi Academic Culture Dalam Pencegahan Korupsi Pada Perguruan Tinggi - Google Search,” *J. IAIN Kendari*, 2016, Accessed: Aug. 23, 2023. [Online]. Available: [https://www.google.com/search?q=Internalisasi+Academic+Culture+Dalam+Pencegahan+Korupsi+Pada+Perguruan+Tinggi%0D%0A&sca\\_esv=559229640&sxsrf=AB5stBifWMSQKfixCoQP8v57umOX5hP9Zw%3A1692751316025&source=hp&ei=01XIZOnFPMrD4-EPoYu84AM&iflsig=AD69kcEAAAAAZOVj514dTII1d5vb0WWbiiDhnQEwbf2Q&ved=0ahUKEwip-4eHxvGAAxXK4TgGHAEFDzwQ4dUDCAk&uact=5&oq=Internalisasi+Academic+Culture+Dalam+Pencegahan+Korupsi+Pada+Perguruan+Tinggi%0D%0A&gs\\_l=p=Egdnd3Mtd2l6Ik5JbnRlcm5hbG1zYXNpIEFjYWRLbWljIEN1bHR1cmUgRGFsYW0gUGVuY2VnYWVhbiBLb3JlcHNpIFBhZGEgUGVvZ3VyYWVlFRpbmdnaQpIAFAAWABwAHgAkAEAmAEAoAEAqgEAuAEDyAEA-AEC&sclient=gws-wiz](https://www.google.com/search?q=Internalisasi+Academic+Culture+Dalam+Pencegahan+Korupsi+Pada+Perguruan+Tinggi%0D%0A&sca_esv=559229640&sxsrf=AB5stBifWMSQKfixCoQP8v57umOX5hP9Zw%3A1692751316025&source=hp&ei=01XIZOnFPMrD4-EPoYu84AM&iflsig=AD69kcEAAAAAZOVj514dTII1d5vb0WWbiiDhnQEwbf2Q&ved=0ahUKEwip-4eHxvGAAxXK4TgGHAEFDzwQ4dUDCAk&uact=5&oq=Internalisasi+Academic+Culture+Dalam+Pencegahan+Korupsi+Pada+Perguruan+Tinggi%0D%0A&gs_l=p=Egdnd3Mtd2l6Ik5JbnRlcm5hbG1zYXNpIEFjYWRLbWljIEN1bHR1cmUgRGFsYW0gUGVuY2VnYWVhbiBLb3JlcHNpIFBhZGEgUGVvZ3VyYWVlFRpbmdnaQpIAFAAWABwAHgAkAEAmAEAoAEAqgEAuAEDyAEA-AEC&sclient=gws-wiz)
- [26] M. A. Wijayanti, “Prevention of Corruption Crimes Through Anti-Corruption Education and Pancasila Morals,” *J. Creat. Stud.*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2019.
- [27] A. Nanggala, “Internalisasi Nilai-Nilai Antikorupsi Melalui Pembelajaran Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan,” *J. Glob. Citiz.*, vol. IX, no. 1, 2020.
- [28] J. J. Duderstadt, *A University For The 21 ST Century*. Ann Arbor: The University

- of Michigan Press, 2003.
- [29] B. Winarno, *Kebijakan Publik. Teori, Proses, dan Studi Kasus*. Yogyakarta: CAPS, 2012.
- [30] Ruslan et al, “Penerapan Pendidikan Antikorupsi di Perguruan Tinggi Pada Mata Kuliah Wajib Umum PPKn,” *J. Pendidik. Kewarganegaraan*, vol. 10, no. 1, 2022.
- [31] A. A. Burhanudin, “Peran Perguruan Tinggi Dalam Penanaman dan Penguatan Pendidikan Karakter dan Antikorupsi,” *SALIMIYA J. Studi Ilmu Keagamaan Islam*, vol. 3, no. 4, Desember 2022.