

THE ROLE OF ISLAMIC RELIGIOUS EDUCATION TEACHER IN CREATING ANTI-CORRUPTION GENERATION

Ahmad Asroni

Universitas Islam Indonesia
e-mail: ahmad.asroni@uii.ac.id

Abstract: This article describes the strategic and important role of Islamic Religious Education (IRE) teachers in creating anti-corruption generation. There are several things that IRE teachers should pay attention in the implementation of anti-corruption education. First, understanding and mastery of anti-corruption educational materials. Second, the ability of IRE teachers to design interesting methods and media of anti-corruption education learning. Third, the anti-corruption education learning model conducted by IRE teachers should not only emphasize the cognitive aspect, but also the affective and psychomotor aspects. Fourth, in evaluating student learning outcomes should not only be based on cognitive or intellectual abilities but should also be based on the attitudes and behaviors of students.

Keywords: IRE teacher, corruption, anti-corruption education

Abstrak: Artikel ini mendeskripsikan peran strategis dan penting guru Pendidikan Agama Islam (PAI) dalam mencetak generasi anti korupsi. Ada beberapa hal yang harus diperhatikan dan dilakukan oleh guru PAI dalam implementasi pendidikan anti-korupsi. Pertama, pemahaman dan penguasaan materi pendidikan anti-korupsi. Kedua, kemampuan guru PAI untuk mendesain metode dan media pembelajaran pendidikan anti-korupsi yang menarik. Ketiga, model pembelajaran pendidikan anti-korupsi yang dilakukan oleh guru PAI tidak boleh hanya menekankan pada aspek kognitif saja, tetapi juga harus menekankan aspek afektif dan psikomotorik. Keempat, dalam mengevaluasi hasil belajar siswa tidak boleh hanya didasarkan pada kemampuan kognitif atau intelektual saja, namun juga harus mendasarkan diri pada sikap dan prilaku siswa.

Kata kunci: Guru PAI, korupsi, Pendidikan Anti-Korupsi

A. INRODUCTION

Indonesia is a paradise for corruptors. This phrase is perhaps not an exaggeration. This is because corruption, which is classified as an extraordinary crime, is spreading in Indonesia. Just an example is the Century Bank mega scandal which cost up to 6.7 trillion rupiah. This mega scandal itself is strongly suspected of involving several elite government figures. Another case is a joint corruption case involving a few officials within the Ministry of Youth and Sports and the Ministry of Manpower and Transmigration. The next relatively recent is Operation Catching Hands (OTT) with suspect of former Minister of Maritime and Fisheries Affairs, Edhy Prabowo, in the alleged bribery case for the export of lobster seeds. Not long ago, former Minister of Social Services, Juliari P Batubara, also

stumbled upon the alleged bribery case of social assistance in handling the Covid-19 pandemic for the Jabodetabek (Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, Bekasi) area in 2020.

Corruption in Indonesia has been in an acute condition. The latest survey released by the World Justice Project in early June 2011 places Indonesia as one of the most corrupt countries in the world. Of the 66 countries surveyed, Indonesia ranks 47th for the absence of corruption. In fact, for the level of the East Asia and Pacific region, the ranking of the absence of corruption in Indonesia is the second lowest before Cambodia. For a corruption-free country, Indonesia lags when compared to Vietnam, the Philippines, Thailand, and Malaysia. In fact, Indonesia ranks rather high in terms of legal clarity. To date, Indonesia has at least 10 laws, 6 government regulations, and 6 presidential instructions related to the fight against corruption (*Media Indonesia*, 16 June 2011).

Indonesia's bad record in the world of corruption as reported by the World Justice Project above is not the first. Long before 2011, Indonesia had listed itself as one of the most corrupt countries in the world. In 2010, for example, Indonesia became the first winner as the most corrupt country in the Asia Pacific. Based on the results of a business survey issued by the Political and Economic Risk Consultancy (PERC), Indonesia ranks first as the most corrupt country by scoring a score of 9.07 out of 10. This figure is up 7.69 points from 2009. The second position is occupied by Cambodia, followed by Vietnam, Philippines, Thailand, India, China, Malaysia, Taiwan, South Korea, Macao, and Japan. Meanwhile, the cleanest country from corruption is occupied by Singapore, then Australia, Hong Kong, and the United States (*Kompas.com*, 8 March 2010).

In addition to PERC, a survey by Transparency International (TI), an organization that is actively campaigning for the anti-corruption movement and has 80 branches worldwide, in 1996 also placed Indonesia in the top 10 countries with the highest degree of corruption. This position lasted until 1999 when Indonesia was the 3rd most corrupt country out of 99 countries in the world. In 2001, Indonesia's position was still very worrying because it was still included in the list of the most corrupt countries in the world, which was ranked 4th out of 91 most corrupt countries in the world. In the 2001 Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) issued by TI, Indonesia scored the same as Uganda, which was 1.9. This score is only slightly better than the other two most corrupt countries in the world, namely Nigeria (1.0) and Bangladesh (0.4). In 2006-2007, Indonesia ranked second after the Philippines as the most corrupt country in Asia (Hardianto, 2003: 83-84).

The World Bank report also reveals the same data. According to a World Bank report, Indonesia has a bad reputation in eradicating corruption and is one of the most corrupt countries in the world. In

fact, the World Bank report states that corruption in Indonesia has very long historical roots, namely since the VOC era before 1800. Surprisingly, corruption continued into the post-independence period (World Bank, 2003: 42). In short, the age of corruption in Indonesia is very old, older than the age of Indonesia itself.

The Spread of Corruption

Seeing the various data that have been released by a few international institutions above is really worrying. Corruption has become a latent disease that plagues Indonesia. Worse, corruption does not only occur in the bureaucracy, but has also spread to almost all dimensions of life and involves many groups and institutions; from high officials to low officials; from executive, legislative, to judicial institutions; from central to local government.

According to the former Minister of Home Affairs, Gamawan Fauzi, there are 155 regional heads involved in corruption. 17 of them are governors. Every week there are regional heads who are processed in corruption cases. The number presented by Gamawan Fauzi is not much different from the data from the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK). As of March 2011, there have been 175 regional heads—consisting of 17 governors and 158 regents and mayors—who have undergone examination at the from the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK). Some of them have been processed by law enforcement, and have even been thrown into prison (Yuntho, 2011). Based on a report by the Financial Audit Board (BPK), in the last seven years in Indonesia there have been budget irregularities (read: corruption) reaching 103 trillion rupiah (*Media Indonesia*, 25 October 2011).

The Indonesian government seems unable to eradicate corruption anymore. Almost all institutions and law enforcement officers are unable to ensnare the corruptors. Surprisingly, not a few laws enforcement officers who actually "flirt" with the corrupt. There are several names of judges who conspired with corruptors. Among them were judge Muhtadi Asnun, judge Syarifuddin Umar, judge Ibrahim, and judge Imas Dianasari. In addition to the judges, there are several rogue prosecutors such as Cirus Sinaga and Poltak Manulang who are strongly suspected of receiving bribes from Gayus Halomoan Tambunan. Long before the arrest of a few judges and prosecutors, there was the name of the prosecutor Urip Trigunawan who was caught taking bribes from Artalita Suryani. Not to mention the case of "fat accounts" which allegedly involved several police officers.

The government's efforts to eradicate corruption at the bureaucratic level by increasing employee salaries (remuneration) have also not yielded sufficient results. One of the most obvious examples can be seen in the corruption case of Gayus Halomoan Tambunan at the Ministry of Finance

several years ago. Although this ministry has implemented a remuneration policy, the fact is that Gayus Halomoan Tambunan is still corrupt in tens of billions of rupiahs. Strangely, he is only a civil servant class III A. If a lowly civil servant can corrupt freely, especially high officials. It is very possible that the corruption committed by high officials is worse than that of Gayus Halomoan Tambunan.

Understanding Corruption

The word corruption comes from the Latin *corruptio* or *corruptus*. *Corruptio* itself comes from the word *corrumpere*, an older Latin word. It is from Latin that it descended into many European languages such as English, namely *corruption*, *corrupt*; French is *corruption*; and the Dutch language is *corruptie*, *korruptie*. From the Dutch, the word came down to Indonesian, namely *corruption* (Hamzah, 2005: 4). In the Indonesian Dictionary (2001: 597), it is explained that corruption is the misappropriation or misuse of state money for personal or other people's gain.

Jeremy Pope (2003: 6) defines corruption as the abuse of power or trust for personal gain. HA. Braz (1985: 7) defines corruption as the secret use of formal authority and power under the pretext of law. Meanwhile, Samuel P. Huntington (1968: 59) defines corruption as the behavior of public officials who deviate from the norms accepted and embraced by society with the aim of obtaining personal gain. Kartini Kartono (1983: 87) suggests that corruption is a product of the attitude of a group's life that uses money as a standard of truth and absolute power. As a result, corruptors and corrupt politicians can freely enter the bureaucracy of power that is so respected. They also occupy a high social status in the public sphere.

Meanwhile, Juniadi Suwanto (1997) states that corruption is the behavior or actions of a person or more that violates applicable norms by using and/or abusing power or opportunities through the procurement process, the determination of acceptance levies or the provision of other facilities or services carried out. in the activities of receiving and/or spending money or assets, storing money or assets as well as in licensing and/or other services with the aim of personal or group gains which directly or indirectly harm the interests and/or finances of the state and society.

Transparency International (in Ghufroon, 2009: 2) defines corruption as the behavior of public officials, both politicians and civil servants who unfairly and illegally enrich themselves or enrich those close to them, by abusing the public power entrusted to them. Joseph S. Nye (1967: 417) defines corruption as behavior that deviates from the official duties of a state position because of status or money gains involving personal (individual, close family, own group). In line with Joseph S. Nye, Brooks (in

Alatas, 1987) defines corruption as an act that intentionally makes a mistake or neglects a duty that is known as an obligation or without the right to use power with the aim of gaining personal gain.

The Role of IRE Teacher in Anti-Corruption Education

Fighting corruption cannot only be done through a legal approach. In the history of Indonesia, many legal efforts have been done. During the New Order Era, for example, several corruption eradication institutions were formed such as the Corruption Eradication Team in 1967, Commission Four in 1970, the Anti-Corruption Commission in 1970, Opstib in 1977, and the Corruption Eradication Team (Harmanto, 2008: 24). Then, in the reform era, the Commission of State Organizing Wealth Inspection (KPKPN) and the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) were formed. The latter institution is a “super body” institution and has many special authorities.

In Indonesia's historical record, a series of regulations to eradicate corruption have also been made along with the change of a government regime. In the Old Order era, for example, there was the Military Authority Regulation Number: PRT/PM/06/1957 concerning the Eradication of Corruption and the Central War Authority Regulation Number: PRT/PEPERPU/013/1958 concerning the Investigation, Prosecution, and Examination of Corruption and Property Ownership. The Central War Authority Regulation (PEPERPU) was temporary in nature and was replaced with Government Regulation in Lieu of Law Number 24 Year 1960 which was later ratified as Law Number 1 Year 1961 concerning Investigation, Prosecution, and Examination of Criminal Acts of Corruption. Meanwhile, in the New Order era, Law Number 3 Year 1971 concerning the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption was enacted which replaced Law Number 1 Year 1961. After the fall of the New Order, Government Regulation in Lieu of Law Number 24 Year 1960 jo. Law Number 3 Year 1971 was replaced by Law Number 31 Year 1999 which was later amended and added to Law Number 20 Year 2001 (Wibisono, 2009: 3-4).

Although many institutions and regulations for eradicating corruption have been made, this white-collar crime still occurs in Indonesia. Seeing this reality, what steps can be taken to stop this unlawful behavior? Because corruption has become "entrenched" in Indonesian society, there must be fundamental steps to eradicate it. One such measure is to teach anti-corruption education in educational institutions.

In my opinion, anti-corruption education is a strategic and effective instrument to instill anti-corruption attitude in students. This is because anti-corruption education can build the personality and

character of anti-corruption, so that corrupt behavior that has been regenerated and "entrenched" can be eliminated. Anti-corruption education learning in every educational institution from Kindergarten to Higher Education is expected to be able to create anti-corruption generation. According to Budi Dharma, anti-corruption education has 3 (three) objectives. First, the formation of knowledge and understanding of the forms of corruption and its aspects. Second, changing perceptions and attitudes towards corruption. Third, the formation of new skills and abilities that are alleged to be fighting corruption (*Kompas*, 25 October 2003).

Anti-corruption education can be taught at every institution and level of education in Indonesia, both formal and informal. At the level of formal education, anti-corruption education can be inverted or integrated into existing subjects. At the level of informal education, anti-corruption education can be carried out with extracurricular activities (Yulita TS, 2010: 5). The implementation of anti-corruption education in formal educational institutions is not difficult. This is because the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) and the Ministry of National Education (now the Ministry of Education and Culture) have prepared an anti-corruption curriculum. In addition, the two institutions have created an anti-corruption education module and have piloted it in a few schools in various regions in Indonesia.

In anti-corruption education, teachers have an important and strategic role. These roles include: (1) introducing the phenomenon of corruption, its essence, reasons, and consequences; (2) promoting intolerance towards corruption; (3) demonstrating how to combat corruption in accordance with the corridors of students; (4) contribute to the curriculum by inculcating values and strengthening the capacity of students such as critical thinking, responsibility, conflict resolution, managing themselves in social life, both at school and in society (Yulita TS, 2010: 6-7).

In my opinion, IRE teachers have great potential and role in anti-corruption education. This is because IRE teachers teach Islamic moral values which are full of anti-corruption educational values. Although IRE teachers have a big role in anti-corruption education, not all IRE teachers have the knowledge and awareness about the importance of anti-corruption education. Therefore, it is necessary to organize various activities such as training, workshops, seminars, workshops, and so on with anti-corruption education content. The aim is to increase the knowledge and awareness of IRE teachers on the importance of anti-corruption education. What has been done by the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) by organizing a Training of Trainers (TOT) on anti-corruption education for teachers, including IRE teachers, in several regions in Indonesia so far deserves to be appreciated and

supported. Organizing these activities will be very beneficial for IRE teachers before anti-corruption education is implemented in schools.

Teachers, including IRE teachers, are at the forefront of providing education in schools. Without intending to rule out other elements of education, the success or failure of education in a school is greatly influenced by the presence of its teachers, including IRE teachers. If the teachers are qualified, the quality of education in the school will also be high. One of the parameters of the teacher's quality can be seen from his mastery of the subject matter. Therefore, an anti-corruption education teacher is required to really understand and master anti-corruption education materials. In this context, I think the TOT activity on anti-corruption education for teachers, including IRE teachers, organized by the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) finds its relevance and significance.

In addition to having to master the material, IRE teachers are also required to be able to create or design appropriate and interesting anti-corruption education learning methods and media. The goal is that students are always interested in anti-corruption education. Thus, anti-corruption educational materials can be digested easily by students. IRE teachers can use and combine various learning methods such as lectures, discussions, games, quizzes, dramas, role playing, and so on. While related to learning media, IRE teachers can use various media such as the internet, posters, films, pictures, and so on. The use of learning methods and media can be adapted to the needs and conditions of students. The use of various methods and learning in anti-corruption education must always be oriented to building anti-corruption character.

Because anti-corruption education aims to build an anti-corruption character, the learning model carried out by IRE teachers should not only emphasize cognitive aspects but must also emphasize affective and psychomotor aspects. In other words, anti-corruption education should not only emphasize the intellectual dimension of students, but also emphasize anti-corruption attitudes and behavior towards them. Therefore, IRE teachers should not only teach theoretical studies about corruption, but what is far more important is educating their students to have anti-corruption attitudes and behaviors.

In this context, IRE teachers can apply the learning by doing learning model, a learning model that is accompanied by real actions. In this regard, IRE teachers together with the school, for example, can initiate the establishment of an honesty canteen. The honesty canteen is a canteen that sells various student needs, both in the form of food, drinks, and student equipment. All items on display without any guards. A cash box is provided to accommodate transaction results. If there is change, the students themselves take and count the amount of change. Through the honesty canteen, students are taught to be

honest even though no one sees it. Although it is not a new idea, but this kind of learning model has proven to be much more effective in creating anti-corruption character in students.

The role model of IRE teachers (as well as other teachers) is an important factor in the success of anti-corruption education. IRE teachers must be able to be role models for their students in cultivating an anti-corruption culture. The words, attitudes, and actions of IRE teachers must always reflect anti-corruption values. An IRE teacher must not commit corrupt acts. If any IRE teacher commits a corrupt act, apart from violating ethics and law, the IRE teacher concerned will become a barrier to the implementation of anti-corruption education. In fact, it is possible that their students will follow the corrupt behavior of the teacher. If that happens, then anti-corruption education learning is useless.

Furthermore, in evaluating student learning outcomes, IRE teachers should not only base themselves on cognitive/intellectual abilities but must base themselves on students' attitudes and behavior. Anti-corruption values such as honesty, responsibility, hard work, and discipline must be the main consideration for teachers in giving grades. In other words, IRE teachers in determining the value of their students should not be based solely on academic ability, but the main thing is that the awarding of these values is based on the ability of their students to implement anti-corruption values in their daily lives.

Concluding Remarks

From the explanation above, it can be concluded that IRE teachers have a strategic and important role in anti-corruption education. There are several things that must be considered and done by IRE teachers in the implementation of anti-corruption education. First, understanding and mastery of anti-corruption education materials. Second, the ability of IRE teachers to design appropriate anti-corruption learning methods and media. Third, the anti-corruption education model carried out by IRE teachers is not only in the cognitive aspect, but also in the affective and psychomotor aspects. Fourth, in student learning outcomes, it should not only be based on cognitive or intellectual abilities but must also be based on students' attitudes and behavior.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alatas, Ali, *Korupsi: Sifat, Sebab, dan Fungsi*, Jakarta: LP3ES, 1987.
- Alwi, Hasan, dkk., *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia*, Jakarta: Balai Pustaka, 2001.
- Bank Dunia, *Memerangi Korupsi di Indonesia*, Jakarta: Kantor Bank Dunia, 2003
- Braz, H.A., “Beberapa Catatan mengenai Sosiologi Korupsi”, dalam Mochtar Lubis dan James C. Scott (ed.), *Bunga Rampai Korupsi*, Jakarta: LP3ES, 1985.
- Dharma, Budi, “Korupsi dan Budaya”, *Kompas*, 25 Oktober 2003.
- Ghofur, Saiful Amin, “Merancang Kurikulum Pendidikan anti-korupsi”, *Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, Vol. 01, No. 01, Juni 2009.
- Hamzah, Andi, *Pemberantasan Korupsi Ditinjau dari Hukum Pidana*, Jakarta: Pusat Studi Hukum Pidana Universitas Trisakti, 2002.
- Hardianto, Budi, “Hukuman Mati Bagi Koruptor, Sebuah Keniscayaan”, *Dirasah Islamiyah*, 2003.
- Harmanto, “Mencari Model Pendidikan Antikorupsi bagi Siswa SMP dan MTs”. Makalah Disampaikan dalam Simposium Nasional Pendidika Tahun 2008. http://puslitjaknov.org/data/file/2008/makalah_peserta/43_Harmanto_MENCARI%20MODEL%20PENDIDIKAN%20ANTIKORUPSI.pdf. Accessed on 15 May 2021.
- Huntington, Samuel P., *Political Order in Changing Societies*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968.
- Kartono, Kartini, *Patologi Sosial*, Jilid I, Jakarta, Rajawali Pers, 1983.
- Kompas.com, 18 Maret 2010, “PERC: Indonesia Negara Paling Korup!”, <http://www.nasional.kompas.com/read/2010/03/08/21205485/PERC.Indonesia.Negara.Paling.Korup>. Accessed on 16 May 2021.
- Media Indonesia*, 16 Juni 2011, “Takluk Melawan Korupsi”.
- Media Indonesia*, 25 Oktober 2011, “Merampok Uang Rakyat”.
- Nye, Joseph S., *Corruption and Political Development: A Cost Benefit Analysis*, *American Political Science Review* 51, Juni 1967.

- Pope, Jeremy, *Strategi Memberantas Korupsi: Elemen Sistem Integritas Nasional*, terj. Masri Maris, Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia, 2003.
- Pusat Kajian Administrasi Internasional, Lembaga Administrasi Negara, “Strategi Penanganan Korupsi di Negara-Negara Asia Pasifik”, Jakarta: PKAI, Lembaga Administrasi Negara, 2007.
- Suwartojo, Juniadi, *Korupsi*, Jakarta: Balai Pustaka, 1997.
- Yulita TS, “Pendidikan anti-korupsi di Sekolah, Perluah?”, Makalah disarikan dari bahan training bertajuk Value Based Education, di ISS, Den Haag April 2010.http://sintak.unika.ac.id/staff/blog/uploaded/5811988034/files/pendidikan_anti_korupsi_di_sekolah,_perluah.pdf. Accessed on 23 March 2021.
- Yuntho, Emerson, “Kepala Daerah Kok Masih Korupsi?”, *Kompas*, 15 Juni 2011.
- Wibisono, Andreas, “Penilaian Judex Juris terhadap Putusan Bebas Murni yang Dimohonkan Kasasi dalam Perkara Tindak Pidana Korupsi (Studi Kasus: Korupsi Terdakwa Ecw. Neloe, Nurdin Halid, dan Fadhillah Budiono)”, *Skripsi*, Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia, 2009.