

Beyond Integrity Rhetoric: Reconstructing Anti-Corruption Character Education through Ethical Christian Leadership and Institutional Role Modeling in Indonesia

Heldy Jerry Rogahang¹, Sugijanti Supit²

^{1,2} Institut Agama Kristen Negeri Manado

Received: 4 April 2026
Revised: 15 April 2026
Accepted: 29 April 2026

Abstract

Anti-corruption character education faces a credibility challenge when educational institutions promote moral integrity while their governance practices communicate potentially contradictory ethical expectations. Indonesia's 2024 Education Integrity Assessment, released in 2025, reported a national integrity index of 69.50, with governance scoring 58.68 compared with 78.01 for character formation. These findings highlight institutional governance concerns without establishing misconduct within Christian educational institutions specifically. This study examines how discrepancies between normative commitments and organizational practices may influence informal moral learning and develops a conceptual framework for accountable Christian educational leadership. Employing a non-empirical critical integrative literature review of scholarly publications and institutional documents issued through 2025, the study synthesizes ethical leadership, behavioral integrity, institutional decoupling, hidden curriculum, and Christian normative ethics. The conceptual synthesis identifies three interconnected results. First, normative integrity education and institutional governance represent distinct but interdependent dimensions of educational integrity. Second, recurring and insufficiently corrected institutional inconsistencies may contribute to contradictory moral socialization, although inconsistency alone does not establish deliberate moral hypocrisy. Third, the proposed Institutional Integrity Role-Modeling Framework integrates moral-theological integrity, ethical leadership enactment, transparent governance, procedural justice, integrity-oriented hidden curriculum, and reflexive accountability. The study contributes a mechanism-oriented theoretical explanation connecting moral instruction, leadership conduct, and institutional accountability. The framework remains conceptually proposed rather than empirically validated. Future research should examine its explanatory relationships, measurement validity, and implications for anti-corruption character formation across Christian educational institutions.

Keywords: Christian leadership; anti-corruption character education; institutional role modeling; moral hypocrisy; hidden curriculum; institutional accountability

(*) Corresponding Author: h.rogahang@gmail.com, sugivantisupit41@gmail.com

Orchid Id: 0000-0002-8133-3207

How to Cite: Rogahang, H., & Supit, S. (2026). Beyond Integrity Rhetoric: Reconstructing Anti-Corruption Character Education through Ethical Christian Leadership and Institutional Role Modeling in Indonesia. *International Journal of Education, Information Technology, and Others*, 9(2), 361-381. Retrieved from <https://jurnal.peneliti.net/index.php/IJEIT/article/view/15004>

INTRODUCTION

Anti-corruption character education faces a fundamental challenge when educational institutions publicly promote honesty, justice, responsibility, and integrity while their everyday governance practices do not consistently embody these commitments. This problem extends beyond the effectiveness of moral instruction because educational institutions are not merely places where ethical values are communicated; they are also social environments in which students encounter institutional authority, observe decision-making processes, and experience the practical application of organizational rules. Giroux

and Penna (1979) demonstrate that schooling communicates social norms through a *hidden curriculum* embedded in institutional relationships and everyday educational experiences, suggesting that moral learning cannot be understood exclusively through formal curricular content. The significance of this institutional dimension is particularly evident in Indonesia's 2024 Education Integrity Assessment, whose results were officially announced by the Corruption Eradication Commission (*Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi*, KPK) on 24 April 2025. The assessment reported a national education integrity index of 69.50, classified within the corrective category, with scores of 78.01 for student character, 71.35 for the educational ecosystem, and 58.68 for educational governance (KPK, 2025b). Covering 36,888 educational institutions and 449,865 respondents across Indonesia, the assessment identified governance as the lowest-scoring of the three measured dimensions. The same official publication reported that 65% of surveyed educational institutions indicated that parents frequently provided gifts to teachers, while 22% reported gift-giving practices intended to influence students' grades or graduation outcomes (KPK, 2025b). These figures provide evidence of integrity-related concerns within the broader educational environment, although they do not represent uniform measurements of criminal corruption or establish causal relationships between governance quality and student behavior. Nor do they identify the prevalence of particular practices within Christian educational institutions. International research provides additional grounds for treating these concerns as substantively educational rather than merely administrative. Hallak and Poisson (2007) identify vulnerabilities involving educational financing, procurement, personnel management, and institutional accountability, while Poisson (2010) emphasizes transparency and responsible administration as central elements of corruption prevention in education. Taken together, the Indonesian assessment and international literature demonstrate the importance of examining institutional integrity alongside individual moral development. The central problem is therefore not simply whether educational institutions communicate anti-corruption values, but whether their leadership practices and governance arrangements provide a credible institutional environment in which those values can be meaningfully experienced and reinforced.

Existing scholarship offers important but analytically distinct explanations of the relationship between moral education, leadership, organizational integrity, and institutional accountability. Within Christian anti-corruption education, Nainggolan (2025) develops a conceptual paradigm integrating Kohlberg's moral reasoning, Lickona's character education, and Freire's critical-transformative pedagogy, emphasizing critical, reflective, communitarian, and prophetic dimensions of educational formation. This contribution is particularly significant because it already recognizes the structural and institutional dimensions of corruption, making it inappropriate to claim that previous Christian educational scholarship has been concerned exclusively with individual morality. Similarly, Sitio et al. (2025) examine the integration of Christian values into educational quality-management systems, demonstrating that theological commitments can be discussed in relation to organizational responsibilities and institutional performance. A second body of scholarship investigates ethical leadership as a source of behavioral guidance and organizational credibility. Treviño et al. (2000) distinguish between the leader as a *moral person* and the leader as a *moral manager*, while Brown et al. (2005) develop an ethical leadership framework grounded in social learning theory. More specifically within educational organizations, Özdoğru and Sarier (2024) synthesize 47 empirical studies involving 18,423 participants and report positive associations between school principals' ethical leadership and teachers' organizational trust, perceived justice, motivation, satisfaction, and commitment, alongside negative associations with several undesirable organizational attitudes and behaviors. Although these findings demonstrate the relevance of ethical leadership within educational settings, they do not directly establish

its effects on anti-corruption character formation among students or test a Christian institutional governance model. A third body of literature explains organizational inconsistencies and their potential consequences. Simons (2002) conceptualizes *behavioral integrity* as the perceived alignment between managerial words and actions; Meyer and Rowan (1977) explain how formal organizational structures may become decoupled from operational activities; Ashforth and Anand (2003) analyze the normalization of corruption through institutionalization, rationalization, and socialization; and Giroux and Penna (1979) illuminate the transmission of informal norms through institutional educational experiences. These perspectives are complementary but should not be conflated: inconsistent practices, institutional decoupling, deliberate moral hypocrisy, and legally established corruption are analytically different phenomena. The research gap addressed here is therefore an integrative and explanatory one, concerning how discrepancies between declared moral commitments and enacted institutional practices may become educationally consequential, how such discrepancies might contribute to a contradictory hidden curriculum, and how accountable Christian leadership may provide a coherent framework for institutional correction. This proposed distinction builds upon, rather than disregards, existing research on structural corruption, Christian educational governance, and ethical leadership.

Against this background, the study addresses the problem of how anti-corruption character education in Christian educational institutions can maintain moral credibility when the values communicated through formal instruction may differ from those experienced through leadership behavior and organizational governance. The issue is particularly significant because Christian educational institutions commonly articulate explicit religious and ethical commitments, creating expectations that the exercise of authority, the management of entrusted resources, and the treatment of institutional members should reflect their stated moral identity. However, the presence of religious commitments or formal ethical policies does not independently demonstrate that institutional practices are consistent with those commitments. The study therefore seeks to develop a critical conceptual explanation of the relationship between normative integrity education, institutional moral inconsistency, accountable Christian leadership, and the hidden curriculum within the Indonesian educational context. Specifically, it addresses three research questions. First, how do existing scholarly studies and authoritative educational documents explain the relationship between normative integrity instruction and institutional governance in the formation of anti-corruption character? Second, through which theoretical mechanisms might recurring inconsistencies between institutional moral commitments and enacted practices contribute to a contradictory hidden curriculum? Third, how can Christian leadership ethics, ethical leadership theory, and institutional accountability be synthesized into a conceptual framework for reconstructing anti-corruption character education through credible institutional role modeling? These questions are addressed through a non-empirical *critical integrative literature review*, which provides a methodological basis for comparing theoretical arguments, findings from prior empirical studies, documentary evidence, and normative theological interpretations (Torraco, 2005; Whittemore & Knafl, 2005; Snyder, 2019). The analysis draws upon scholarly and institutional publications issued no later than 31 December 2025, including the officially released findings of Indonesia's 2024 Education Integrity Assessment. Its units of analysis comprise concepts, theoretical propositions, previously documented findings, governance principles, and contextually interpreted Christian ethical norms rather than observations obtained from a particular educational institution. Consequently, the study does not attempt to establish the prevalence of moral hypocrisy in Christian schools or universities, evaluate individual institutional leaders, or measure causal relationships between leadership practices and student behavior. Instead, it investigates the conceptual

conditions under which institutional governance may reinforce or contradict moral education, thereby establishing a theoretically reasoned foundation for the subsequent development and empirical examination of an institutional integrity framework.

The central argument advanced in this article is that credible anti-corruption character education within Christian educational institutions requires more than the formal transmission of moral principles or the personal reputation of religious leaders; it also requires an intelligible alignment between institutional commitments, observable leadership conduct, governance procedures, and mechanisms of accountability. This argument draws upon the complementary explanatory strengths of ethical leadership, behavioral integrity, institutional theory, and the hidden curriculum, while incorporating Christian ethical reflection on justice, service, stewardship, and responsibility. At the normative-theological level, Mark 10:42–45 challenges leadership understood primarily through domination and privileged status, while Micah 6:8 identifies justice, faithfulness, and humility as fundamental ethical obligations. Matthew 23:23–28 offers a critique of discrepancies between outward religious observance and substantive moral responsibility, Luke 12:48 emphasizes accountability associated with entrusted responsibilities, and 2 Corinthians 8:20–21 provides a relevant context for reflecting on integrity in the administration of communal resources. These texts require historical and literary interpretation rather than direct application as contemporary administrative regulations; Smit's (2018) examination of Mark 10:42–45 particularly underscores the exegetical complexity of translating biblical concepts of service into modern leadership discourse. Building upon these normative considerations and the organizational literature, the study proposes the **Institutional Integrity Role-Modeling Framework (IIRMF)** as a provisional integrative model linking moral–theological integrity, ethical leadership enactment, transparent governance, procedural justice, integrity-oriented hidden curriculum, and reflexive accountability. The proposed contribution is threefold. Theoretically, the article connects behavioral integrity and institutional decoupling with the educational consequences of formal–informal moral inconsistency, specifying mechanisms through which institutional practices may become sources of ethical learning. Theologically, it develops an account of Christian leadership in which service and stewardship are not substitutes for institutional scrutiny but normative reasons for responsible and accountable authority. Practically, it identifies preliminary institutional dimensions and observable indicators that may inform subsequent evaluations of educational integrity, including transparent decision-making, consistent procedural enforcement, conflict-of-interest management, protected reporting, and institutional responsiveness to ethical criticism. These contributions should be interpreted within the limits of a conceptual review: the framework has not been empirically validated, its proposed mechanisms remain open to competing explanations, and its effectiveness in strengthening anti-corruption character education has not been demonstrated. Rather than claiming to establish the first connection between Christian values and educational governance, the article seeks to specify how moral commitments, leadership consistency, and organizational accountability may be integrated into a more explicit and testable explanation of institutional integrity. This conceptual position provides the foundation for the literature review that follows, in which the explanatory contributions and limitations of the relevant educational, organizational, and theological perspectives are examined more closely.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature relevant to anti-corruption character education within Christian educational institutions comprises three interconnected yet analytically distinguishable fields of inquiry: moral and character education, ethical leadership and organizational

integrity, and Christian educational leadership in relation to institutional socialization and governance. The first field examines how ethical knowledge, moral reasoning, character formation, and critical reflection contribute to the development of responsible conduct. Kohlberg (1984) provides a cognitive-developmental account of moral judgment, while Lickona (1991) approaches character education through the integration of moral understanding, dispositions, habits, and action. Freire (1970) introduces a complementary critical-pedagogical perspective, emphasizing the relationship between education, consciousness, power, and social transformation. These approaches have informed contemporary discussions of anti-corruption education, including Nainggolan's (2025) conceptual integration of moral reasoning, character formation, and critical-transformative pedagogy in Indonesian Christian higher education. The second field addresses the influence of leadership conduct and organizational structures on ethical expectations. Treviño et al. (2000) and Brown et al. (2005) establish the importance of ethical leadership and observable role modeling, whereas Simons (2002) conceptualizes behavioral integrity as perceived consistency between managerial commitments and actions. Meyer and Rowan (1977) offer an institutional explanation for the possible separation of formally legitimate organizational structures from actual practices, while Ashforth and Anand (2003) examine mechanisms through which unethical conduct may become normalized within organizations. The third field concerns the relationship between Christian moral commitments, educational leadership, institutional culture, and governance. Giroux and Penna (1979) conceptualize the hidden curriculum as a process through which institutional relationships and practices transmit informal social expectations, while Cracknell (2018) examines Christian educational leadership through service, relational responsibility, and the integration of faith with professional practice. More recently, Sitio et al. (2025) have examined the translation of Christian values into educational quality-management systems. Institutional studies by Hallak and Poisson (2007) additionally demonstrate that educational corruption must be examined through financing, recruitment, procurement, transparency, and accountability rather than individual misconduct alone. Although these bodies of scholarship address related problems, they operate at different analytical levels and employ different standards of explanation. Moral education concerns the formation of ethical judgment and conduct; leadership studies investigate the credibility and influence of organizational actors; institutional theory examines relationships between formal structures and enacted practices; and Christian ethics provides normative orientations for the exercise of authority. Their integration therefore requires more than assembling compatible concepts. It requires an explanation of how formally taught values interact with observable leadership behavior, organizational arrangements, and the informal moral experiences of educational communities.

Moral and character education provides an indispensable foundation for anti-corruption education because resistance to corruption requires the ability to recognize ethical problems, evaluate competing obligations, and translate moral commitments into responsible action. Kohlberg's (1984) theory of moral development emphasizes changes in the structure of moral reasoning, particularly the movement beyond externally imposed sanctions toward increasingly principled judgments concerning justice and responsibility. This perspective is relevant to anti-corruption education because students may need to evaluate dilemmas in which obedience to authority conflicts with fairness, legality, or public responsibility. Nevertheless, moral reasoning and actual conduct are not equivalent constructs; the ability to articulate principled judgments does not independently demonstrate that an individual will resist unethical pressures. Lickona (1991) addresses a related limitation by conceptualizing character formation through the interaction of moral knowing, moral feeling, and moral behavior. Importantly, Lickona's approach extends beyond individual instruction by recognizing teachers as moral exemplars and classrooms

and schools as communities in which character is cultivated through relationships, discipline, and shared practices. It would therefore be inaccurate to characterize classical character education as wholly detached from institutional experience. In the Indonesian context, the *Modul Pendidikan Antikorupsi untuk Mahasiswa* developed through the KPK and its educational partners (KPK, 2018) emphasizes the cultivation of anti-corruption awareness, understanding, attitudes, and behavior in everyday life. Such pedagogical approaches contribute to students' capacity to identify dishonesty, conflicts of interest, abuses of authority, and other integrity-related problems. Freire (1970), however, directs attention toward the institutional and political conditions through which unequal power relations may constrain ethical agency. His critical pedagogy underscores the importance of dialogue and reflective engagement rather than treating students as passive recipients of predetermined moral prescriptions. Nainggolan (2025) brings these perspectives together through a conceptual model of Christian anti-corruption education grounded in critical, reflective, communitarian, and prophetic orientations. Notably, this model already recognizes institutional culture, leadership example, transparency, and systemic transformation as integral to moral education. Its contribution establishes that Christian anti-corruption pedagogy cannot credibly be reduced to doctrinal instruction or individual virtue cultivation. Nevertheless, the relationship between educational formation and institutional accountability warrants further analytical specification. An institution may cultivate students' knowledge of integrity while simultaneously exposing them to decisions that appear inconsistent with its declared commitments. Conversely, students may encounter exemplary institutional conduct without necessarily developing the critical capacity to recognize less visible forms of injustice. These possibilities indicate that anti-corruption education should be examined as an interaction among moral reasoning, character formation, critical consciousness, and institutional experience. The conceptual challenge is not to replace individual moral education with organizational governance, but to explain how educational and institutional processes may reinforce, constrain, or contradict one another.

Ethical leadership and organizational theory provide complementary explanations of how institutional practices acquire moral significance, although their underlying concepts must be differentiated carefully. Treviño et al. (2000) distinguish the *moral person*, whose credibility rests on perceived personal integrity, ethical conduct, and decision-making, from the *moral manager*, who actively communicates ethical expectations and reinforces them through leadership practices. Their distinction suggests that ethical credibility requires both personal conduct and the organizational management of ethical standards. Brown et al. (2005) subsequently develop and empirically investigate ethical leadership through a social learning perspective, emphasizing leaders' roles as observable models whose behavior can inform the expectations of organizational members. Within educational organizations, Özdoğru and Sarier (2024) provide relevant quantitative evidence through a meta-analysis of 47 empirical studies involving 18,423 participants. Their analysis reports strong positive associations between principals' ethical leadership and teachers' organizational trust, perceived justice, job satisfaction, motivation, and commitment, alongside negative associations with organizational silence, mobbing, and cynicism. However, these findings concern teachers' organizational outcomes and cannot be interpreted as direct evidence that ethical leadership reduces corruption or improves students' anti-corruption character. A more specific conceptual contribution is provided by Simons (2002), who defines *behavioral integrity* through the perceived alignment between managerial words and actions, particularly promises and espoused versus enacted values. This concept is particularly useful for evaluating the credibility of institutional moral commitments because it concerns observable or perceived consistency rather than assuming the moral intentions of leaders. Meyer and Rowan (1977) examine a different

phenomenon: institutional decoupling, through which formal structures adopted for legitimacy may become separated from organizational activities. Such discrepancies need not arise from deliberate dishonesty, since organizations may face competing institutional expectations, administrative constraints, and legitimacy pressures. Moral hypocrisy must therefore be differentiated from both behavioral inconsistency and institutional decoupling. Batson et al. (1999) investigate psychological mechanisms through which individuals may preserve a moral self-image despite discrepancies between professed standards and actual behavior, while Tenbrunsel and Messick (2004) explain how ethical considerations may recede from attention during decision-making through processes of self-deception. Bandura (1999) further identifies forms of moral disengagement, including the displacement or diffusion of responsibility and the rationalization of harmful conduct. At the organizational level, Ashforth and Anand (2003) explain the normalization of corruption through institutionalization, rationalization, and socialization, illustrating how practices initially regarded as unacceptable may become embedded in organizational routines and expectations. These theories can be brought into dialogue without treating their constructs as interchangeable. Behavioral integrity concerns perceived consistency; decoupling concerns organizational structure and practice; moral hypocrisy concerns discrepancies between moral presentation and conduct; and normalization concerns the reproduction of misconduct through organizational processes. Their integration suggests a possible explanatory sequence in which recurring inconsistencies, when insufficiently challenged or corrected, may influence informal expectations about the legitimate use of institutional authority. Nevertheless, this sequence remains a conceptual proposition requiring evidence about particular practices, institutional responses, and the interpretations of organizational members.

Christian educational leadership and hidden curriculum scholarship provide a further basis for examining the moral significance of institutional practice, particularly where educational organizations explicitly identify themselves with religious commitments. Cracknell (2018) conceptualizes Christian educational leadership through a relationship between faith, service, wisdom, community, and responsibility, challenging leadership orientations primarily concerned with status or personal importance. This perspective resonates with the Christian ethical emphasis on service and stewardship, but it should not be conflated automatically with contemporary social-scientific constructs of servant leadership. Eva et al. (2019), in their systematic review of servant leadership research, demonstrate the importance of conceptual clarity and distinguish servant leadership from related value-based leadership approaches. Likewise, Smit (2018) examines Mark 10:42–45 through a contextual analysis of *diakonia*, authority, masculinity, and martyrdom, showing that biblical language concerning service requires historically informed interpretation rather than straightforward translation into modern managerial principles. Within the broader biblical framework, Micah 6:8 addresses justice, faithfulness, and humility; Matthew 23:23–28 criticizes discrepancies between visible religious observance and substantive ethical obligations; Luke 12:48 relates responsibility to entrusted obligations; and 2 Corinthians 8:20–21 provides a historically situated account of concern for honorable conduct in the administration of communal resources. Commentaries by Waltke (2008), France (2007), Green (1997), and Harris (2005) provide scholarly resources for interpreting these texts within their respective literary and historical settings. Their relevance to institutional governance is normative and analogical rather than evidence that biblical prescriptions directly establish the effectiveness of contemporary transparency mechanisms. Sitio et al. (2025) contribute a more explicitly organizational perspective by examining how Christian commitments to stewardship, integrity, service, and excellence may inform educational quality-management systems and institutional performance indicators. This contribution demonstrates that translating theological values

into organizational practices is already an established concern within recent Christian educational scholarship. However, quality management and anti-corruption governance should not be treated as identical: an institution may demonstrate procedural efficiency or administrative compliance without necessarily resolving questions of unequal power, unethical favoritism, or the credibility of moral leadership. The educational significance of these distinctions becomes apparent through the hidden curriculum. Giroux and Penna (1979) argue that schooling transmits social expectations through institutional and classroom practices beyond formally prescribed curricular content, thereby situating education within wider relationships of power and social reproduction. Applied cautiously to Christian educational institutions, this perspective permits analysis of how students may encounter informal messages concerning fairness, authority, honesty, and accountability through institutional decisions and everyday relationships. Yet hidden curricula are not necessarily negative or uniform; institutional practices may reinforce formal moral instruction, produce contradictory messages, or become objects of student criticism. The interaction between religious values, leadership conduct, institutional governance, and moral socialization is therefore best understood as a theoretically significant relationship rather than a demonstrated pattern of behavior across Christian educational institutions.

A critical comparison of the reviewed scholarship indicates that the principal research problem concerns the specification and integration of explanatory mechanisms rather than the complete absence of previous attention to institutional integrity. Nainggolan (2025) provides a substantial conceptual contribution by connecting moral reasoning, character formation, critical consciousness, and structural transformation within Indonesian Christian higher education. Importantly, the study explicitly discusses leadership example, transparency, whistleblowing, institutional culture, and policies capable of supporting anti-corruption education. Consequently, neither the importance of institutional accountability nor the integration of individual and structural dimensions can be claimed as an entirely new discovery of the present article. Nevertheless, Nainggolan's principal theoretical architecture is organized around educational and transformative paradigms derived from Kohlberg, Lickona, and Freire. This orientation provides a foundation for extending the analysis toward a more differentiated explanation of how discrepancies between leaders' ethical commitments and institutional procedures may arise, become normalized, and influence informal educational experiences. Sitio et al. (2025) similarly address the operationalization of Christian values through educational quality management, but their conceptual emphasis differs from an examination of organizational moral inconsistency and its possible consequences for anti-corruption learning. Their synthesis also should not be interpreted as establishing the causal effectiveness of particular governance interventions without corresponding intervention-based evidence. At a different analytical level, Brown et al. (2005) and Özdoğru and Sarier (2024) establish the relevance of ethical leadership, but their original research contexts and measured outcomes do not directly explain how students interpret discrepancies between an institution's moral teaching and its governance practices. Simons (2002) clarifies the significance of perceived word-deed alignment, while Meyer and Rowan (1977) explain potential separation between formal structures and enacted activities; however, these theories do not independently establish the educational consequences of inconsistency. Giroux and Penna (1979) provide a framework for examining institutional socialization, but this does not itself identify which particular governance practices generate anti-corruption learning or how such relationships might be evaluated. Finally, Hallak and Poisson (2007) identify transparency and accountability as relevant to corruption prevention in education, although administrative safeguards do not automatically establish the moral credibility of leaders or demonstrate students' internalization of integrity values. The more defensible research gap therefore concerns the need to distinguish and connect three analytical processes: the

possible production of institutional moral inconsistency, the interpretation and informal socialization of that inconsistency within educational communities, and the governance arrangements through which inconsistencies may be detected and corrected. This gap is advanced as a focused integrative problem within the examined literature, not as an exhaustive claim that no publication has previously connected these concepts. Its wider novelty must remain open to reassessment as the comprehensive literature corpus and search audit are finalized.

The theoretical position developed from this critical review treats anti-corruption character education as a relationship among normative commitments, leadership enactment, institutional governance, and informal moral socialization. Christian ethical principles supply a normative orientation toward justice, service, integrity, and responsibility, but they do not independently establish the moral quality of institutional practices. Ethical leadership theory explains why leaders' observable behavior may provide moral guidance, while behavioral integrity identifies the importance of consistency between publicly expressed commitments and enacted decisions (Treviño et al., 2000; Brown et al., 2005; Simons, 2002). Institutional theory introduces the possibility that legitimate formal structures may diverge from practical organizational arrangements, whereas research on normalization, moral disengagement, and ethical fading identifies mechanisms that may sustain problematic behavior under particular conditions (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Ashforth & Anand, 2003; Bandura, 1999; Tenbrunsel & Messick, 2004). Hidden curriculum theory adds the educational dimension by directing attention toward the informal expectations communicated through institutional relationships and everyday organizational experience (Giroux & Penna, 1979). The proposed synthesis does not presume that inconsistent institutional conduct invariably produces moral hypocrisy, that students necessarily imitate leaders, or that formal accountability mechanisms inevitably create ethical organizational cultures. Rather, it identifies theoretically plausible relationships that require differentiation, contextual interpretation, and empirical examination. On this basis, the study advances the **Institutional Integrity Role-Modeling Framework (IIRMF)** as a provisional conceptual structure connecting six dimensions: moral-theological integrity, ethical leadership enactment, transparent governance, procedural justice, integrity-oriented hidden curriculum, and reflexive accountability. These dimensions are intended to specify how declared moral principles might become observable through leadership decisions and institutional practices, how students might interpret those experiences, and how organizational mechanisms might support the correction of discrepancies. The framework extends existing Christian anti-corruption scholarship by making the potential relationship between moral inconsistency, informal educational experience, and correctable institutional practice more explicit, rather than claiming to introduce institutional integrity as a previously unrecognized educational concern. Its explanatory contribution is organized around three questions addressed in the subsequent analysis: the relationship between normative education and institutional governance, the possible mechanisms generating contradictory informal moral learning, and the construction of an accountable Christian institutional role-modeling framework. Because these relationships have not been tested through institutional observations or student-level measurements, IIRMF remains a conceptual proposition rather than a validated model of organizational effectiveness. The methodological challenge is consequently to evaluate the evidentiary foundations of each theoretical connection while maintaining clear distinctions between documentary findings, social-scientific explanations, and normative theological interpretation. This provides the basis for the critical integrative review methodology developed in the following section.

METHOD

Data Sources, Corpus Development, and Evidence Classification

The documentary corpus was developed to examine the conceptual, institutional, educational, and theological dimensions of anti-corruption character education in Christian educational institutions. The selection of evidence was informed by the principles of integrative literature reviewing, which permit the critical examination of theoretical publications, prior empirical studies, and institutional documents while requiring explicit attention to their different evidentiary functions (Torraco, 2005; Whittemore & Knafl, 2005; Snyder, 2019). Four categories of sources were distinguished. The first comprises foundational organizational and leadership theories, including ethical leadership (Brown et al., 2005; Treviño et al., 2000), behavioral integrity (Simons, 2002), institutional decoupling (Meyer & Rowan, 1977), the normalization of corruption (Ashforth & Anand, 2003), and the hidden curriculum (Giroux & Penna, 1979). The second comprises education-focused research, particularly Nainggolan's (2025) critical-transformative approach to Christian anti-corruption education and prior scholarship concerning the integration of Christian values into institutional management. The third category consists of documentary evidence concerning educational integrity and governance, particularly the findings of Indonesia's 2024 Education Integrity Assessment published by the Corruption Eradication Commission in 2025. The fourth comprises biblical texts and academic exegetical literature relevant to justice, stewardship, service, and the responsible exercise of authority. Academic commentaries by Waltke (2008), France (2007), Green (1997), and Harris (2005), together with Smit's (2018) study of Mark 10:42–45, establish an identifiable scholarly foundation for examining the theological dimensions of institutional integrity. These source categories were not treated as epistemologically equivalent: official assessments provide descriptive contextual evidence; previous empirical studies offer findings within their original research settings; organizational theories provide explanatory constructs; and biblical scholarship supports historically and textually informed normative interpretation. The evidence base is limited to publications issued no later than 31 December 2025. Although the source identities and central relevance of selected publications have been verified, the corpus should be regarded as a documented core literature set rather than a demonstrably exhaustive database-derived collection.

Literature Retrieval, Selection Procedures, and Auditability

The literature-retrieval procedure was designed to establish a traceable relationship between the research questions, selected publications, and the arguments developed in the conceptual synthesis. Searches combined terms associated with ethical leadership, Christian leadership, moral hypocrisy, behavioral integrity, institutional decoupling, hidden curriculum, anti-corruption education, organizational accountability, and educational governance. Supplementary theological searches targeted the interpretation of Mark 10:42–45, Micah 6:8, Matthew 23:23–28, Luke 12:48, and 2 Corinthians 8:20–21 through scholarly commentaries and academic publications predating 2026. Retrieved sources were examined for bibliographic identity, relevance to the central questions, publication provenance, and consistency between the claims attributed to them and their accessible scholarly records. The inclusion criteria comprised demonstrable relevance to at least one analytical domain, identifiable authorship, traceable publication information, substantive theoretical or documentary contributions, and compliance with the temporal boundary. Publications were not excluded merely because they predated 2015 where they provided foundational theoretical formulations. Conversely, publications were considered unsuitable when their bibliographic identities could not be reliably established, their arguments could not be distinguished from unsupported commentary, or their evidentiary contributions fell outside the research questions. The verification procedure also identified

the need to distinguish source-level verification from full-text interpretive examination. A publisher record may establish that a commentary exists and addresses a biblical book, but it does not independently verify a particular interpretation of a selected verse. Similarly, a published abstract can establish the stated aims and reported conclusions of a study without supporting claims about methodological details not visible in that record. The documented verification searches provide an initial audit trail, but the absence of complete raw-result counts, deduplication records, and comprehensive database-screening logs prevents the present review from being represented as an exhaustive systematic search. Its reproducibility therefore rests primarily on transparent source attribution, explicit selection logic, and an auditable claim–source matrix, with remaining retrieval limitations acknowledged rather than concealed.

Critical Synthesis, Contextual Exegesis, and Conceptual Validity

The analytical procedure combines comparative conceptual synthesis with contextual biblical interpretation, while maintaining a strict distinction between descriptive evidence, theoretical explanation, and normative judgment. The first stage involves identifying the central claims and evidentiary functions of each source. The second compares related concepts to prevent unwarranted equivalence between moral hypocrisy, behavioral inconsistency, institutional decoupling, and corrupt conduct. The third examines plausible explanatory connections between enacted leadership behavior, organizational accountability, and the informal moral experiences associated with the hidden curriculum. The fourth evaluates Christian leadership principles through literary, historical, and theological interpretation of selected biblical passages. Mark 10:42–45 is examined in relation to the dispute over status and authority among Jesus' disciples; Micah 6:8 within the prophetic confrontation concerning covenantal obligation and injustice; Matthew 23:23–28 within Jesus' criticism of religious leadership; Luke 12:48 within the discourse concerning faithful stewardship and accountability; and 2 Corinthians 8:20–21 within Paul's administration of a collection for the Jerusalem community. These contextual readings avoid treating ancient biblical texts as direct prescriptions for contemporary financial auditing, procurement procedures, or institutional governance instruments. Instead, they identify moral principles whose applicability to modern educational institutions requires further ethical reasoning. The fifth stage integrates these theoretical and normative insights into the provisional Institutional Integrity Role-Modeling Framework. Conceptual validity is examined through internal coherence, distinction among constructs, compatibility with the available literature, identification of alternative explanations, and specification of empirically testable propositions. The resulting framework is understood as an interpretive and explanatory construction rather than a psychometrically validated instrument or empirically demonstrated intervention. No statistical reliability coefficients, causal estimates, or claims of measured effectiveness are attributed to the framework.

RESULTS

Reconstructing Anti-Corruption Character Education through Accountable Christian Institutional Role Modeling

The theological foundation of accountable Christian leadership emerges from a contextual synthesis of biblical passages addressing authority, justice, moral consistency, stewardship, and responsibility. Mark 10:42–45 situates Jesus' teaching on leadership within the disciples' struggle over positions of honor, particularly the preceding request by James and John for privileged places in the anticipated kingdom. Jesus contrasts prevailing patterns of domination with a community ethic in which greatness is redefined through service. Smit (2018) demonstrates that the meaning of *diakonia* in this passage requires

careful exegetical consideration rather than an uncritical equation with contemporary managerial theories of servant leadership. The passage therefore establishes an important theological challenge to self-serving authority, although it does not directly formulate modern institutional procedures. Micah 6:8 provides a complementary prophetic perspective. Situated within the broader covenantal controversy of Micah 6:1–8, the verse identifies justice, covenantal faithfulness, and humility before God as central ethical obligations. Waltke's (2008) extensive treatment of Micah provides an appropriate scholarly context for locating these requirements within the prophet's confrontation with social and religious disorder. Matthew 23:23–28 develops a further critique of moral discrepancy by contrasting the scrupulous performance of visible religious obligations with neglect of weightier ethical demands, including justice, mercy, and faithfulness. France (2007) offers a major historical and literary commentary on Matthew through which this passage can be examined within the wider controversy between Jesus and religious authorities. Luke 12:48 contributes the principle that responsibility is proportionate to what has been entrusted, within a discourse concerning the readiness and faithfulness of servants. Green's (1997) narrative-oriented commentary provides an established scholarly resource for interpreting this passage within Luke's wider theological treatment of discipleship and accountability. Finally, 2 Corinthians 8:20–21 concerns Paul's administration of a substantial charitable collection, including measures intended to avoid criticism and preserve honorable conduct in the eyes of both God and other people. Harris (2005) provides a major exegetical resource for examining the passage within Paul's correspondence and the collection project. These textual contexts support a carefully delimited normative synthesis: legitimate Christian leadership entails more than claims of personal virtue and includes ethical obligations concerning the exercise of authority, the handling of entrusted responsibilities, and the public credibility of institutional conduct. The interpretation does not establish the empirical effectiveness of specific governance mechanisms; it establishes theological reasons for regarding accountability as compatible with, rather than contrary to, Christian leadership.

The integration of Christian moral principles with organizational theory yields an institutional understanding of role modeling that extends beyond the personal conduct of a morally respected leader. The interpretive relationship between Mark 10:42–45 and ethical leadership theory is particularly significant because both concern the observable use of authority, although they arise from different epistemological traditions. The biblical passage offers a normative challenge to domination and status-seeking, whereas Brown et al. (2005) provide a social-scientific explanation of ethical leadership through social learning processes. Their integration allows leadership service to be considered not simply as a personal disposition but also as conduct that may become visible through decisions, resource distribution, and treatment of institutional members. Similarly, the justice-related emphasis of Micah 6:8 and Matthew 23:23–28 supplies a normative basis for examining whether institutional procedures reflect declared ethical commitments. Behavioral integrity theory (Simons, 2002) clarifies the importance of perceived alignment between words and actions, while institutional decoupling theory (Meyer & Rowan, 1977) explains why formal policies and actual organizational practices may diverge. Second Corinthians 8:20–21 introduces a particularly relevant theological analogy for financial stewardship: Paul's concern for handling collective resources in a manner that avoids legitimate criticism can support a modern normative argument for transparent administration, although a direct equivalence between apostolic collection practices and contemporary audit systems would be historically unwarranted. The proposed Institutional Integrity Role-Modeling Framework brings these perspectives into six interconnected dimensions: moral–theological integrity, ethical leadership enactment, transparent governance, procedural justice, integrity-oriented hidden curriculum, and reflexive accountability. Their

integration suggests that institutional integrity requires both credible moral commitments and procedures capable of making those commitments observable and correctable. The hidden curriculum functions as the educational interface through which institutional practice may communicate informal expectations concerning honesty, fairness, responsibility, and the legitimacy of power. Nevertheless, the precise nature and strength of such learning processes have not been established for the proposed framework. The framework therefore represents a theoretical synthesis linking normative commitments with potentially observable organizational mechanisms rather than a validated causal model of anti-corruption education.

The proposed framework generates five propositions that specify theoretically plausible relationships while remaining open to empirical falsification. The first proposition predicts that perceived consistency between leaders' expressed moral commitments and enacted decisions is positively associated with the credibility of institutional ethical role modeling. The second proposes that transparent procedures and meaningful accountability arrangements may reduce opportunities for persistent discrepancies between formal integrity commitments and organizational practice. The third suggests that students' repeated experiences of fair and consistent institutional conduct may strengthen the perceived credibility of formal anti-corruption instruction. The fourth predicts that leadership grounded in Christian commitments to service and stewardship, when accompanied by enforceable institutional accountability, may provide a more coherent environment for moral education than leadership dependent exclusively on personal moral authority. The fifth proposes that institutional responsiveness to ethical criticism, including the protection of legitimate reporting and the correction of documented misconduct, may contribute to perceptions of organizational integrity. These propositions should not be interpreted as established empirical findings. Several competing explanations remain plausible. Resource limitations, administrative complexity, institutional size, regulatory conflicts, cultural expectations, and differences in students' previous experiences may affect the relationship between declared values and observed practices independently of moral hypocrisy. Furthermore, the presence of formal accountability procedures does not ensure their consistent implementation, and greater procedural transparency does not automatically result in greater moral trust. The framework also requires differentiation among organizational-level conditions, leader-level conduct, and student-level learning outcomes to avoid inferential errors across analytical levels. Its six dimensions have not been subjected to construct validation, reliability testing, measurement invariance analysis, or field-based assessments of predictive validity. Consequently, the present article contributes a structured conceptual vocabulary and preliminary mechanisms for future research, not evidence that the framework reduces corruption or improves students' moral behavior. Its value lies in generating explicit, theoretically grounded questions about how Christian educational institutions might align moral teaching, leadership practices, governance arrangements, and opportunities for ethical correction.

DISCUSSION

The synthesis developed in this study suggests that the credibility of anti-corruption character education depends not only on the moral principles communicated through formal instruction but also on the institutional conditions through which those principles are enacted, experienced, and subjected to accountability. The three analytical results establish a progressive relationship between the identification of an institutional integrity problem, the explanation of potential mechanisms of moral inconsistency, and the reconstruction of accountable institutional role modeling. First, the descriptive synthesis distinguishes individual moral formation from organizational integrity, demonstrating the analytical importance of examining educational governance alongside formal character

education. Indonesia's 2024 Education Integrity Assessment provides relevant national context, particularly the difference between the reported character and governance dimensions, although these descriptive scores cannot establish a causal relationship or demonstrate moral inconsistencies within Christian educational institutions specifically (KPK, 2025b). Second, the critical synthesis indicates that discrepancies between declared institutional commitments and observable organizational practices may become educationally consequential when they are recurrent, visible, normalized, and insufficiently corrected. Behavioral integrity theory explains the significance of consistency between leadership commitments and actions (Simons, 2002), while institutional decoupling and hidden curriculum perspectives illuminate how organizational arrangements and everyday experiences may convey messages that differ from formally endorsed values (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Giroux & Penna, 1979). Nevertheless, these theories do not establish that every inconsistency represents deliberate hypocrisy or produces unethical student behavior. Third, the transformative synthesis proposes the Institutional Integrity Role-Modeling Framework (IIRMF) as a theoretical response that connects Christian moral commitments with ethical leadership enactment, transparent governance, procedural justice, informal moral learning, and reflexive accountability. These dimensions are intended to strengthen the conceptual connection between what institutions teach, what leaders demonstrate, and what organizational procedures permit or constrain. The integration consequently addresses the three research questions by identifying the relationship between normative integrity education and governance, clarifying possible mechanisms underlying contradictory moral socialization, and constructing an institutionally accountable framework grounded in Christian leadership ethics. Its broader implication is that institutional integrity should be approached as an ongoing relationship between ethical instruction, organizational conduct, and the capacity for correction, rather than as an attribute inferred solely from religious identity or formal declarations of moral commitment.

The interpretation of these relationships requires particular attention to the institutional and sociocultural conditions within which Christian educational organizations operate in Indonesia. Christian schools, theological colleges, and faith-based universities may differ substantially in organizational size, governance arrangements, financial resources, denominational affiliations, and distributions of authority. Consequently, the application of IIRMF cannot presume a uniform administrative structure or identical relationships among foundations, institutional executives, academic authorities, religious communities, and educational stakeholders. These differences are analytically important because responsibilities for financial management, staff appointments, curriculum supervision, ethical enforcement, and institutional oversight may be distributed across several organizational bodies. In such circumstances, moral credibility may depend on whether the responsibilities and limitations of each authority are sufficiently defined and whether institutional members have legitimate means of questioning decisions that appear inconsistent with publicly declared standards. The relationship between communal loyalty and institutional accountability also requires careful consideration. Shared religious identity, pastoral relationships, and communal solidarity may encourage cooperation and mutual responsibility; however, under certain organizational conditions, expectations of personal loyalty could also discourage criticism or complicate the disclosure of institutional misconduct. These possibilities should not be interpreted as evidence that Christian institutions or particular Indonesian cultural practices are inherently permissive toward corruption. Rather, they represent contextual conditions whose significance depends on specific governance arrangements and observable behavior. Similarly, apparent inconsistencies between institutional policies and administrative outcomes may arise from limited organizational capacity, ambiguous regulatory requirements, conflicting

stakeholder expectations, or inadequate resources rather than intentional deception. This distinction is particularly important when examining smaller educational institutions with restricted administrative infrastructure. An accountability framework must therefore remain sensitive to institutional capacity while maintaining substantive requirements for fairness, transparency, and responsible decision-making. Hallak and Poisson (2007) provide a relevant governance perspective by emphasizing that transparency and corruption prevention require institutional capacity, clear procedures, and stakeholder participation rather than formal regulations alone. Applied to Christian education, this reasoning suggests that responsible governance should include proportionate oversight, documented decision criteria, accessible institutional information, and procedures for responding to legitimate concerns without compromising confidentiality or procedural fairness. The contextual contribution of IIRMF is thus not to impose an identical administrative model on every institution, but to identify normative and organizational principles that can be adapted to different institutional settings and subsequently examined through context-specific empirical research.

At the theoretical level, the study extends existing explanations of ethical leadership and organizational integrity by identifying the conditions under which institutional moral inconsistency might influence educational experience. Brown et al. (2005) conceptualize ethical leadership through social learning processes, suggesting that influential leaders may provide observable behavioral standards for organizational members. Treviño et al. (2000) similarly distinguish the credibility of the leader as a moral person from the managerial responsibility to communicate and reinforce ethical expectations. However, these approaches do not imply that students automatically reproduce every behavior exhibited by institutional leaders. Moral learning is mediated by interpretation, social interaction, competing normative influences, and the extent to which organizational behavior is visible and regarded as legitimate. Simons (2002) offers a complementary perspective by explaining why perceived alignment between words and deeds matters for leadership credibility. When applied to anti-corruption education, this concept helps distinguish the existence of an institutional commitment from the credibility attributed to that commitment by those who observe the institution's conduct. Meyer and Rowan (1977) provide a different explanatory mechanism through institutional decoupling, showing how formally legitimate organizational structures may become separated from everyday activities. Such separation may be produced by legitimacy pressures, technical constraints, or competing institutional requirements and should not automatically be interpreted as intentional moral deception. By contrast, Ashforth and Anand (2003) explain how corrupt practices can become normalized through institutionalization, rationalization, and socialization, while Batson et al. (1999) examine psychological processes associated with individual moral hypocrisy. The distinction between these approaches is essential because evidence of formal-practical inconsistency does not independently establish corruption, organizational normalization, or an intention to mislead. Giroux and Penna (1979) add an educational dimension by demonstrating how institutional relationships and everyday practices can communicate implicit social expectations beyond the formal curriculum. Integrating these perspectives produces a conditional explanatory proposition: recurrent inconsistencies may contribute to contradictory informal moral learning when they become sufficiently observable, are treated as acceptable by influential actors, and remain unchallenged by effective corrective mechanisms. Conversely, institutional practices that consistently reinforce publicly declared standards may provide experiences compatible with integrity-oriented moral education. This interpretation also exposes a potential weakness of accountability arrangements themselves. Formal transparency policies and ethical codes may become ceremonial if their implementation is not independently examined, creating an additional possibility of institutional decoupling.

IIRMF therefore requires a distinction between the existence of accountability procedures and evidence that those procedures are accessible, consistently applied, and capable of producing correction. Its theoretical contribution lies in bringing together leadership credibility, institutional structure, and informal moral socialization without assuming a deterministic pathway from organizational inconsistency to student misconduct.

The theological significance of the synthesis concerns the relationship between moral authority and the institutional responsibility to exercise power justly, transparently, and accountably. Christian leadership ethics can provide a normative rationale for integrity, but the presence of religious language, public expressions of faith, or the personal reputation of leaders cannot independently establish the ethical quality of institutional decisions. Mark 10:42–45 offers an important starting point because Jesus' teaching emerges within a dispute concerning status and authority among the disciples. The contrast between domination and service challenges leadership understood primarily through privilege and the unrestricted exercise of power. Smit (2018) demonstrates that this passage requires contextual interpretation of *diakonia* and ancient understandings of authority rather than an uncritical identification with contemporary servant-leadership models. Micah 6:8 complements this perspective by locating justice, faithfulness, and humility within the wider prophetic concern for covenantal responsibility. Matthew 23:23–28 further challenges the separation of outward religious observance from substantive ethical obligations, especially justice, mercy, and faithfulness. Nevertheless, this biblical criticism should not be appropriated as evidence that a contemporary leader is deliberately hypocritical merely because an administrative inconsistency has been identified. Luke 12:48 emphasizes the responsibility attached to entrusted obligations, while 2 Corinthians 8:20–21 provides a historically situated example of concern for honorable administration in the handling of resources intended for a religious community. These passages supply a coherent normative orientation toward responsible authority, but they do not constitute empirical proof that particular organizational mechanisms reduce corruption. The movement from biblical principles to contemporary governance practices therefore requires an explicit interpretive distinction between the historical meaning of the text, its theological implications, and the institutional measures proposed in response. Within these limits, accountability can be understood as an expression of Christian stewardship rather than an indication of distrust or opposition to religious leadership. An institution committed to service and justice should have normative reasons to avoid placing leaders beyond scrutiny, to protect members from arbitrary treatment, and to establish legitimate opportunities for institutional correction. Equally, accountability mechanisms should respect the dignity of those involved, including procedural safeguards for persons accused of wrongdoing and protection against retaliatory conduct. The deeper theological implication is therefore that integrity cannot depend exclusively on the presumed virtue of an individual leader; moral responsibility must also become recognizable in institutional relationships and practices that remain open to principled evaluation. In this sense, accountable leadership represents a practical expression of moral commitment while remaining subject to independent empirical assessment of its educational consequences.

Comparison with previous scholarship clarifies both the contribution and the limitations of the proposed framework. Nainggolan (2025) already establishes an important conceptual foundation for Christian anti-corruption education by integrating Kohlberg's moral development theory, Lickona's character education, and Freire's critical-transformative pedagogy into a framework emphasizing reflection, community, structural awareness, and prophetic responsibility. The present study therefore does not claim to be the first to recognize the institutional or structural dimensions of Christian anti-corruption education. Its more specific contribution is to examine how observable leadership inconsistency, institutional decoupling, informal moral socialization, and corrective

accountability might be connected within one explanatory framework. Sitio et al. (2025) similarly advance the discussion by integrating Christian values with educational quality-management practices and proposing ways to connect theological commitments with organizational indicators. IIRMF complements this contribution by placing greater analytical emphasis on the potential educational consequences of discrepancies between declared institutional values and enacted decisions, as well as on mechanisms through which such discrepancies might be challenged and corrected. Relative to Brown et al. (2005) and Treviño et al. (2000), the framework extends the discussion of ethical leadership from individual role modeling and managerial reinforcement toward its relationship with institutional practices and the informal moral experiences of educational communities. The meta-analysis by Özdoğru and Sarier (2024) provides empirical support for the relevance of principals' ethical leadership to teachers' organizational attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors; however, its outcomes cannot be interpreted as direct evidence of changes in students' anti-corruption character. IIRMF identifies this relationship as an area requiring subsequent investigation rather than treating it as already demonstrated. Relative to Meyer and Rowan (1977), the framework develops the educational implications of possible separation between formal commitments and operational practices. Relative to Giroux and Penna (1979), it specifies governance-related institutional experiences that might contribute to integrity-oriented or contradictory informal moral learning. These theoretical extensions should nevertheless be understood as integrative rather than as the discovery of previously unknown psychological or organizational mechanisms. Their proposed originality lies in connecting established constructs across levels of analysis and translating those connections into provisional institutional dimensions and testable propositions. The distinction is important because an accumulation of established theories does not automatically constitute conceptual innovation. The framework's contribution will depend on whether its integration improves explanatory clarity, identifies previously insufficiently specified relationships, and provides propositions that can be critically examined against competing interpretations. Accordingly, IIRMF should be regarded as a theoretically grounded contribution to the development of institutional integrity scholarship rather than a validated explanatory model or a demonstrated solution to educational corruption.

The practical implications of the proposed synthesis concern the institutional conditions under which anti-corruption character education might become more consistent with the practices of educational leadership and governance. A first implication is the potential value of periodic institutional integrity assessments examining the correspondence between declared moral commitments and documented organizational decisions. Such assessments could evaluate whether ethical standards apply to institutional leaders, whether appointment and promotion procedures follow publicly stated criteria, and whether procurement and resource-allocation decisions are sufficiently documented to permit legitimate scrutiny. A second implication concerns transparent governance and procedural justice. Consistent with Hallak and Poisson (2007), institutions may consider proportionate financial disclosure, conflict-of-interest procedures, accountable procurement practices, and oversight arrangements appropriate to their organizational responsibilities and resources. A third implication is the establishment of accessible and procedurally fair mechanisms for reporting concerns, protecting legitimate complainants against retaliation, examining alleged misconduct, and communicating corrective actions where disclosure is appropriate. These mechanisms should include safeguards against arbitrary accusations and should not be evaluated merely through the number of complaints received, since reporting levels may reflect differences in trust, accessibility, or institutional awareness. A fourth implication concerns the integration of institutional experience into anti-corruption pedagogy. Educational activities may invite students to examine ethical dilemmas involving favoritism, misuse of authority, conflicts of interest, financial

stewardship, and procedural fairness, while encouraging reasoned criticism and responsible participation. Such activities should avoid exposing confidential information or presuming the guilt of particular institutional actors. Nainggolan's (2025) critical-transformative approach provides a relevant pedagogical foundation for linking ethical reflection with awareness of institutional responsibility. Nevertheless, these recommendations remain conceptually derived proposals rather than interventions whose effectiveness has been established by the present study. The evidence reviewed here does not demonstrate that IIRMF improves governance, reduces corruption, or strengthens students' integrity-related behavior. Moreover, the use of national secondary data, the absence of primary research in Christian educational institutions, the incomplete comprehensive search audit, and the limitations of the available exegetical source examination restrict the conclusions that can legitimately be drawn. Future research should therefore evaluate the proposed relationships through multi-institutional designs combining organizational documents, leadership and student perceptions, procedural assessments, and longitudinal evidence where feasible. Particular attention should be given to whether the proposed dimensions remain conceptually distinct, whether their indicators demonstrate acceptable validity and reliability, and whether alternative explanations such as resources, institutional size, regulatory complexity, and pre-existing organizational culture account for observed outcomes. These requirements establish an empirical agenda through which the framework may be supported, revised, or rejected. The central implication of the discussion is that accountable Christian institutional role modeling represents a defensible theoretical direction for reconstructing anti-corruption character education, but its educational effectiveness remains a question for research rather than a conclusion already established by the available evidence.

CONCLUSION

The study concludes that anti-corruption character education in Christian educational institutions requires a coherent relationship between formally articulated moral commitments, observable leadership conduct, institutional governance, and the informal educational experiences through which ethical expectations are communicated and interpreted. Addressing the first research question, the critical synthesis establishes that normative integrity education and organizational governance constitute analytically distinct but interconnected dimensions of educational integrity. Moral instruction provides principles for evaluating honesty, justice, and responsibility, whereas institutional practices determine how such commitments are expressed through decisions, procedures, and the exercise of authority. Regarding the second research question, the synthesis identifies behavioral inconsistency, institutional decoupling, moral rationalization, normalization, and insufficient accountability as theoretically plausible mechanisms through which discrepancies between institutional commitments and enacted practices may contribute to a contradictory hidden curriculum. However, these mechanisms remain conditional explanations rather than evidence that moral hypocrisy necessarily occurs within Christian educational institutions or directly causes unethical student behavior. Addressing the third research question, the study develops the Institutional Integrity Role-Modeling Framework (IIRMF), integrating moral-theological integrity, ethical leadership enactment, transparent governance, procedural justice, integrity-oriented hidden curriculum, and reflexive accountability. These six dimensions articulate a conceptual pathway through which moral principles may be translated into institutional arrangements that support consistency, responsible authority, and opportunities for ethical correction. The central conclusion is therefore that the credibility of anti-corruption character education cannot be inferred solely from the presence of religious instruction, institutional ethical codes, or leaders' personal

moral reputations; it must also be examined in relation to the consistency and accountability of everyday organizational practices.

The study contributes to the literature by developing an integrative explanation of institutional integrity that connects ethical leadership, behavioral integrity, institutional decoupling, informal moral socialization, and Christian normative ethics within the specific analytical context of anti-corruption character education. Its theoretical contribution lies in clarifying the relationships among established constructs without treating organizational inconsistency, deliberate moral hypocrisy, and corruption as equivalent phenomena. Its educational contribution is to position institutional practices as potential sources of moral learning that may reinforce, complicate, or contradict formally taught values. Its theological contribution is to interpret Christian commitments to service, justice, stewardship, and responsibility as normative grounds for accountable authority rather than as substitutes for organizational scrutiny. The proposed framework extends existing scholarship by specifying mechanisms and preliminary institutional indicators through which these relationships may be examined more systematically. Methodologically, the critical integrative literature review provides a means of bringing together organizational theory, educational research, institutional documentation, and contextual theological interpretation while distinguishing their respective evidentiary functions. Nevertheless, the study has important limitations. National educational integrity data cannot establish the prevalence of misconduct in Christian educational institutions, and a conceptual synthesis cannot determine causal effects on students' moral development. Furthermore, the documentary corpus requires continued full-text assessment, comprehensive search documentation, and more extensive comparison of academic biblical commentaries before the review can be considered methodologically complete for journal submission. The IIRMF has not undergone empirical evaluation, construct validation, or reliability testing; accordingly, its dimensions and proposed relationships must be regarded as provisional theoretical contributions rather than validated measures or demonstrated interventions. These limitations define the appropriate explanatory boundaries of the study and establish the need for further investigation.

The findings suggest several implications for Christian educational leadership and future research. At the institutional level, the proposed framework offers a rationale for examining whether leadership decisions, financial administration, appointments, disciplinary procedures, conflict-of-interest arrangements, and mechanisms for addressing ethical concerns remain consistent with publicly declared moral commitments. Institutions may consider proportionate integrity assessments, transparent decision-making procedures, independent oversight arrangements, protected reporting mechanisms, and opportunities for critical ethical reflection as potential means of strengthening accountability. Such recommendations should be adapted to institutional circumstances and evaluated rather than presumed effective. At the educational level, anti-corruption character formation should be examined in relation to students' experiences of fairness, consistency, responsibility, and institutional responses to questionable conduct, while recognizing that students may interpret these experiences differently. Future research should therefore investigate the proposed framework across diverse Christian educational institutions through multi-site studies combining organizational document analysis, interviews, surveys, and assessments of governance practices. Longitudinal and multilevel designs would be particularly valuable for examining whether leadership consistency and institutional accountability are associated with changes in perceived integrity, informal moral learning, and anti-corruption dispositions, while accounting for competing explanations such as institutional resources, organizational culture, and regulatory complexity. The development and testing of reliable measures for the six IIRMF dimensions should precede claims concerning its explanatory or practical effectiveness.

Ultimately, the study advances the proposition that the moral credibility of Christian education rests not merely on the values an institution proclaims, but also on its willingness and capacity to make the exercise of authority consistent, transparent, just, and accountable. This proposition provides a researchable foundation for examining institutional integrity as an essential dimension of anti-corruption character education, without presuming that the proposed framework has already achieved the outcomes it seeks to explain.

REFERENCES

- Ashforth, B. E., & Anand, V. (2003). The normalization of corruption in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 25, 1–52. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085\(03\)25001-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085(03)25001-2)
- Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3(3), 193–209. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0303_3
- Batson, C. D., Thompson, E. R., Seufferling, G., Whitney, H., & Strongman, J. A. (1999). Moral hypocrisy: Appearing moral to oneself without being so. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(3), 525–537. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.77.3.525>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 97(2), 117–134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.002>
- Brunsson, N. (1989). *The organization of hypocrisy: Talk, decisions, and actions in organizations* (N. Adler, Trans.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Cracknell, D. (2018). Christian leadership in education. In R. Stuart-Buttle & J. Shortt (Eds.), *Christian faith, formation and education* (pp. 229–243). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-62803-5_15
- Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., van Dierendonck, D., & Liden, R. C. (2019). Servant leadership: A systematic review and call for future research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 30(1), 111–132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.07.004>
- France, R. T. (2007). *The Gospel of Matthew*. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Herder and Herder.
- Giroux, H. A., & Penna, A. N. (1979). Social education in the classroom: The dynamics of the hidden curriculum. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 7(1), 21–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.1979.10506048>
- Green, J. B. (1997). *The Gospel of Luke*. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Hallak, J., & Poisson, M. (2007). *Corrupt schools, corrupt universities: What can be done?* UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning. <https://www.iiep.unesco.org/en/publication/corrupt-schools-corrupt-universities-what-can-be-done>
- Harris, M. J. (2005). *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A commentary on the Greek text*. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi. (2018). *Modul pendidikan antikorupsi untuk mahasiswa*. <https://www.aclc.kpk.go.id/materi-pembelajaran/pendidikan/buku/modul-pendidikan-antikorupsi-untuk-mahasiswa>
- Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi. (2025a, April 27). *Temuan hasil SPI Pendidikan 2024: 68% pengadaan barang dan jasa di perguruan tinggi rawan*

- disusupi. <https://kpk.go.id/id/ruang-informasi/berita/temuan-hasil-spi-pendidikan-2024-68-pengadaan-barang-dan-jasa-di-perguruan-tinggi-rawan-disusupi>
- Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi. (2025b, April 26). *Temuan hasil SPI Pendidikan 2024: Gratifikasi masih membayangi ruang kelas*. <https://kpk.go.id/id/ruang-informasi/berita/temuan-hasil-spi-pendidikan-2024-gratifikasi-masih-membayangi-ruang-kelas>
- Kohlberg, L. (1984). *Essays on moral development: Vol. 2. The psychology of moral development: The nature and validity of moral stages*. Harper & Row.
- Lickona, T. (1991). *Educating for character: How our schools can teach respect and responsibility*. Bantam Books.
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340–363. <https://doi.org/10.1086/226550>
- Nainggolan, M. M. (2025). Model konseptual pendidikan antikorupsi Kristen di pendidikan tinggi keagamaan Kristen Indonesia: Integrasi teori Kohlberg, Lickona, dan Freire. *Vox Dei: Jurnal Teologi dan Pastoral*, 6(1), 40–56. <https://doi.org/10.46408/vxd.v6i1.729>
- Özdoğan, M., & Sarier, Y. (2024). The relationship of ethical leadership with teachers' organizational behavior, attitudes, and perceptions: A meta-analysis study. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11, Article 1538. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-04070-6>
- Poisson, M. (2010). *Corruption and education*. UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning. <https://www.iiep.unesco.org/en/publication/corruption-and-education>
- Simons, T. (2002). Behavioral integrity: The perceived alignment between managers' words and deeds as a research focus. *Organization Science*, 13(1), 18–35. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.13.1.18.543>
- Sitio, R. J. T., Simanulang, P., Marpaung, M. C., & Kamangmau, Y. (2025). Iman dan keunggulan: Sebuah integrasi dalam kerangka manajemen mutu berbasis nilai Kristiani pada institusi pendidikan. *ELEOS: Jurnal Teologi dan Pendidikan Agama Kristen*, 4(2), 172–185. <https://doi.org/10.53814/eleos.v4i2.136>
- Smit, P. B. (2018). Servant leadership revisited: διακονία, masculinity and martyrdom in Mark 10:42–45. *Ecclesiology*, 14(3), 284–305. <https://doi.org/10.1163/17455316-01403004>
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333–339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>
- Tenbrunsel, A. E., & Messick, D. M. (2004). Ethical fading: The role of self-deception in unethical behavior. *Social Justice Research*, 17(2), 223–236. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:SORE.0000027411.35832.53>
- Torraco, R. J. (2005). Writing integrative literature reviews: Guidelines and examples. *Human Resource Development Review*, 4(3), 356–367. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484305278283>
- Treviño, L. K., Hartman, L. P., & Brown, M. (2000). Moral person and moral manager: How executives develop a reputation for ethical leadership. *California Management Review*, 42(4), 128–142. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41166057>
- Waltke, B. K. (2008). *A commentary on Micah*. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Whittemore, R., & Knafl, K. (2005). The integrative review: Updated methodology. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 52(5), 546–553. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2005.03621.x>