The Development of Anti-Corruption Education Course for Primary School Teacher Education Students

Ninik Indawati
University of Kanjuruhan Malang

Abstract
The purpose of this research was to develop learning tools as well as test the effectiveness of the implementation of anti-corruption education course for Primary School Teacher Education students, who must be able to transfer anti-corruption values to learners. The research method refers to the development of procedural models, which is descriptive, that shows the steps to produce a product that is effectively used at schools; not to test theories. The research procedures of every stage of development were done through expert assessment, individual assessment, group assessment, and field assessment. The model system approach, which was done to the formative evaluation measures, was developed by Dick & Carey. The results of the development of the learning tools included syllabus, Lesson Plans, teaching materials, handbooks for lecturers, and handbooks for students. The trials included learning experts assessment, content experts assessment, learning media experts assessment, individual assessment, group assessment, and field assessment. Results of the assessment trials were used as an input to improve products development which was conducted using the t test (Paired Samples Test) to determine the effectiveness of the teaching materials. Descriptive quantitative analysis techniques were used to compare the ability of students before and after the use of teaching materials through the pretest and posttest which showed significant results, namely the difference in the value of pretest and posttest. It means anti-corruption education teaching materials are very effective implemented on students of Primary School Teacher Education.
Keywords: development, teaching materials, anti-corruption education.

Character education in accordance with Law No. 20 in 2003, is a system of naming the character values that include components of knowledge, awareness or willpower, and actions to implement these values, either against Almighty God, ourselves, others, the environment, or nationality. The development of national character can be done through the development of individual character of a person. However, because people living in certain social and cultural environment, the development of a person's individual character can only be done in the related social and cultural environment. That is, the development of culture and character can be done in an educational process which does not release students from the social and cultural environment.

According to Thomas (1991), character deals with the concept of moral (moral knowing), moral attitudes (moral feeling), and moral behavior (moral behavior). Based on these three components, it can be stated that good characters are well supported by the knowledge of the good, the desire to do good, and do deeds of kindness.

Pancasila, in the preamble of the 1945 Constitution and further elaborated in the articles contained in the 1945 Constitution, contains the values that govern political life, law, economics, society, culture and the arts. The education of culture and national character is very important. It aims to prepare students to become better citizens who have the ability, willingness, and implement Pancasila values in their life as Indonesian citizens.

The selection of schools as the pioneer in character education is submitted to the respective offices. Socialization is addressed to the entire school community, including principals, teachers, students, and education staffs. So, the key to the success of the character education in the school is the principal. If one has the intention to change to be better, then one will pass on good behavior to teachers and students. In principle, it of course starts from ourselves; start from the easy one, and do it today, for example, arriving on time. The most important thing is that the school environment, both students, teachers, and the education staffs, will be better through implementing character education. The results of character education cannot be felt or seen immediately because it takes a long time. The implementation of character education requires the cooperation of various parties and also requires examples from educators, education staffs, and parents.

According to Tirtarahardja et al (2005), good education should be able to demonstrate a meeting point or a bridge between theory and practice. Meanwhile, Abduhzen (2010) argues that our educational strategies at various levels are less concerned at the development of reasoning as the basis of attitude and behavior. Learning in our schools is more likely in charge or indoctrinate the mind. Consequently, what is gained in such schools does not correlate with real life. Education should be able to create a balance in the lives of the students (Ketut, 2004).

To achieve the goals of anti-corruption character education, several steps can be taken by the government and the Ministry of National Education such as personality training to teachers to inculcate an anti-corruption stance. The results will be seen in the daily attitude of teachers in performing their duties. Anti-corruption attitudes shown by the teachers would sharpen students thinking about corruption than memorizing

theories about corruption. Other steps that can be taken to maximize the anti-corruption character educational purposes is by giving strict punishment to teachers and education department officials who commit acts of corruption. Thus, the world of education will be far from corruption that will have an impact on the creation of conditions conducive to the implementation of anti-corruption character education.

Considering the various constraints that extend in the implementation of anti-corruption character education, then it is proper to do repairs in the body of educational institutions in advance. To get fruitful effects, teachers as the spearhead of the anti-corruption education should reflect the characters themselves. Planting this noble gesture will be achieved when teachers could be an example of being honest, kind, responsible, and fair to students. Not only the extension of the theory of the characteristics of being honest, kind, responsible, and fair that targets only a mere memorization.

Anti-corruption education is a conscious and deliberate effort to realize the learning process critical of the anti-corruption values. In the process, the Anti-corruption education is not just a medium for the transfer of knowledge, but also an emphasis on character formation, anti-corruption values and moral awareness in the resistance against corruption. Anti-corruption education is also an instrument to develop study skills in capturing configuration problems and difficulties of nationality issues that triggered the corruption, the impact, prevention, and resolution. The education system participating to combat corruption is the education system that departs from simple things, such as not cheating, discipline, and others (Wibowo & Nana, 2011).

Anti-corruption education is expected to instill and disseminate anti-corruption values to the children, so they understand about it early that corruption is contrary to legal norms or religious norms. Therefore, children need to be socialized to be honest, do not cheat, and do not take thing that is not their right as early as possible. It is a good thing that if the government establishes the educational institution as a repair workshop of nation's morality. Educational institution is the right choice as the frontline formation of national character. In its application, there should be particular anti-corruption education materials in the curriculum at the primary level to college.

Anti-corruption education emphasizes more on the moral formation of anti-corruption efforts than the transformation of knowledge and the ins and outs of anti-corruption theory to students. Wibowo & Puspito (2011) explains that the purpose of anti-corruption education is to create a young generation that is morally good and has anti-corruptive behavior that is to build an exemplary character that children do not engage in corruption early with the goal of creating a young generation of good moral behavior and building character to no corruption early. It is done through more effective education because education is a process of changing in the mental attitude that occurs in a person. Education is also more systematic and easily scalable, i.e. changes in anti-corruption behaviour. According to the Ministry of Education and Culture (Kemendikbud, 2012) there are values that are internalized in the anti-corruption education, namely: honesty, caring, self-reliance, self-discipline, responsibility, hard work, temperance, courage, and justice.

Combating corruption requires the role of teachers / lecturers to begin serious in combating corruption. Efforts to eradicate corruption should be implemented as early as possible from the level of elementary school education up to the university level by implementing subjects or courses of anti-corruption education. Now is the time required for the development of the idea of learning a course of anti-corruption education for students of Primary School Teacher Education because the output is a teacher candidate who is expected later to provide understanding, planting, and delivering anti-corruption values to students. As the starting point to repair manners, the learning value investment of anti-corruption culture must start from the basic education level, though it certainly cannot be done in a short time. It is very likely that education is the only possible path most likely to be taken in order to provide public awareness.

The goal of this development was to develop and test the effectiveness of the learning tools of anti-corruption education course for students of Primary School Teacher Education which consists of teaching materials, lecturer handbooks, student handbooks, syllabus and lesson plans.

METHODS
A. Model and Procedure of Development
According to Gay (1991), research and development is an attempt to develop an effective product to be used by school, and not to test the theory. The main component of Development Research method includes three main components (Puslitjaknov, 2008), namely: (A) model of development, (B) procedure of development, and (C) product trials.

The model of the development of teaching materials of anti-corruption education course is using procedural model according to Puslitjaknov (2008) because this model is in the form of descriptive model which will produce certain products, namely products that will be used in the learning activities. This is a system approach to the basic components of the learning system design that includes analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation which were designed and developed by Dick, W. & Carey, L. (2005). Components as well as the main steps / procedures consist of ten steps, namely (1) identifying learning

objectives, (2) analyzing learners, (3) identifying initial behavior and characteristics of learners, (4) formulating learning objectives, (5) developing assessment instruments, (6) developing learning strategies, (7) developing and selecting teaching / learning materials, (8) designing and developing a formative evaluation, (9) revising the learning program, and (10) designing and developing a summative evaluation. However, this study did not include summative evaluation. The steps in this study are: 1) Identifying learning objectives, doing analysis of learning, identifying early behavior and characteristics of learners, formulating learning objectives, and developing assessment instruments, 2) Preparation and evaluation of learning materials, lecturer handbook, student handbook, syllabus, and lesson plans, 3) Designing and conducting formative evaluation, and revision of product development.

B. Products Trial

The products trial was done through (1) design trial, (2) subject trial, (3) type of data, (4) data collection instruments, and (5) data analysis techniques.

1. Design Trial

The trial was conducted in order to determine the level of validity, the attractiveness and effectiveness of the product. Products in the form of teaching materials, lecturer handbook, and student handbook, as the result of this development, were tested to find out their validity, attractiveness and effectiveness. The validity of the teaching materials were known through the analysis of the results of pilot activities conducted through several stages, namely: (1) learning experts assessment, (2) content experts assessment, (3) learning media experts assessment, (4) individual assessment, (5) group assessment, and (6) field assessment. The respondents are the students as users of the product development. Meanwhile, the level of effectiveness of the teaching materials was known through the pre-test and post-test to the acquisition of student learning outcomes at the time of the field test. As to determine the level of significance of the difference between the pre-test and post-test, t test was used.

2. Subject Trial

Subject trial of the product of the development consisted of learning experts, content experts of anti-corruption education, learning media experts, as well as students of primary school teacher education (PGSD). The steps of trial for each activity were as follows:

a. Learning Expert Assessment Phase

  The subjects of the assessment in the experts validation phase were learning experts, content expert of anti-corruption education and learning media experts.

b. Individual Assessment Phase

  Individual assessment conducted on students of primary school teacher education (PGSD), the subjects of trial at this stage were six students. This assessment was to determine the product quality of the teaching materials. The products of the development tested were the teaching materials and the student handbook. This assessment was intended to identify and minimize errors contained in teaching materials and student handbook.

c. Group Assessment Phase

  Once revised based on the input of the experts and individual assessment, the next step was a group test. The subjects tested in this phase were ten students of primary school teacher education (PGSD).

d. Field Assessment Phase

  At this stage of the assessment, the subjects consisted of 30 students of primary school teacher education (PGSD). It was observed by lecturers (practitioners) of primary school teacher education (PGSD) and the students (academic) of the Economics Education Graduate Program of State University of Malang. The products of the development tested to the students were the learning materials and the student handbook. While the products of the development tested to lecturers (practitioners) of primary school teacher education (PGSD) and the students (academic) of the Economics Education Graduate Program of State University of Malang were the teaching materials and the lecturer handbook.

3. Type of Data

The type of data was categorized into four pieces, namely (1) the evaluation of the first phase in the form of data (a) learning experts assessment results, (b) the results of the assessment from content experts of anti-corruption education course, (c) the results of the assessment from learning media experts, (2) the individual assessment results, (3) the results of the group assessment and (4) the results of field assessment in the form of student interview data, the results of students' pretest and posttest, students' motivation questionnaire results, and data of the results of the review done by the lecturers of PGSD (practitioners), and S3 students (academics).

  The overall data obtained were grouped into two: quantitative and qualitative data. The qualitative data obtained from the results of learning expert assessment through questionnaires and feedbacks, the results of content expert assessment via questionnaires and feedbacks, assessment results of learning media experts through questionnaires and feedbacks, individual assessment results through questionnaires and feedbacks, assessment results of the group through questionnaires and feedbacks, the results of field assessment for students through questionnaires and feedbacks, the results of field assessment for lecturers through questionnaires and feedbacks, the results of students' motivation questionnaires and feedbacks, and the data of students'

achievement test / learning outcomes i.e. the students' pre-test and post-test. The results of the qualitative data were then quantified by using a Likert scale (a scale of five) for the data analysis process.

4. Data Collection Instrument

The data collection was done using questionnaires and tests. Questionnaires were used to collect data from a review of learning expert, course content expert, and learning media experts. The data were collected from the students in individual assessment, group assessment, and field assessment, as well as from lecturers of PGSD (practitioners) and S3 students (academics). The test was used to determine students' learning outcome before using the teaching materials (pretest) and after using the teaching materials (posttest).

5. Data Analysis Techniques

5.1 Scope of Data

The data in this development include:

a. The data of the development design of anti-corruption education course which include: the data of the results / feedback from experts assessment, the data of the results / feedbacks from individuals assessment, the data of the results / feedback from groups assessment, and the data of the results / feedback from field assessemnt.

b. The data from the questionnaires of students' motivation towards teaching materials of anti-corruption education course.

c. The data from the results of students' learning outcome that included pretest and posttest on the anti-corruption education course related to the use of teaching materials being developed.

5.2 Data Analysis

The data analysis of each component, which included data from the expert assessment, the results of individual assessment, the results of group assessment, field assessment, and the assessment of students' motivation and students' learning outcomes, was performed descriptively in the form of averages and percentages. The results of expert assessment of teaching materials, lecturer handbook, and student handbook were calculated to find out the level of achievement percentage by using the following formula:

$$\text{Percentage (\%)} = \frac{\text{Number of answers X score of each item}}{\text{N X highest score}} \times 100$$

Meanwhile, the result of group test was calculated to find out the average and the percentage of the level of the achievement by using a formula as described below:

$$\text{Percentage (\%)} = \frac{F}{N} \times 100$$

Description:

F = frequency of each answer item

N = number of the test subjects who answered

To be able to give meaning and making decisions about the quality of teaching materials, the researcher used the following precision scale:

Conversion of Achievement Level with Scale 5

Achievement Level	Qualification	Explanation
85% - 100%	Very good	No revision
75% - 84%	Good	No revision
65% - 74%	Fair	Revision needed
55% - 64%	Poor	Revision needed
9% - 54%	Very poor	Revision needed

Descriptive quantitative analysis technique was also used to compare the ability of students before taught using the teaching materials, and after using the teaching materials. These two were done during the field test. The method used was the t test (Paired Samples Test) to determine the effectiveness of teaching materials. T test calculations carried out with the aid of SPSS statistical software.

RESULT OF THE DEVELOPMENT

The chronology of the development process describes the sequence of product development process, starting from the process of preparing to test a product. The presentation and analysis of data contain data display and analysis of the results of feedback / assessment of learning experts, course content experts, and learning media experts, individual assessment, group assessment, and field assessment. Meanwhile, the revised product development elaborated on the revision of product development based on input from learning experts, course content experts, learning media experts, students, the lecturers of PGSD as observers representing practitioners, where trials of anti-corruption education course conducted, and a student of Economics Education Graduate Program of State University of Malang acting as an observer.

A. The Chronology of Design Process

The first step in the development of this teaching material begins with the establishment of the courses to be developed. The considerations in choosing a course of anti-corruption education were based on

observations in the field as well as consultations and discussions with the supervisor. The second step was identifying the purpose of learning, conducting teaching analysis, identifying initial behavior and characteristics of the students, writing the learning objectives and developing a benchmark reference test. The third step was the preparation and the writing of teaching materials, lecturer handbook, and student handbook. The fourth step was designing, conducting an assessment and revising the product of the development.

B. Data Presentation, Data Analysis, and Revision of Development Product

The presentation and analysis of the data were elaborated on the basis of the results of the assessment / feedback from learning experts, course content experts, learning media experts, individual assessment, group assessment, and field assessment. The analysis of the data presented ranging from teaching materials, lecturer handbook, student handbook, and lesson plan. To determine the feasibility of the product that had been tested, the data that had been analyzed was matched with a predetermined eligibility table. The revision of the development product needs to be done was on the teaching materials, lecturer handbook, and student handbook.

Mean Value, Standard Deviation & Standard Error of Pretest and Posttest

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair	Pretes	28.90	30	2.354	.430
	Postes	37.57	30	2.373	.433

Source: Students Pretest and Postest Results

Both the results of learning outcomes through the pretest and posttest were then conducted two sample paired t test (Paired Samples Test) with the help of SPSS program.

The result of t-test showed the difference of pretest and posttest results

		Paired Differences		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation			
Pair 1	Pretes Postes	-8.667	.922	-51.470	29	.000

Source: Appendix 23-24 of Students pretest and posttest results

The result of the analysis in Table 4.36 shows that between pretest and posttest differ significantly ($P < 0.000$, df = 29, t = -51.470), by a margin of difference between the two amounted to -8.667. Negative value indicated the difference between the two showed that the pretest was lower than the posttest. This means that the presence of the teaching material had been able to improve students' learning outcomes at 8.67 compared to the previous condition. Based on the results of the analysis it can be concluded that the teaching material proven significantly effective for improving student achievement of learning outcomes.

STUDY OF DEVELOPMENT

The study and the presentation of the results of the development describe the development of the teaching materials, ranging from the teaching material itself to the handbooks for lecturers and students.

Product Assessment Revised

A. Assessment Analysis

The analysis study provided answers to the reasons the authors developed the teaching materials. The analysis study of the teaching materials would be evaluated from two aspects: (a) design aspects message and (b) the design aspects of the text. Besides, it also exposed the strengths and weaknesses of the products / results of development. The study of design aspects of the message would be reviewed on a number of principles in the design of the message. While the design aspects of the text were presented after the design aspects of the message and its presentation were observed in terms of the rules governing the writing of the text. The handbooks for lecturers and students would be analyzed and presented in relation with their characteristics.

SUMMARY

A. Conclusion

Based on the results of the development, it can be summarized as follows:

1. The learning materials of anti-corruption education course have the characteristics that contain anti-corruption values which should be delivered by students of PGSD as the candidates of primary school teachers in their future teaching practice. On the basis of the research results, it was proven that students and lecturers of PGSD stated that this course should be developed and implemented as a preparation for those who will become educators in elementary school.

2. From the research results, it was proven that students of PGSD and the experts stated that this course should be developed and implemented as a preparation for those who will become teachers, with reference to the nine anti-corruption values: honest, caring, independent, self-discipline, responsible, hardworking, humble, brave, and fair.

B. Suggestions and Implications / Recommendations

Suggestions presented here are related to the product development which includes (1) advice of utilization, (2) dissemination advice and (3) suggestions of further product development.

1. Suggestions of Utilization

Based on the current record of the field tests that had been conducted, to optimize the utilization of the materials, the researcher suggests the lecturer to be more optimal as a facilitator, motivator, and mentor of PAIKEM learning, and use the right strategy.

2. Suggestions of Dissemination

Based on the current record of field tests that had been conducted, to optimize the utilization of materials, the researcher suggests that it should be in accordance with the learners' characteristics, and the test should include the summative assessment not only the formative assessment. Thus, there will be further development.

3. Suggestions on Further Development

To improve the quality of the teaching materials, it should be provided with exercises which are more applicable, and there should be not too many theoretical aspects.

4. Suggestions to the Ministry of Higher Education

It is pivotal that the course of anti-corruption education be made as a compulsory subject for students, especially students of PGSD, either through personal development courses (MPK) or integrated in other subjects.

REFERENCES

Aziz, H.A. 2011. *Pendidikan Karakter Berpusat pada Hati: Akhlak Mulia Pondasi Membangun Karakter Bangsa*. Jakarta: Ai-Mawardi Prima.

Abduhzen, M. 2010. *Pendidikan Karakter, Perlukah?*

Artadi, I.K. 2004. *Nilai, Makna, dan Martabat Kebudayaan: Kebudayaan Bangsa-bangsa dan Posmodern*. Denpasar: Sinay.

Andi, H. 1991. *Ikrar Anti Korupsi*.

Asniar, K., S.Psi., Lukman, S. Psi., M. Appsy. 2009. *Membentuk Karakter Anti Korupsi Pada Siswa Sekolah menengah Pertama di Sulsel*.

Barda, N. A. 2005. Pembaharuan *Hukum Pidana dalam Perspektif Kajian Perbandingan*. Bandung: Citra Adiyta Bakti.

Bertens, K. 2002. *Etika*. Jakarta: Gramedia.

Benny, A.P. 2009. *Model Desain Sistem Pembelajaran Dick dan Carey*.

BPKP. 1999. Undang Undang RI. No. 28. *Tentang Penyelenggara Negara Yang Bersih Dan bebas dari Korupsi, Kolusi, dan Nepotisme*.

Corr, P.J., &Matthews, G. (Eds.). 2009. *The Chambridge Handbook of Personality Psychology*. New York:Cambridge University Press.

Dick, W. & Carey, L. 2005. *The Systematic Design of Instruction*. NY: Longman, Inc.

Dirjen Dikti kemendikbud, Surat Nomor: 1016/E/T/2012, *Implementasi Pendidikan Anti Korupsi di Perguruan Tinggi dan Perguruan Tinggi Swasta*.

Effendy, C. 2003. *Privatisasi Versus Neo-Sosialisme Indonesia,* Jakarta: LP3ES.

Ekosusilo, M. 1988. *Dasar-dasar Pendidikan*. Semarang: Effar Publishing.

Fakultas Pascasarjana. 2010. *Pedoman Penulisan Karya Ilmiah: Skripsi, Tesis, Disertasi, Artikel, Makalah, Tugas Akhir, Laporan Penelitian*. Malang: FPS Universitas Negeri Malang.

Gay, L.R. 1991. *Educational Evaluation and Measurement: Com-petencies for Analysis and Application. Second edition New York: Macmilan Publishing Compan*.

Hallak, J., & Poisson, M. 2005. *Ethics and corruption in education: an overview. Journal of Education for International Development, 1(1). Retrieved Month Date, Year, from http://equip123.net/JEID/articles/1/1-3.pdf*

Hasan, L. 1992. *Manusia dan Pendidikan Suatu Analisa Psikologi dan Pendidikan.* Jakarta: Pustaka Al-Husna.

Harmanto, M. Pd. 2008. *Mencari Model Pendidikan Anti Korupsi*.

Inpres RI No. 17 Tahun 2011. *Tentang Aksi Pemberantasan Korupsi.*

Isaac, Alan G., 1996. *Morality, maximization, and economic behavior*, Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization.

Jakob, S. 2005. *Delapan Pertanyaan Tentang Korupsi. Journal Of Economic Perspektive-Volume 19, Number 3-Summer 2005-Pages 19-42Kebijakan Pendidikan Internasional, Peabody College, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37138*, Amerika.

Jauhar, M. 2011. *Implementasi Paikem: Dari Behavioristik sampai Konstruktivistik*. Jakarta: Prestasi Pustakaraya.

Kemendiknas. 2012. *Pengembangan Pendidikan Budaya dan Karakter Bangsa-Pedoman Sekolah.* Jakarta: Badan Penelitian dan Pengembangan.

Kemendikbud. 2012. *Pendidikan Anti Korupsi Untuk Perguruan Tinggi.* Jakarta: Kementrian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Direktorat Perguruan Tinggi.

Ki Hadjar, D. 2009. *Menuju Manusia Merdeka*. Yogyakarta: Leutika.

Kneller, George, F. 1984. *Movements of Throught in Modern Education*. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York.

Lewis, Barbara A. 2004. *Character Building Untuk Remaja*. Batam: Karisma

Montessori, M. 2008. *Absorbent Mind.* Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar

Noddings, N. 1997. *Philosophy of Education: The Philosophical and Educational Thought of John Dewey. Westview Press, a member of Percus Books*. L.L.C.(Co-Mimbar Demokrasi).

Nurfita, K.D. 19 Maret 2011. Dalam Keteladanan Masyarakat. *Wawasan,* hlm. 4.

Puslitjaknov. 2008. *Badan Penelitian dan Pengembangan Departemen Nasional.*

Quah, Jon S.T. 2010. *Curbing Corruption in Asian Countrie : The Difference Between Success and Failure.*

Rosida, T.M. 2012. *Pendidikan Anti Korupsi Sebagai Satuan Pembelajaran Berkarakter Dan Humanistik.*

RPJM Daerah Jawa Timur. 2009-2014. Lakip. Jatim

Siti, M.H. 2014. *Anomali Anti Korupsi.*

Sutrisno, H., M.A., 1981. *Metodologi Research*. Yogyakarta: Yayasan penerbit Fakultas Psikologi UGM.

Stephen, P. H. 2004. *Pendidikan Anti Korupsi. International Journal of Educational Development 24.* 637–648

Segal Jeanne, 2000. *Meningkatkan kecerdasan emosional* (terj. Dian Paramesti Bahar). Citra Aksara.

Thomas, L. 1991. *Educating for Character How Our Schools Can Teach Respect and Responcibility*. New York: Bantam Books.

Tilaar. 2000. *Manajemen Strategi Dalam Mengelola Satuan Pendidikan*

Tirtarahardja, Umar, dan La Sulo, 2005. *PengantarPendidikan*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Tim Puslitjaknov 2008. *Badan dan Penelitian Pengembangan Departemen Nasional.*

Tim MCW. 2005. Seri *Pendidikan Anti Korupsi Mengerti dan Melawan Korupsi.* Jakarta: Kerjasama YAPPIKA dan MCW.

Transparancy International. 2013

Transparancy International. 2007. *Korupsi Dalam Sektor Pendidikan.*

Undang-Undang RI No. 20. Tahun 2003. *Tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional (Sisdiknas)*. Jakarta: Visimedia.

Undang-Undang RI No. 28 Tahun 1999. *Badan Pengawas Keuangan dan Pembangunan.*

Undang Undang Dasar RI Tahun 1945

Undang-Undang RI No. 17. Tahun 2007 *Tentang Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Panjang Nasional.*

Undang-Undang No. 31. Tahun 1999 jo Undang-Undang No. 20. Tahun 2000 *tentang Pendidikan Anti Korupsi.*

Undang-Undang No. 31. Tahun 1999 jo Undang-Undang No. 20. Tahun 2001 *tentang Tindak Pidana Korupsi.*

Wibowo, Aryo P. dan Puspito, Nanang T. 2011. *Peranan Mahasiswa dalam Pencegahan Korupsi*. Dalam *Pendidikan Anti Korupsi untuk Perguruan Tinggi/ Anti Korupsi*. Jakarta: Kemendikbud.